

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 19, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. HALL: In view of the disquieting report in this morning's *Advertiser* that unemployment in South Australia had reached the figure of 7,357 (1.7 per cent of the work force), and the alarming trend in this respect, will the Premier say what steps he has taken or intends to take to alleviate this position?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The general trend in Australia is toward an increase in the number of unemployed persons. Prior to the announcement of the increase in the basic wage, there was a slight hesitancy on the part of some firms to enter into contracts for fear of unknown extra costs, but my Government expects that certain industries will now take up a little of the apparent slack. In addition, there will be some demand for seasonal labour. Judging from press reports, unemployment is growing throughout Australia. However, I expect to present the Loan Estimates soon and, as soon as we have the necessary funds to continue with what we now have going, we shall be able to see what further steps we can take to alleviate the position.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In his policy speech last year the Premier said:

As a Party, we are very mindful of the need for a public works programme, but we are also aware that we cannot afford to be too elaborate in our approach in these matters when we have to compete against private works, as the labor market has its limitations in so far as manpower resources are concerned, but in the event of any curtailment on the part of private enterprise, our policy will provide for a speeding up of a works programme which will be to the advantage of the State generally. Can the Premier say whether the Loan programme envisaged will cover the matters referred to in his statement, and whether projects such as the Tailem Bend to Keith main, which has been eliminated temporarily from the public works programme, will be considered as urgent now in order to absorb manpower?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I regret that the information I gave was not acceptable to the honourable member. I said that the Loan Estimates would be introduced soon, but I have no date in mind at present. This programme will extend to as large a field as possible in order to create employment wherever

possible. The project referred to by the honourable member must be further considered before it will be known whether it can proceed immediately, or not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In answer to the Leader, the Premier pointed to the Australia-wide nature of the unemployment figures, except those for Queensland which show an improvement. However, this morning's *Advertiser* shows that the percentage for South Australia is now the highest, or the worst (which ever way one puts it), for the Commonwealth, and in marked contrast with the position at the beginning of last year and prior to that. As the Government's room for manoeuvre within the framework of the Loan Estimates is strictly limited, does not the Government consider that action additional to whatever may be proposed in the Loan Estimates is required to remedy the serious situation that has arisen and is continuing to develop in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Irrespective of the Party in Government, I doubt whether sufficient Loan money is available to solve the unemployment problems in South Australia. I cannot say at this stage what will be the exact position concerning particular Loan works. As I said before, I will bring down the Loan Estimates soon, and everything that can be done to relieve the unemployment position will be done by the Government.

Mr. COUMBE: As the Premier has said, the introduction of the Loan Estimates will have the effect of producing more contracts and spending in the community, thus providing more jobs. Therefore, can he say definitely when he is likely to introduce these Estimates?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Had I known the date of the presentation of the Loan Estimates, I would have given it. This Government is probably more concerned about unemployment in this State than anybody else. No doubt the Opposition is also concerned about it. The Chamber of Manufactures and other organizations concerned at the trend throughout the Commonwealth have asked the Commonwealth Government to reduce taxation and to take other action to reverse this downward trend. I assure the House and the people of South Australia that we have seriously considered this problem and that, if we do not succeed to the full, it will not be because this Government has not tried to remedy the position. I pay a tribute to the people who waited on the Prime Minister and other responsible officials in Canberra to try and solve this important problem.

Mr. McANANEY: As the Premier has said, all members of Parliament are most concerned about the increase in unemployment in South Australia to a greater extent than anywhere else in Australia. Unemployment such as this is usually due to a lack of money in the community or a lack of confidence amongst the community to spend. South Australia has not been affected by the drought and by other conditions that apply in other States, so apparently there must be a lack of confidence in South Australia, and I think this is brought about because industry and the community as a whole is wondering where the Government will raise money to meet its big deficit and its commitments in the coming year. Recently the Premier told the community as a whole not to worry about increased assessments because the Government would possibly consider a reduction in land tax rates. Last year the Opposition wanted the rates that were fixed to operate for only one year, while the Government wanted to extend the higher rates indefinitely. In view of the worry amongst landholders at present that there will be a \$6,000,000 increase in land tax this year, can the Premier now say whether there will be a reduction in the rate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As a general rule, I proceed one step at a time on matters that must come before this Parliament. Following the honourable member's long preamble to this question, I wish to remind him of the position in this State as I understand it. Much has been said about unemployment. However, I wonder whether the honourable member has given any thought to secondary industry production, and whether he realizes that domestic appliances are amongst the most important items of secondary production in this State. If the honourable member is considering production in the motor vehicle industry does he suggest that I prevail on the manufacturers to continue with an extensive overtime system which has assisted many people but which has now ceased because of the need for competitive costs? If the honourable member analyses all factors he will have a better idea of secondary industry and unemployment. Further information about land tax will be given when I introduce a Bill at the appropriate time, as the second reading explanation will contain all the necessary information.

ELECTROCUTION.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier an answer to my recent question concerning an accident caused by a power cable at Marino?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Without mentioning names in this report, because I do not wish to refer to anyone in particular, it seems that a gang was laying a 4in. C.I. main in Newland Avenue, Marino, on Saturday, July 2, 1966. At 1.15 p.m. the South Australian Gas Co. crane, registered number 164-083, fouled overhead wires causing neutral and 240-volt wires to fall to the ground. The ganger and his men shifted the live wires off the roadway by means of shovels. After the wire was placed near the pole in long grass about 12in. high, two double red lamps on stands were placed adjacent to the wire and a person was detailed to stand by. During the period this man was standing by waiting for the Electricity Trust to arrive, rain began to fall and he left the wire to get his overcoat. It was during this time that the horse walked between the warning lamps and stepped upon the live wire. From a float across the road in which other men in the gang were taking shelter from the rain, one of them saw the horse rear and pull the lead rope from the hand of a girl (about 12 years old) who was leading the horse. Although the girl walked outside the barricade lamps, the horse walked between the lamps, trampled on the wire, and was electrocuted. When the wire was broken the ganger detailed someone to ring the Gilbert Street depot and report the damage. The person in charge, on receipt of the report, endeavoured to telephone the Electricity Trust but was unable to make contact for 30 minutes after the wire had been broken. The trust's repair gang arrived at 2.20 p.m. and repairs were carried out. The horse electrocuted was a chestnut gelding 11 to 12 years old and stated to be valued at \$140. It was used as a hack and owned by the residents of a house in Newland Avenue, Marino. The owner arranged for the horse to be removed to the zoo or to the abattoirs.

MODBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 7 about sewer connections to two Modbury houses?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that the sewer connections to the houses concerned will be provided on the condition that the owners agree to make an annual payment, slightly in excess of the normal sewer rate, until June 30, 1972, to ensure that the department receives a reasonable return of revenue on the cost of the extension. Both residents have been so notified, and have now returned the signed agreement forms to the department. It is therefore proposed

that the 120ft. of 6in. sewer to connect these houses will be laid in about three weeks, while the plant is in the area.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Minister of Education may recall having had discussions last year with members of the Nuriootpa High School Council and me (and I think there has been correspondence since then) concerning the urgency for providing an additional oval and tennis courts at the school, particularly in view of its recent increased enrolment. As I understand that some time ago tenders were called for that work to be undertaken, can the Minister say whether a tender has been accepted and, if it has, when the work is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. E. LOVEDAY: I cannot say today whether tenders for that work were taken up, but I shall ascertain the position for the honourable member as soon as possible, and let him know.

FOOT-ROT.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked concerning the importance of the work undertaken at the Glenfield Research Centre in New South Wales, dealing with foot-rot in railway sheep vans?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We are aware of the work done at the Glenfield Research Station in New South Wales some years ago. Similar trials were carried out by us in 1957 and 1958, using sheep trucks and yards at Mile End, and here also there was no spread. These trials indicate that the risk of spread in railway vans is not great, but when we consider the greatly increased number of times such contact between infected and healthy sheep probably takes place over a year, the greater crowding which would normally occur in vans and transports, and the variations in the amount of moisture, temperature and fouling which occur, they cannot be accepted as conclusive. We have circumstantial evidence but no proof that clean sheep have become infected in transports and vans.

The South Australian Railways Department washes down its vans whenever possible at Adelaide and Mount Gambier in order to eliminate this risk. Most transport operators also wash down their vehicles after each load whenever possible, in order to avoid criticism from their clients. Our greatest danger lies now in the operation of interstate vans and transports which may have carried infected sheep in those States. Only 25 flocks remain in quarantine

in South Australia, and at least 20 of these are considered to be free of foot-rot.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: Last week, I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads a question about the intersection of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads at Eastwood. The Minister replied that there was a hold-up pending negotiations about the north-east corner of the intersection. I am well aware of this, and I believe one of the difficulties is that the Road Traffic Board wants to secure a left-hand turning lane, which it believes is a pre-requisite to the installation of traffic lights. As I have observed many intersections with traffic lights where there is no such lane, will the Minister again refer this matter to his colleague, with my comments added, to see whether perhaps this cannot be treated as is a normal intersection without the need to negotiate to obtain land for a left-hand turning lane?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a report as soon as possible.

HORTICULTURAL ADVISER.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of July 15 regarding the appointment of a horticultural adviser at Berri?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague informs me that, at present, Mr. G. W. Botting, an experienced adviser, is carrying on the work at Berri. Mr. Botting is appointed to the river districts specifically as an adviser on special duties on war service land settlement properties but is able to cope with routine duties at Berri. The permanent position of District Horticultural Adviser, Berri, will be filled as early as practicable, but there is difficulty owing to shortage of experienced staff.

KIDMAN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Minister of Education will be aware that I previously referred to him the difficulties of residents of Kidman Park who wished to send their children to the Seaton Park Primary School, which is a considerable distance away. Can the Minister say what progress has been made towards the construction of the new Kidman Park Primary School, and whether the new school is expected to be ready for use next year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a full report for the honourable member on progress and let him have it as soon as possible.

LICENSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago (I think on July 11) the Premier opened a new hotel-motel at Penola, and the press reported the occasion as follows:

The Premier (Mr. Walsh), speaking at Penola yesterday, said that he hoped the Royal Commission on liquor would make no recommendations that would enable the "big organizations" to sell ale and spirits over the counter. He said that we were all grateful that as a community, State and nation we had control of liquor within a licensing organization.

As there is now a Royal Commission inquiring into the liquor industry in South Australia, will the Premier say whether he was correctly reported and, if he was, just what he meant by that statement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not responsible if the report has omitted the preface to my remarks on that occasion, when I deliberately set out to say that my remarks were not to be associated in any way with the liquor inquiry. As far as it went the report was fairly accurate, although I made other statements that were not reported. On that occasion I compared large storekeepers with tobacconists, for I pointed out that during the Second World War people who smoked tobacco, cigarettes or cigars obtained their quotas from tobacconists, whereas these days large chain stores buy in large quantities and sell more cheaply in some instances than do the tobacconists. I went on to say that if alcoholic beverages could be sold under those conditions it would not be in the best interests of this State. That is my definite opinion. We should consider ourselves fortunate that at least we have a control over the sale of alcohol, for this functions in the best interests of all.

POTATOES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of July 7 concerning the rejection of potatoes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, reports:

The procedure for the inspection of potatoes is as follows:

1. Unwashed Potatoes.—Potatoes are inspected to the grading standards prescribed by regulations under the Fruit and Vegetables (Grading) Act. These standards were

approved five years ago by Agricultural Council and are uniform in all States. The inspection procedure is as follows: Two or three bags, dependent on size of load, are selected from each load submitted for inspection. These bags are run over a grader and any potatoes not complying with the minimum standard of the particular grade are removed and weighed. In removing these potatoes a tolerant interpretation of the requirements is exercised. If the total weight of the reject potatoes is greater than the percentage permitted on a package basis then further bags are run over the grader. If after examining several bags the inspector is satisfied that on the basis of his examination the potatoes are not up to the minimum standard then the load is rejected. While an inspector passes a load on the result of his initial examination, he rejects only after viewing further bags when a load is in doubt. Rejection figures in relation to delivery figures are very small. Following are the rejection figures for April, May and June (2 weeks only) for 1965 and 1966. Delivery figures would be in the vicinity of 4,000 tons per month.

| | 1965. | Tons. |
|-----------------|-------|-------|
| April | 84 | |
| May | 46 | |
| June | 78 | |
| | 1966. | |
| April | 33 | Tons. |
| May | 41 | |
| June | 19 | |

2. Washed Potatoes.—Potatoes in South Australia are washed by three private firms and one co-operative. Washed potatoes are subject to the same grade standards as are unwashed. The interpretation of the requirements by the inspector is the same. However, two important factors must be borne in mind:

- (a) With washed potatoes all defects are much more readily visible.
- (b) Damaged potatoes if not sold promptly after washing can quickly deteriorate and become rejects.

Potatoes after washing are not held by the processor and submitted for inspection. The majority of potatoes washed are not seen by the inspectors. Inspectors make regular visits to washing plants to try to ensure that the potatoes packaged are of the minimum standard required by the regulations. Whilst the inspectors may advise the managers on standards, they do not set the standard which is the responsibility solely of the manager. Departmental rejections of potatoes at the washing plants are negligible. Rejections take place when an inspector is called in to look at potatoes returned or held by a dissatisfied buyer.

On numerous occasions inspectors have refused to reject potatoes from a dissatisfied buyer. This is because in the opinion of the inspector the potatoes meet the minimum standard required for the grade. This applies particularly to potatoes that have discoloured after washing. There is great difficulty, however, in selling such potatoes. Emphatically,

the standard for washed potatoes is set by the consumer and not by the inspectors. The many loads of potatoes reported rejected, presumably after forwarding for marketing, have not been rejected by the Agriculture Department.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Earlier this year I presented a petition to the Minister of Works from residents of southern Yorke Peninsula concerning further water reticulation in that area. On March 20 I received a letter from the Minister in which he stated that a final survey was being made of underground water basins on southern Yorke Peninsula, and that the Mines Department would complete the investigations by the end of the financial year. Can the Minister say whether these investigations have been completed and, if they have been, whether they are favourable for further water reticulation on southern Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful to the honourable member for reminding me of my statement. I shall inquire whether the report is available and, if it is, I shall inform the honourable member.

BOOL LAGOON.

Mr. RODDA: I understand that the existing grazing licences at Bool Lagoon are to be renewed for a further 12 months. It has been rumoured in the area that the area known as "Hacks" will be made into a sanctuary, and this rumour is causing disquiet amongst people interested in duck shooting. Can the Minister of Lands say whether the rumour is correct and what is the Government's policy on the future use of Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware that something has been done about the renewal of grazing rights for a further 12 months. However, I shall refer the matter to the department, obtain a report, and inform the honourable member tomorrow, if possible.

COMPANY INVESTIGATION.

Mr. HURST: I have received many inquiries concerning the Lease Merchandising Company of Australia Proprietary Limited, a company apparently involved in a system of chain letters. Can the Attorney-General say whether this company has been investigated by his department and, if it has, has the Attorney-General any information for the public of South Australia about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for this question. I have received queries from many members concerning this organization, which has been

investigated by my department, and these investigations are proceeding. The reports so far given me have caused me so much concern that I consider I should make a statement now to try to save the public from further involvement with this organization. The company was incorporated in South Australia on April 18, 1966, with a nominal capital of 10,000 shares of \$1 each. The called-up capital is 12 shares of \$1 each, these being subscriber shares taken up by Joseph Terlizzi with 10 shares; Luigi Verlingieri with one share; and Gioglio de Cicco with one share. The company directors are Joseph Terlizzi and Luigi Verlingieri, whose occupations are described as minister at large and manager respectively. Terlizzi's address is shown on the company Return of Directors, Managers and Secretaries held in this office, as 454 Mission Street, Pasadena, California, U.S.A., whilst that of Verlingieri is 206 Portrush Road, Trinity Gardens, S.A. Terlizzi is at present residing in Adelaide.

On Tuesday, July 12, 1966, at 7 p.m., the Senior Companies Inspector attended with about 40 others a so-called "opportunity" meeting held by the company in the Rechabite Hall, Grote Street, Adelaide. The purpose of his being in attendance was to obtain information concerning the company's business and to observe the manner in which persons were being invited to become associated with its activities. On Wednesday, July 13, 1966, he interviewed the managing director (Mr. Terlizzi) at the registered office of the company situated at North Terrace House, North Terrace, Adelaide. The purpose of this visit was to inspect the company's books and records, etc.

Arising out of his inquiries, it seems that the business of the company is to appoint "distributors" (after the payment of a licence fee) whose function it is in turn to obtain other distributors and so on and thereby obtain for themselves commission based on an operation principal similar to that of a chain letter. The company's methods appear to be as under:

(1) To sell licences for \$225 each to sponsored applicants entitling them to become company distributors.

(2) To rent a company product (one only) to each distributor (30 days after completing payment for his licence) for a fixed term of three years under a signed lease or rental agreement. Terms of payment for the lease being at a rental rate of \$12.50 a month during the three-year period.

(3) To hand over the company product covered under the lease agreement to the distributor at the end of three years, or subject to certain events happening during the course of the three years to hand over the article conditional upon the payment of \$5 release fee.

(4) To pay out to distributors commissions as and when due based on the number of distributors he has introduced into the company both directly and indirectly and who are still active, i.e., still paying their \$12.50 a month.

(5) Appoint dealers after payment of an application fee of \$2 to sell on a rental basis company products for commission.

The mechanics of the system outlined under methods above are as under:

(1) Prospective applicants are invited to attend "opportunity" meetings of the above company held from time to time. They are required by the company manual to be accompanied by a sponsor who is required to be either a distributor or a district manager (this practice does not appear to apply in all instances). A sponsor in forming his group is required to sponsor five applicants (who later become distributors).

(2) Applicants can either pay the \$225 licence fee in full or make a deposit (thereby becoming a provisional licensee) and pay the balance remaining over four payments beginning 30 days after the signing of the licence agreement. All applicants are required to sign the contract agreement applying to become a distributor at time of making any deposit as applicants.

(3) Thirty days after the completion of the payment in full for the \$225 licence the applicant then becomes a distributor. This 30-day period is necessary as under the terms of the contract an applicant can apply for his money back during this time subject to certain conditions.

(4) As a distributor, two things then follow:

1. He commences receiving commissions as under based on the number of distributors obtained by him in his group (both directly and indirectly) and who are active at the time commissions are payable:

- (a) \$30 for each distributor sponsored, that is, the five he obtains in his group.
- (b) \$2 monthly for each direct distributor as in (a) above.
- (c) \$1 monthly for each distributor brought in by his direct distributors.

(d) 40c monthly for each distributor brought in in his group on the third level.

(e) 25c monthly for each distributor brought in in his group on the fourth level.

(f) 20c monthly for each distributor brought in in his group on the fifth level.

(g) \$2 (as a one time payment each year), two weeks prior to Christmas for each active distributor in the group at that time.

In terms of the manual commissions are only payable to distributors who continue paying the \$12.50 a month under the rental agreement. In all instances where a distributor does not continue this payment, he is (according to the company) handed over the company product he is renting, subject to a \$5 release fee being paid and in turn he ceases to receive any further commissions, which revert to his immediate sponsor distributor provided he is "active".

2. Selects a company product (clothes drier, sauna bath, etc.) at the same time signing a 3-year rental or lease agreement contracting to pay the company \$12.50 a month as rent payment. Until the expiration of the three years or unless released by the company earlier, the product remains the property of the company.

Mr. Jennings: It's a racket!

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Are the firm's solicitors named in the prospectus?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a public company: it is a proprietary one.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It must have solicitors.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot see their names here. From my examination of the company records, Terlizzi's name appeared on the majority of contract agreements as the first sponsor, and in instances where his name did not appear on an agreement, these agreements had been fully taken up by the five persons required. It could therefore be assumed that his name had appeared in the first instance. In most agreements three originating members of the company, Verlingieri and the two District Managers (B. D. Turton, a name which I have no doubt is known to the member for Semaphore and to certain members opposite, and K. Lawson) followed as first

applicants on Terlizzi's sponsorships. It is obvious therefore that in the end the main persons to benefit from the scheme will be the originators. The company handles all the money and, therefore, if its activities expand a very extensive record system of distributors and their entitlements will have to be maintained in order to ensure that each distributor rightfully received his dues. This type of operation strongly favours manipulation in favour of the company.

Books of account and records were completely inadequate. Until eight days ago (the company has been functioning five to six weeks) receipts were not issued or if they were they were typed receipts on pieces of paper (not duty stamped). There was no record maintained adequately of receipts and payments which could be reconciled with banking accounts. The company operated two accounts, a trading account and a trust account in its name at the Australian and New Zealand Bank branch, corner King William Street and Currie Street, Adelaide. Terlizzi also operated a bank account in his own name at this bank. As I understand from inquiries made, the only person authorized to operate any of these three accounts is Terlizzi. As the result of an examination of the contract agreements held in the company's office the trust account (of which there was no proper record in the company's books of account) should have been in credit to the extent of \$2,677, but on further inquiries the balance at the bank as at July 14, 1966, was found to be \$1,370. The trading account balance at the bank was \$206. Mr. Terlizzi's private account has been credited with a number of deposits recently. The initial investigations, made as a result of numbers of complaints received, reveal that this is a project of the chain letter type which is bound to collapse eventually. The people who will suffer at that stage of the proceedings will be the most recent applicants to the company, and the people who make the money will be the originators of the company. The whole thing is of doubtful legality, indeed, and further investigations will be made. I am grateful to the honourable member for asking his question, because I urge members of the public to be extraordinarily careful about being involved in this scheme.

PATHOLOGICAL TESTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question I asked

last week, concerning charges for pathological services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I brought before my colleague (who, unfortunately, was away last week) the matters raised by the honourable member. I have not had a full reply from him yet, although I have spoken with him about the question, but I expect to have a report for the honourable member tomorrow.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week I asked a question of the Premier concerning the expenditure of \$670,000 at Roseworthy Agricultural College. I realize that the Government does not desire to misrepresent the matter and that it frowns on the lack of keeping proper books of account (to which the Attorney-General referred a few moments ago). I expected a "Yes" or "No" to the question I asked last week, but the Premier merely said that he would supply further information at the appropriate time during the next week. Therefore, can he say whether this is now an appropriate time for the public and this House to receive an answer "Yes" or "No" to my question whether the Commonwealth Government or the State Government would provide the necessary finance?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commonwealth has undertaken to make available over a period of four years to June, 1968, an aggregate of \$3,733,000 to supplement expenditure by the State upon buildings and equipment for technical education. The State, for its part, in order to qualify for the Commonwealth assistance, has undertaken to spend out of its own funds at least at the annual rate of its expenditures prior to this arrangement. The availability of these additional Commonwealth funds has assuredly made it possible to carry out the proposed expenditure of \$670,000 at Roseworthy, and in fact the project has been submitted to the Commonwealth and approved as coming within the arrangements. In this sense it could be said the Commonwealth will be effectively paying for the Roseworthy work. Certainly if this work were not carried out by the State, and if no other acceptable work were contemplated in its place, then the Commonwealth grant to that extent could not be claimed. More fairly, however, the situation could be stated as follows: over the four-year period expenditures upon land, buildings and equipment by departments associated with education will

amount to something like \$50,000,000, including this \$670,000 for Roseworthy. Towards this four-year programme of about \$50,000,000 the State will receive Commonwealth assistance of \$3,733,000 under these particular arrangements. To go further than this simple factual statement and try to specify just which money, Commonwealth or State, goes to which project and in what proportions, introduces an artificial and arbitrary approach on which different people may easily come to different answers. The arrangements for the Chowilla dam are similar, and perhaps the history of that project could be explained to the House, if necessary.

Mr. HALL: With regard to the Premier's answer to the member for Rocky River, I am alarmed—

The SPEAKER: Order! I realize I made a mistake in allowing the member for Rocky River to get away with the comment he made in asking his question. I do not intend to allow comments in questions.

Mr. HALL: I beg your pardon, Sir, if I have transgressed, and I shall endeavour to rephrase my question. As the Premier states, concerning expenditure by the State and Commonwealth Governments on technical education and on education generally, that he is unable to separate what is to be spent by the Commonwealth Government and what is to be spent by the State Government, and is therefore unable to say definitely whether the Commonwealth Government has been directly responsible for all money to be spent at Roseworthy, I draw his attention to the report submitted to the House by the Public Works Committee, with regard to Mr. Barnes's evidence, which states:

The schedule of projects had been approved by the Commonwealth but it was left to the State Government to determine priorities and to see that the funds were put to as effective a use as possible. This could be the last opportunity for Roseworthy to participate in a full Commonwealth grant under "technical training" because of new arrangements for advanced education as a result of the report of the Martin Committee.

In its findings, the committee stated:

If contracts are let by the end of July there is every prospect of a full Commonwealth grant being made to cover the total capital cost of buildings and equipment.

The recommendation of the committee was as follows:

The committee recommends the proposed public work on the construction of a science block and farm engineering centre at Roseworthy Agricultural College at an estimated cost of \$670,000.

The committee made its recommendation in the belief that this money would be supplied totally by the Commonwealth Government. Can the Premier say whether the committee's findings were based on an incorrect surmise of the source of this money?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already given an answer to this important question this afternoon, and I have nothing more to add to that.

Mr. HALL: Because of the public interest in Commonwealth aid for education, will the Premier table the correspondence relating to the negotiations with the Commonwealth Government about additions to the Roseworthy Agricultural College?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have given members a prepared statement concerning the Roseworthy Agricultural College, and I do not know what else I have to do. I will examine the position further to see what more can be done, but the Leader may read the details in *Hansard* tomorrow or he may peruse the docket if he wishes.

BERRI HOSPITAL.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my question of July 7 seeking information about the construction of a pathology and radiology block at Berri Hospital to serve the Upper Murray area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chief Secretary informs me that approval has already been given for a branch laboratory of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science to be established at the Berri Hospital. Plans for a combined pathology and radiology block have already been prepared and are at present receiving consideration. A decision has not yet been made as to the method to be adopted concerning the provision of the X-ray equipment in the radiology centre.

HARBOURS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the committee appointed by the Government to inquire into establishing a harbour at Giles Point also investigated the possibility of establishing harbours in other parts of the State, particularly at Port Neill and Streaky Bay on Eyre Peninsula? If the committee made these inquiries but has not yet finalized them, will the Minister say when a report on other harbours will be made available?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee reported to me, and I referred the report

to Cabinet. The committee members considered generally many ports in South Australia, but their only recommendation to date unanimously favours a port at Giles Point.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Evidence was recently taken concerning deep sea ports in South Australia. As evidence was submitted with regard to a deep sea port at Arno Bay, can the Minister of Marine say whether the report has been received and, if it has, will he make it available to me?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall make the report available to the honourable member (and to the members for Yorke Peninsula and Bidley, who showed interest in the matter) with the greatest of pleasure.

DIRTY WATER.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about the water supply in certain parts of my district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department has received complaints from householders in the Warradale and Brighton areas. These complaints are justified and the trouble is caused by, first, the completion of the cleaning of the Happy Valley reservoir outlet tunnel leading to the metropolitan area; and, secondly, the work which is at present being done on the cleaning out of the Darlington tanks. Because of these two reasons it has been necessary for the department to change the direction of the flow of water in a number of mains and to also increase the velocity of flow in some mains. This has had the effect of picking up sediment lying on the bottom of the pipes concerned. These works are necessary and the department uses its best endeavours to ensure that as little trouble as possible is caused from dirty water resulting from them. When complaints are received the mains concerned are flushed through fire plugs to try to improve the quality of the water. In years when the metropolitan reservoirs fill, an intensive programme of systematic flushing of all mains is commenced and this work is continued as long as the reservoirs remain full. The Regional Engineer, Metropolitan, has prepared a general report on the question of the occurrence of dirty water in the reticulation system and I shall be happy to make that report available to the honourable member.

CAR SAFETY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There appeared in the *Australian* of last Saturday morning (and it has appeared in other newspapers, too) a report of the decisions of the *Australian Transport*

Advisory Council meeting in Canberra at the end of last week. Dealing with the eight points of car safety which apparently have been agreed to by the Ministers, the *Australian* says:

The Federal Minister for Shipping and Transport and Chairman of the council (Mr. Freeth) said that all Governments realized that more safety factors would have to be built into cars if the road toll was to be reduced.

Can the Premier say whether this indicates the attitude of the South Australian Government and, if it does, what action the Government intends to take in this State along these lines?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Nothing has come before Cabinet, and I have not yet received a report from the Minister of Transport. When anything specific is received, the Government will make up its mind on the matter and inform the honourable member what the decision is likely to be.

TEA TREE GULLY WATER SUPPLY.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on June 29 concerning the pressure of the water supply in Erica Street, Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief informs me that the property referred to by the honourable member is in the highest part of Tea Tree Gully, located on the eastern side of Haynes Road. This is an area which is too high to be satisfactorily supplied from the Tea Tree Gully tanks, despite the fact that these tanks are the highest service tanks along the foothills. The property is supplied by means of an indirect service, which was only granted on the acceptance by the householder of the fact that, at times of peak demand, the pressure would be poor. The usual programme of winter maintenance is being carried out at the present time and the supply to the higher areas along the foothills has fluctuated with the necessary alterations to the feeds. This has affected the supply to indirect services on the very high levels such as the one referred to by the honourable member, and it is expected that this condition will continue until the maintenance programme is completed in August.

BARLEY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning a new variety of barley that was being introduced by the Western Australian Agriculture Department. Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports:

The new Western Australian barley variety, Dampier, has been included in six barley variety trials in South Australia this year. Four of these, namely, Urania, Melton, Lameroo and Turretfield Research Centre, have been sown and the remaining two, Cummins and Arthurton, will be sown shortly. A strong indication of its likely performance in South Australia will be obtained from these experiments but further testing will be carried out in subsequent years. It is apparent from a report to the Barley Research Advisory Committee in Western Australia that further testing is going on in Western Australia this year. It appears that sowings are restricted to four farmers who are growing grain for brewing tests, and a further 11 farmers who have two bags each to sow to evaluate its performance. A small quantity of seed was made available for use by the Waite Institute and this department. Yield data made available to the Waite Institute indicated advantages over Prior less than those quoted and also those reported in the press.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last week the Minister of Education agreed to get me some supplementary information regarding certain payments that the State Government made in respect of trainee teachers in the Education Department. My question concerned the information set out on the Form 3 and the date the payments were actually made. Has the Minister that information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Form 3 excess warrant gives the following information concerning payment to teachers, as required by the honourable member:

Item of Expenditure: Contingencies—Contribution to teachers for additional tax arising from delayed salary adjustments.

Amount required: \$2,252.

Reason for Expenditure: The amount is required to reimburse teachers for the additional tax incurred by them as a result of delayed salary adjustments. This amount was approved by Cabinet in E.D. 19/6/33 on 26/4/66.

Payment was passed by the Treasury on June 22, 1966; and cheques were forwarded to teachers on June 24.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Earlier this session I asked several questions about employees of the S.A. Railways who, as members of the Citizen Military Forces, were having their pay made up and were not being paid in addition to army pay while they were in camp. The Premier promised me a report but I have not received it yet. When I asked those questions

it was on the assumption that members of the Public Service who were members of the C.M.F. received their pay as well as their army pay while on full-time duty. I have received representations from several public servants in the C.M.F. (notably from those in the Public Buildings Department) to the effect that while they were in camp a couple of months ago they did not receive full pay, their pay being made up by the difference between their army pay and their civilian pay. Can the Premier indicate the Government's policy in this regard with respect to employees of the Public Service and of the S.A. Railways and whether, if full pay is to be given during their absence on military service (and I hope it is), those cases that have been brought to my notice where this has not been done will be reviewed and the difference made up?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I recollect having replied last week to a question about the pay of C.M.F. members. However, rather than guess I shall obtain further information from my colleague, and shall inform the honourable member when I have it.

APPLES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Lands a report from the Minister of Agriculture concerning inspection of apples for export during the forthcoming season?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that inspection of fresh fruit for export is carried out by officers on behalf of the Department of Primary Industry which administers the fresh fruit export regulations, pays all salaries and costs involved, and sets out the requirements for the work to be done properly to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Department of Primary Industry. The inspection is not a duty of the State Agriculture Department, although certain of its officers administer the regulations in South Australia under direction from the Department of Primary Industry. The duty of an inspector is to examine a number of cases selected at random from a consignment packed and submitted for export and satisfy himself that the declaration made by the shed manager that the conditions and requirements applicable under the Exports (Fresh Fruit) Regulations have been complied with, and that the containers are marked in the prescribed manner.

It is not the duty of an inspector to advise sheds on the requirements for the packing of fruit for export. The Department of Primary

Industry is very clear, in its instruction to this effect. It is the responsibility of the shed manager to set his standard, supervise the packing, and submit for export inspection. Shed inspection commenced in South Australia in 1961. South Australia is the only State with large-scale shed inspection. Previously, for about 40 years, it was the practice to do full export inspection at shipside. Shipside inspection is the normal approved method in Australia. On a Commonwealth basis, only a small percentage of fruit exported is inspected in packing sheds. In 1961, in an endeavour to assist the South Australian industry to improve its handling and reduce its costs, inspection at sheds was introduced with the provision that a final examination at shipside must be carried out for such factors as loading temperature, bitter pit which may have developed in storage, general condition of fruit, marking of boxes and any other defects not noticeable at time of immediate packing.

The main advantages of shed inspection were to the sheds themselves and were as follows:

- (1) Palletizing could be carried out from packer to ship without breaking them down for inspection.
- (2) No freight was incurred from wharf to shed on rejected consignments.
- (3) Managers could be warned of faults on the spot and without delay, these faults being seen at the time of inspection in the shed itself.

On the inspection side, there were difficulties such as the need for increased seasonal staff and for inspectors, although in reduced numbers, at shipside as well as in the sheds. Supervision of inspectors was more difficult but as the sheds are all relatively close to the port it was considered that the increased cost was reasonable and worthwhile.

Shortly after the beginning of the last season, it was necessary to withdraw inspectors from the sheds as, with the poor quality of the fruit resulting from widespread hail damage and the great amount of sorting which had to be done, shed inspection became impracticable with the staff available. The estimated quantity of fruit to be packed for export was so reduced by shed managers that in several instances it was economically unsound to have inspectors stationed on the premises. The greatest problem of the season, apart from hail damage, was broken skins and these were not apparent at the time of packing, necessitating inspection at the wharf. At the time that the inspectors were withdrawn from sheds and stationed at the wharf it was known by all con-

cerned that this was related to the particular season only. Provided seasonal and other conditions are normal, it is expected that shed inspection will resume during the forthcoming season.

YOUTH FACILITIES.

Mrs. STEELE: About 12 months ago a public meeting was held at the Norwood Town Hall to discuss what recreation facilities could be provided for the young people of that district to keep them off the streets. I understand that, prior to that meeting, much research work had been undertaken and that, following it, various committees were formed for the purpose of examining the matter. As I have heard nothing further, can the Minister of Social Welfare say what is happening in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for her question. The committees formed as a result of that public meeting held, I think, last October, examined a number of propositions that had arisen from the 3-year survey taken by the university Department of Social Science into gaps in youth facilities in the Kensington and Norwood area. After the committees had met for some time they had a certain number of propositions to put forward. There were three basic proposals arising from the survey. One was that certain after-school facilities should be established. These were all ordered (though not over-organized) after-school activities of a project type to be made available in the period from about 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. First, there was a project for younger people who were at a loose end after school and who were not involved (as were those at the later stages of secondary education) in regular after-school sport and extra curricular activities associated with secondary schools. The second project was for a casual drop-in club, not providing for organized activities, but a place where young people in the later teen-age group could go, which could provide a clearing house under some supervision for the organized activities in the area and, at the same time, provide satisfactorily furnished accommodation and a pleasant atmosphere in which young people could mix and engage in some creative activities of their own.

The third proposal was a much more ambitious project, namely, the provision of a youth garden—a sort of combination between the Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen and the Cannon Hill Trust project in England, both

of which we have examined in detail. Early this year we decided the committees had gone about as far as they could go in preparing proposals here. None of them had come up so far with specific projects, that is, for buildings or for areas to be acquired. There were some differences of opinion about after-school facilities, and no site had been chosen. As far as the drop-in club was concerned, it had been recommended that we should seek premises on the Parade, and we examined a number of alternative premises, none of which was satisfactory. (That, of course, was as an interim measure.) It was ultimately proposed that the drop-in facilities be provided in the youth garden project. Originally, it was thought the youth garden project might be involved in the Kensington redevelopment proposals being examined by the consultant appointed by the Kensington and Norwood City Council to prepare its redevelopment schemes under the Town Planning Act.

However, the examination made by the consultant involved (Mr. Pak Poy) did not produce a proposal for a youth garden area in Kensington and, in consequence, other areas had to be examined. In the first three months of this year we examined areas in Norwood to see whether there was a possibility of a long-range acquisition and of planning for the development of a major and ambitious long-range project there. We have found an area that we think can provide the basis for such a project, and this is currently being examined. We hope we may be able initially to lease some premises erected in part of this area to provide the initial drop-in club; we are currently negotiating for this and, at the same time, examining the possibilities of long-range acquisition by an incorporated organization, consisting of local residents and the council, with Government support, for the whole project. I hope that later this year I shall be able to make announcements in relation to it. Immediately, we are examining two sites for the after-school activities. We have proposals for a temporary building to be erected, and there are two alternative sites about which we are negotiating with the Kensington and Norwood City Council. I expect that I shall shortly be able to announce the erection of a temporary building to start the after-school activities.

The Kensington and Norwood Girls Technical High School is expected to be completed at about the end of next year (as the honourable member knows, it is under construction), and we have viewed the possibility, then,

of more permanent quarters for the after-school project. The department, after having sponsored the various committees set up around the projects, then seconded Mr. Pat Hall (a wellknown probation officer in the department) specifically to do this work, in conjunction with the survey he is making of recreation facilities within the department's institutions generally. Mr. Hall went to Sydney, together with Mr. Richards, an officer of the department, earlier this year to study the work in that State in connection with after-school facilities and general youth projects and, as a result of his report to me, I think the honourable member will find that specific announcements on this project will shortly be made.

BOLIVAR SEWAGE WORKS.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question concerning odour emanating from the sewage works at Bolivar?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has reported that there are some odours emanating from the temporary sludge treatment and disposal operations at Bolivar. At present the sewage is receiving primary treatment only and the works will discharge a fully treated effluent when stage 2 is completed later this year. Stage 3 will include six large digestion tanks from which gas will be collected to operate the power station. The odourless digested sludge will then be passed into lagoons for the removal of excess water, after which it will be finally dried and available for disposal. Tenders for stage 3 will close this week and it is expected that, subject to the acceptance of a satisfactory tender, the work under this stage will be completed towards the end of 1968. In the meantime, every effort will be made to keep odours to a minimum, for, while there is no health hazard, it is realized that such odours can be unpleasant.

MODBURY SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: A new school, to be known as the Modbury South Primary School, is at present under construction adjacent to the Modbury High School in Pompoota Road. Children who will attend this school are at present housed in the third wing of the high school. Can the Minister of Education say when the new school will be completed and ready for occupation? How many classrooms and what ancillary accommodation will it have?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have a check made on the matter, and report to the honourable member as soon as I have the information.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that over the years it has always been the practice of the Government of South Australia to finance the construction of major bridgeworks out of Loan funds and not out of the Highways Fund. Earlier this session I asked the Premier whether he would arrange for the House to have an opportunity to debate the programme to be financed from the Highways Fund; he flatly turned down that proposal. I have now heard the Government intends to finance the construction of the new Jervois bridge out of the Highways Fund and not out of Loan funds, as has always been done up to the present, the last case in point being the financing of the Blanchetown bridge. Can the Premier say whether the Jervois bridge is to be financed from the Highways Fund and, if it is, will he give the reason for this departure from an old and well established policy?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am unaware of any departure from previous policy. To the best of my knowledge the Loan Estimates have always included a provision for bridges. If the Minister of Roads can provide information in reply to the honourable member's question, I shall be happy to convey it to the honourable member.

TARNMA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the original plan for the Tarnma water scheme provision was made for the installation of a buffer reservoir.

Mr. Jennings: How about provision for leave to explain your question?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the foundations for this tank have been excavated for over a year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must get leave of the House if he wants to make an explanation.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker, and ask for that leave. Can the Minister of Works say whether his department intends to complete the building of this buffer tank?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that I do not possess that information but I will call for a report and inform the honourable member when it is to hand.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have before me the Attorney-General's circular letter dealing with the appointment of justices of the peace. I hope he will pardon me for not communicating with him by the date he set down, but he is aware of my reasons for not doing so. I notice that in some districts there are vacancies; in other words, the number of exist-

ing justices is less than the quota. I know that in at least one township (Port Neill) in my district there are vacancies; also, applications from that town for appointment as justices are before the Attorney-General at present. Can the Attorney say whether, assuming these people are within the acceptable categories, he will proceed to make the appointments soon?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member lets me know as soon as he can whether he agrees with the proposed quotas, the outstanding applications will be examined and appointments made as soon as possible.

LYNDOCH SCHOOLHOUSE.

Mrs. BYRNE: In a letter dated March 31, the Minister of Education informed me that the Housing Trust had commenced building a house for the Headmaster of the Lyndoch Primary School, the present house being condemned. At present, the Headmaster resides in a trust house at Freeling. Can the Minister say when the new residence will be completed and ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. What was the salary for the position of Public Relations Officer in the Attorney-General's Department when the position was first advertised?

2. What salary was paid to this officer when first engaged?

3. What subsequent increment, if any, has there been to this salary?

4. What will this officer's salary be when transferred to the Premier's Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are:

1. The position was advertised at the graduates' range, \$3,004 to \$4,504.

2. Mr. Combe was appointed at \$3,124 per annum, the appropriate figure in the range for a graduate of his standing.

3. \$3,292 per annum from January 1, 1966. \$3,640 per annum from March 10, 1966. This followed changes in general salaries of clerks in the graduates' range, which is now \$3,004 to \$4,740.

4. No change is contemplated.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Physiotherapists Board or any other body recommended any change in section 39 of the Physiotherapists Act?

2. If so, what has been recommended and by which body?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to amend section 39 of this Act?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. No.

2. See No. 1.

3. The Physiotherapists Board has no present intention of making any recommendation to the Government for amendment of section 39.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. HALL (on notice): How much was paid by the Government for land purchased for the establishment of a new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cabinet approval has been given to purchase land adjacent to the corner of West Beach Road and Marion Road, Netley, for \$290,000. Under the terms of settlement, 10 per cent of the purchase price has been paid to the vendor. The balance of the moneys due will be paid later this year at which time vacant possession of the site will be given.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT 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 amend the Prices Act, 1948-1966, 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 amend the Prices Act, 1948-1966, to provide for the continuation of price control until December 31, 1967. The Government's reasons for proposing the amendment are much the same as they were last year. It is considered to be in the best interests of the community as a whole to retain this legislation. The \$2 increase in the basic wage will add considerably to the costs of manufacturers and traders. As a result, many industries will be seeking to recover these increased costs by way of increased prices. This State is particularly vulnerable to cost increases for two main reasons: first, because of the limited local market, a large

proportion of our factory output has to be sold in other States in competition with goods made in those States and, secondly, in the case of primary producers, nearly two-thirds of the State's primary production amounting to approximately \$280,000,000 is exported and is, in the main, subject to world prices. It is therefore important to ensure that any price increases which follow the wage increase are not excessive and are fully justified.

Prices and charges for a wide range of goods and services in this State are below those in other States, and there is continual pressure to bring many of these prices and charges up to the levels prevailing elsewhere. Without control, the prices of the items concerned would rapidly rise to achieve this uniformity and, in some cases, would probably go higher on account of the incidence of freight costs where goods are manufactured outside of South Australia. Furthermore, unrestricted price increases would rapidly whittle away the benefit that will be obtained by wage-earners from the wage increase. As honourable members know, under the Prices Act a service is provided to the community by way of investigation into complaints of over-charges on both controlled and uncontrolled goods and services. Many of the complaints received by the Prices Department relate to disputes concerning charges for services rendered, in particular, on home-building work and repairs. In the 12 months to June 30 last over 400 complaints of over-charges on goods and services were investigated, and in 172 cases refunds or reductions in the amount of accounts were obtained. An important aspect of this service is its deterrent effect; without it, it is likely that excessive charging would be more widespread. This applies particularly to services supplied to elderly people and migrants who are more likely to be unfamiliar with what would constitute a reasonable charge. A number of cases have been investigated where these people have been over-charged by unscrupulous operators. There is ample evidence to show that this service is widely appreciated.

This State also enjoys the advantage of low building costs, which means that more houses can be built with the finance available. Whilst this is not all due to price control, the fact that prices of many building materials and rates for building services have been under control for 25 years and are in a number of cases lower than those in other States where they are not controlled, must assist in keeping building costs down. Apart from its price-fixing function, the department

continues to cover a number of other activities including, for example, special investigations for the Government (which this year included the fixing of minimum prices for wine grapes) and inquiries into complaints relating to hire-purchase agreements, used car transactions, etc. As a result of active supervision by the department, the unfair trading provisions in the Prices Act have proved of benefit to the community in several ways. In particular, small traders are being afforded some protection through the provision which prohibits any limit being placed on the sale of cut-priced articles. Consequently, the practice of "loss leading" by large chain stores to attract customers away from small shops has been substantially reduced. Also, the provision regarding misleading advertising has resulted in the elimination of a number of undesirable and misleading advertisements.

In addition to the practices specifically covered by legislation, investigations involving a variety of complaints have been made on behalf of members of the public where unfair treatment is claimed. It is proposed in due course to introduce a separate Bill to incorporate the unfair trading provisions, together with additional matters. Until such a Bill is introduced and passed, it is necessary that the existing provisions be retained in the Prices Act. I ask the House to vote for an extension of the Act until the end of December, 1967.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 13. Page 472.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill renews for another five years the Housing Agreement, in force until June 30, between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, with certain amendments to the schedule. It is important legislation for this State and for people trying to obtain a house. The previous Government made greater use of the provisions in this legislation than has any other State in the Commonwealth, because of its ability to use a certain percentage of its moneys for housing. At one stage this State used over 20 per cent of the total nominated by all the States specifically used for housing from the Loan programme but, recently, this percentage dropped. In 1963-64, from a total State works programme of new moneys of \$74,584,000 this State used \$18,800,000 for housing, or 25.3 per cent. In 1964-65 the percentage rose to 25.8, but after

the first year of the Labor Government in this State this percentage was reduced to 23.5. From figures published after the recent Loan Council meeting, this percentage will remain at 23.5 for this year.

With a rising population and an increasing number of young couples seeking houses, it is difficult to understand the reduction of 2 per cent in Loan money allocated to the housing programme. Because of the increasing population, both from natural increase and migrant intake, the percentage that had been applied for this purpose previously should have been maintained. Perhaps the recession in the house-building industry is attributable to the fact that 2 per cent less of this State's Loan moneys is to be provided for house building. Those associated with the building industry tell many stories of a surplus of labour in the trades. Last week I discussed this matter with the building supervisor of a large house development company and he said that he was besieged daily by tradesmen looking for work. The housing programme of this State is in the doldrums, as was shown by figures quoted by the member for Torrens in the Address in Reply debate. For approvals for March, 1965, and for this year, the total decreased from 594 to 429, or 25 per cent. This is a serious position. Houses are available, and those on a rental-purchase basis are readily available from the Housing Trust. However, there seems to be a lack of confidence by people to purchase these houses, or money is not available to them. Section 12 of the Schedule of the Housing Agreement Act is not altered by this amending legislation, and it provides:

A State will ensure that advances by the Commonwealth are not used for—

(a) shops,

(b) except as may otherwise be agreed between the Minister and the appropriate Minister of the State, works such as the construction of drainage systems or mains for sewerage, water, electricity or other services, which are normally the financial responsibility of Local Government or public utility authorities; or . . .

After assuming office, this Government made developers responsible for a payment of \$500 (with a rebate of \$250 when the house was built) to pay for services provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This is a direct charge for the services referred to in section 12.

Mr. Clark: This has been done for some time.

Mr. HALL: It was instituted by the Labor Government.

Mr. Clark: It was done before.

Mr. HALL: I am speaking of the Housing Trust. Has the Minister of Housing obtained permission from the Commonwealth Minister for Housing to use these funds to provide services normally supplied by a council? This provision was included in the Bill for a good reason. The money obtained by the State at a lower rate of interest enabled cheaper houses to be built and a lower rent to be charged. The Commonwealth Government included these provisions to ensure that the money was used for its proper purpose, and that more houses would be built. Every \$250 the State demands from the Housing Trust through these funds is so much less available for the housing programme. I should like the Minister of Housing to comment on this aspect and to assure me, if he can, that he has the agreement of the Commonwealth Minister for Housing to divert funds from the Housing Trust for the payment of the services.

The rate of house building in this State will influence the migration programme, and the money available from these funds is at a much lower rate of interest than that available on the open market. It is important to use as much of these funds as possible through the normal housing channels so that we can provide the maximum number of houses. We must ensure that migrants can obtain a house without committing themselves to high interest rates on second mortgages as bridging finance. I support the Bill, but should like the Premier to answer my question about whether the Commonwealth Minister has given his permission for the particular use of these funds.

Mr. FREEBAIN (Light): I, too, support the Bill. My Leader drew members' attention to the unhappy situation affecting South Australia's building industry, and pointed out that this Government's policy has not been as helpful towards the building industry as was the policy of the previous Administration. He also referred to money invested in building in this State, in addition to which I point out that South Australia's allocation pursuant to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement in 1964-65 was \$20,000,000, about \$20 per capita. That allocation compared favourably with those of other States. New South Wales received \$35,000,000, which amounted to only \$8.4 per capita. The State receiving the next highest allocation per capita to that of South Australia (surprisingly enough for a Socialist State) was Tasmania with \$17.3, resulting from an allocation to that State of

\$6,400,000. The real reason for the Bill is to revive the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which expired on June 30 last. The South Australian Parliament is now undertaking what the Commonwealth Parliament undertook in its last days of sitting earlier in the year, and what other States in the Commonwealth are at present undertaking, namely, ratifying the agreement so that, eventually, it will include seven parties.

The Bill seeks to ensure that the Commonwealth Government grants Loan funds to the States at a concessional interest rate of 1 per cent. It is interesting to compare the approach of the Liberal and Country Party Administration in Canberra with that of the previous Commonwealth Socialist Administration: the agreement follows on the 1956 agreement made by the Menzies Administration, which was a drastic change from the previous 1945 legislation enacted by a Socialist Administration. It is evident that a great gulf exists in the political philosophies on housing between the L.C.P. Administration and the previous Socialist Administration. The 1945 agreement openly restricted sales and promoted the building of houses for rental, whereas the 1956 agreement promoted the building of houses for sale.

There have been four principal changes in the legislation since 1945. The first is that 30 per cent of the grants now go to approved lending institutions, and 5 per cent to dwellings for members of the Armed Forces. The second change is that houses built by State authorities are now built primarily for sale and not for letting. Thirdly, the interest rate is amended to 1 per cent less than the prevailing bond rate, and, fourthly, since 1956 the rental rebate system has been discontinued. It is interesting to note the figures relating to house sales under the first nine years of the 1945 agreement, when 3,629 houses built by State housing authorities were sold, whereas, in the first nine years of the 1956 agreement, 40,000 houses built by those authorities were sold. One of the important features of the 1956 agreement was the inauguration of the Home Builders' Account, and I find that between July 1, 1956, and June 30, 1965, more than 44,000 houses were built in Australia with funds provided from that account.

The L.C.P. coalition in Canberra has made an important contribution to housing in this country. Through the house savings grant system, young people are actively encouraged to save and to build their own homes, and the scheme has been well received throughout Australia. It was a deliberate move to encourage young people to build their own houses as well

to discourage those who wished only to occupy rental premises, although I believe that the relevant Bill was not enthusiastically supported by the Labor Opposition at the time. The Commonwealth Parliament recently passed legislation dealing with housing loan insurance schemes which together with the War Service Homes Act and the Aged Persons' Homes Act greatly contributes to housing many people. A person owning his own house has a vested interest, a stake, and a sense of belonging in the property he occupies. Similar legislation to this Bill has been before this House four or five times previously; indeed on October 12, 1961, the then Leader of the Opposition expressed some concern about the ratification of the Housing Agreement Bill, saying:

This is all part of the price we are called upon to pay because the Commonwealth Government has bowed the knee to Shylock.

However, I cannot see how granting a 1 per cent reduction in interest rates to house owners can be described in that way. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that he did not oppose the Bill and yet he did not really want to support it. He said:

I am forced into a cleft stick in not being able to oppose the Bill because there are only

two alternatives open to us: namely, we either accept the Bill that has already been agreed to by the Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers or remove South Australia from the provisions of the Housing Agreement. Therefore, although I am not happy with some of the provisions of the agreement, I do not oppose the Bill.

What he meant was that he did not want to take money from the Commonwealth and yet he did not want to lose the benefits of the 1 per cent interest reduction. I wish to make some comparison on the availability of this concession interest rate money in terms—

Mr. McKee: This will be good.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making this speech especially for the edification of my members opposite. Although I appreciate the member for Port Pirie's interjecting, he is mumbling and unless I hear what he says I cannot reply to him. To save the time of the House, I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a schedule that appeared in the House of Representatives *Hansard* of March 8, 1966, in reply to a question seeking information about housing finance provided by Government housing authorities in the various States.

Leave granted.

HOUSING FINANCE.

| Authority | Maximum Loan | Minimum Deposit | Interest Rate (per cent per annum) | Maximum Repayment Term (years) |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| The Housing Commission of New South Wales | No prescribed limit | £50 | 5 | 45 |
| Housing Commission, Victoria (a): | | | | |
| (i) With Death Benefit Cover | £4,000 | £100 | 5½ | 30 |
| (ii) Without Death Benefit Cover | No prescribed limit | £100 | 4½ | 45 |
| Queensland Housing Commission | No prescribed limit | £250 | 5½ | 45(b) |
| South Australian Housing Trust | No prescribed limit | £50 | 4½ | 40 |
| The State Housing Commission, Western Australia: | | | | |
| (i) Mortgage | £3,000 | 10 per cent of valuation | 5½ | 45 |
| (ii) Contract of Sale | £2,900(e) | £100(d) | 5½ | 45 |
| Housing Department, Tasmania | No prescribed limit | No deposit | 4½(e) | 53 |

(a) In addition to the two schemes listed, the Victorian Housing Commission has recently introduced a "No Deposit" scheme under certain conditions for suitable applicants.

(b) A purchaser who is prepared to pay within 30 years, and who meets certain other conditions, is entitled to free life insurance cover up to £2,250 for liquidation of debt in event of death before balance of the purchase price is paid.

(c) The cost of the land on which a dwelling is erected is added to this figure to give a maximum loan applicable in each case.

(d) A lower deposit is payable in special circumstances.

(e) An administrative charge of ½ per cent per annum on the purchase price is also payable.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thank members for their courtesy in enabling this schedule to be incorporated in *Hansard*. Members should appreciate the savings that can be made by a person borrowing money from the Home Builders' Account or buying a house from the Housing Trust and gaining the benefits of a reduced interest rate. The following question was asked by a member of the House of Representatives about interest rates:

What would be the amounts repayable monthly if £3,500 were made available to individual borrowers at interest rates of (a) 4 per cent, (b) 5 per cent, (c) 5½ per cent, (d) 6 per cent, (e) 6½ per cent and (f) 7 per cent per annum?

I will select a 30-year term to illustrate the point. The monthly instalments that would repay the loan, together with interest, in the case of question (a) would be \$33.42; (b) \$37.57; (c) \$39.74; (d) \$41.96; (e) \$44.24; and (f) \$46.56. This indicates clearly the benefits that the discount rate of interest under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement offers. I looked back over the history of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and I refer to the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Dedman when he introduced the first Commonwealth-State Housing Bill into the House of Representatives. I shall read one or two extracts from his speeches on the Bill because they clearly illustrate the Socialist approach to housing, which is to build houses for rental and not for sale. On September 13, 1945, he said:

The Government has asked the States to let these dwellings, whatever their economic rent may be, at, broadly, one-fifth of a family's income. By economic rent I mean the costs which ordinarily enter into rent, such as interest, repayment of capital, maintenance, rates and taxes, and administration. The difference between one-fifth of the family income and the economic rent would be rebated. As the income rises or falls, however, the debate will diminish or increase.

He went on to amplify his remarks as follows:

Let us take a few examples: If the economic rent of a three-bedroom dwelling be 30s. a week and the family be on the basic wage of, say, £5 a week, the rent payable would be one-fifth of that income, or £1, and the rebate would be 30s., less 20s., or 10s. weekly. Six shillings of that rebate would be met by the Commonwealth and 4s. by the State. If, however, the family's income increased and reached £6 a week, while it was still occupying the dwelling, the scheme provides that the amount would fall by one-third of the amount by which the income was greater than the basic wage, that is, by one-third of £1, or 6s. 8d. The rebate would thus fall to 3s. 4d., or taking it to a round 6d., to 3s., and the rent payable would be 27s. a week.

The whole text of the remarks of the Minister for Post-war Reconstruction completely ignored the effect this would have on the trade union leaders in the building industry. There was no incentive for trade union leaders to do anything at all to promote efficiency in the building industry. It was said in the debate in the Commonwealth Parliament that Mr. Holt (a trade union leader) was advocating that bricklayers, in particular, should cut down their daily rate of laying bricks to about one-third of the figure they were laying. Mr. Holt said that it did not matter anyway, because the Commonwealth Government was going to subsidize the difference to the people. In his speech, Mr. Dedman said:

We hope to lower the cost of building so as to reduce subsidies to a minimum; but good housing for all Australians is the objective. Of course, we all know that this began the greatest inflationary boom ever known in Australia's history. I shall now quote, for the edification of members opposite and so that they will realize the situation that existed under a Labor Administration in Canberra, the following remarks of Mr. Dedman:

Whilst it is important to reduce interest rates as far as possible, it would be wrong to apply to a particular undertaking a reduced interest rate which was not applicable over the whole field of finance. I am strongly in favour of reducing the general interest rate, but it is entirely wrong to say that we should provide the money needed for Commonwealth projects at a reduced rate of interest.

I should like the House to compare that conservative statement with the generous approach of the Liberal and Country Party in Canberra which subsidizes interest rates to provide cheaper housing for Australians. Mr. Dedman goes on to make some remarks that have gone down in history, for he says:

The Commonwealth Government is concerned to provide adequate and good housing for workers; it is not concerned with making the workers into little capitalists.

Those words indicate very clearly the approach of the Socialists to housing. Mr. Dedman goes on:

If there is any criticism which may be directed against the policies of past Governments, supported by the present Opposition, it is this: too much of their legislative programmes was deliberately designed to place the workers in a position in which they would have a vested interest in the continuation of capitalism.

There we have a Socialist Minister of the Crown criticizing previous right-wing Governments for giving Australian workers a vested interest in

the continuation of capitalism. In other words, the Socialists are opposed to house ownership. I do not intend to speak further on this Bill. I indicate my support for it, and I applaud the L.C.P. approach to providing cheaper finance to enable Australians to buy and to own their own houses.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill. My colleague, the honourable member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), has delved into the history of this matter, so it is not necessary for me to do so. I think this agreement is good because it provides cheaper interest rates for housing, which is perhaps the most urgent need of most people and something that affects the whole of their life. It is rather disappointing that the Commonwealth Government did not allocate the percentage increase to housing that was warranted by the increase in population. However, the fact that there has been an increase is most pleasing.

We have reached the most unsatisfactory situation in South Australia that 1,500 people are unemployed in the building industry, and I think every member of Parliament should be trying to work out just why this is so. Many reasons for this were given during the Address in Reply debate. I think the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) maintained that the rate of building had decreased because of fine weather, but I point out that compared month by month with last year the rate of building is less. Therefore, I do not think that is a valid reason. Some Government members have attempted to blame the Commonwealth Government's credit policy. I think the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and the Attorney-General blamed that Government because certain moneys were put into reserve some 15 months ago and (as they claimed) that was causing the present state of affairs. When we have full employment, we cannot accomplish anything more by just pouring out money, because that only causes inflation. The member for Glenelg was apparently horrified because the trading banks advances increased by \$275,000,000. However, this run-down in building has not occurred in other States, so we must find out why it has occurred in this State. I think it has occurred because of a general lack of confidence. The Government is actually building as many houses as before, but it is in the private building sector that the slowing down is noticeable.

At present there is not the capital being saved in Australia to carry out all the necessary national development or to build houses for our people, and we have to borrow money overseas

to carry on our finances. I think there must be more incentive to save. The Premier in a recent speech spoke of dispelling the gloom that was growing in South Australia, and he went on to say that he was going to use more of this cheap money to assist the people to obtain rental-purchase houses on low deposit. My answer to that is that as a consequence of this less houses will be built. We live in a fairly affluent society at present, and it should be possible for everybody to save a certain amount. Many of the younger generation are savers, just as were many of the previous generation, but at the same time many people today prefer to spend money on other things. People who smoke and drink spend a great deal on those things; in fact, if a person drinks as much as does the average Australian, he spends \$2,000 in seven years. Therefore, it is possible for that person to save that amount. In this affluent society, everyone can get a job. The happiest person I have seen for many a day was a barman at a hotel in Victor Harbour who told me that he played in an orchestra as well as doing his ordinary job. That person could buy a house in 10 years if he wished to do so. People could not do these things in the depression years because work was not available, but it is available today. I know that men from the Fire Brigade on their days off lump meat at a certain market in which I am interested. If we are going to get our building up to meet the requirements of people, we must provide the houses for those who are willing to help themselves a little. The Commonwealth Government's scheme of providing \$500 to those who are prepared to save is one way in which the housing problem will be solved.

The people themselves will have to make the effort to save. It is comparatively easy to get finance from the banks now. I repeat that there is a lack of confidence amongst the people in South Australia to spend money. Just where is the Government going to get the \$6,000,000 to make up the deficit it has incurred, and the extra \$6,000,000 it requires to meet the basic wage increase? Land tax will be trebled this year in some cases unless the rates are adjusted. I maintain that it is in action such as this where we are falling down in South Australia at present. We must restore people's confidence. The problem of the lack of housing and this slowing down in the building industry must be assisted by more individual effort to save, and the incentive to do this is what is required. All that the Premier has announced is that his Government

is prepared to assist those who are not willing to help themselves in any way. The more houses we can build the better it is for everyone.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I am perturbed at the falling off in the building industry of this State. This industry, which employs many artisans and much unskilled labour, should be encouraged. Perhaps we have been too parsimonious in allocating to building societies and the State Bank moneys that come to the State under this agreement. Perhaps more houses would have been built if we had given them more money: also the private building sector of the building industry should be allocated more money. In a normal year this sector builds more houses than does the Housing Trust, and we should encourage that aspect of the house-building industry. The trust has done an excellent job in building large groups of houses where industry has been established, but that does not seem to be taking place today. Most people could save enough for the required deposit in order to build a house of their own design. The trust has a large range of designs, but many young people today are individualistic about the facilities to be included in a house.

Money available is at a high rate of interest that young people cannot afford. The Commonwealth Government's subsidy of \$500 has assisted, but it is restricted in many ways. To me, it does not matter in which account money is saved, but the subsidy is not granted unless it is ear-marked for this specific purpose. We should encourage young people to build houses of their own design, and enable them to borrow money to do so. Because they do an excellent job, we should encourage building societies. They take a personal interest in the borrower and in the construction of the house. At present the building industry in this State is in the doldrums and many large contractors have been affected. The company, in which I have the honour to be interested, recently called for tenders for a large building, and I have not seen so many keen competitive prices for many years. People employing expert gangs seem more interested in keeping them employed than in making handsome profits, hence their keen bidding to get the jobs so that they will retain their staffs. This applies in every sector of the building industry. Perhaps skilled people can adapt themselves to another walk of life, but it is a waste of effort training a man and then losing his services because work cannot be found for him. I am all for the agreement: I think it is a good thing, but I should like to

see the cake cut up a little more liberally for private building interests.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

AMENDING FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 13. Page 473.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): This is a simple Bill that we must all support. Its necessity has arisen because of the changeover to decimal currency.

Mr. Freebairn: Would you agree it was non-controversial?

Mr. McANANEY: I do not think even the most difficult person could make this a controversial issue. I always try to support the Government in everything it does; it is only when it goes off the rails that we should question its actions for the benefit of South Australians, generally. Whilst on the subject of decimal currency, I take the opportunity to congratulate the Decimal Currency Board on its good work and on the smooth changeover to a currency that has been beneficial to everybody concerned. We all like to simplify matters and to progress. Indeed, that is Liberal philosophy: the more things are simplified, and the more the conditions under which goods are produced are simplified, the higher the standard of living becomes. However, I shall not attempt to make a non-controversial measure into a controversial one. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the Bill, primarily because I have to, and not because I am in favour of the Financial Agreement. I think the time will arrive when the State will need to take resolute action to alter the agreement, because I believe it is one of the most devastating and frustrating enactments ever forced on a State. Under the agreement, of course, money can be raised only for semi-Government instrumentalities, such as the South Australian Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust; the State cannot raise its own loan. The Commonwealth Government raises the loan, from which the States, cap in hand, seek their allocation. That was supposed to be good, but it has worked out extremely badly. At another stage and on another matter I shall enlarge on how the present set-up can and, more emphatically, how it ultimately will be resolved.

This Financial Agreement guarantees the perpetuation of a debt structure hanging around the necks of Australian people; it guarantees that in South Australia over \$1,000

will be the first legacy handed to a newly-born baby—a \$1,000 debt! I think the first move is to bring the matter up to date, so that the States, in the interests of the people over which they otherwise have sovereign powers, will be able to give a full measure of help to the people they represent. Under this agreement they cannot. We are perpetually short of money in every respect, but this Bill is introduced merely as the result of the changeover to decimal currency, and does not alter the agreement at all. I hope I shall live to see the day when the agreement will be altered so that the States can have the freedom that was theirs prior to their conceding power to the Commonwealth, and selling their birthright for the proverbial mess of pottage. The worst thing that ever happened to the sovereignty of the States was when they made that Financial Agreement with the Commonwealth. After the effluxion of time what should have been acceptable in past days is certainly not acceptable now. Now is the time to vary the terms of the agreement. However, in the circumstances I must support this measure.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT
(WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 13. Page 471.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): First, I thank the Minister for having provided me with an advance copy of the Bill so that I could examine it over the weekend and for postponing the debate until today. Having no serious objection to the Bill, I support it. However, I desire to make one or two observations.

The first part of the Minister's second reading explanation deals with that small but not insignificant matter of applying to the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme the same principles as apply in the legislation governing the Tod River water scheme in respect of rating on both sides of a railway line. I am pleased that the Minister found it necessary to bring down this legislation, because I consider it to be somewhat in advance of its actual requirement. From what I gather, the project is not advancing as quickly as the residents would like, but I take it that the Bill foreshadows future events and that in due time the scheme will reach Keith. However, perhaps that is a matter more for discussion in the debate on

Loan Estimates than at present. I merely make that comment because the scheme has been mentioned.

It is logical that a railway line should not divide a water district so that property on one side of the line is ratable and that on the other side is not, because a trunk main serves properties on both sides of the line. I should like the Minister to listen to me on this matter. Although a trunk main may pass down one side of the line (say, the south side), I know that on Eyre Peninsula and in other parts of the State difficulty is sometimes experienced by owners in getting the number of services they require to efficiently water their blocks. The fact that a railway line separates a property from a trunk main accentuates the difficulty. The Railways Commissioner quite properly imposes fairly stringent conditions regarding the laying of water mains under railway lines, for obvious reasons. He does not want a water service to burst, flood his permanent way, and let his track down, and I do not criticize him for taking that stand. However, these conditions tend to make under-the-line services more expensive and cause the department to take the view that it does not want any more of these services than are absolutely necessary.

I urge the Minister to consider this matter and, indeed, the matter of services to properties generally in order to provide, perhaps, by imposing certain conditions, rather more services than he is willing to provide now. I know of cases where a strict application of the provisions of the Waterworks Act means that a farmer may have a service main to, say, the centre of a block that has a frontage of two miles along a trunk main, but it may be a long, narrow block running parallel to the trunk main and comprising an acreage that does not qualify him for more than one or two services. In those circumstances, the farmer has to lay internal piping from the service he is entitled to have and over a long distance parallel to the trunk main. If the area of his block is 640 acres, he is entitled to one service and, if it is 700 acres, he is entitled to two services.

I consider that owners would readily pay a higher fee for extra services than those operating at present and I think it is proper that a higher fee should be required, because the maintenance cost to the department is high. It is so costly that during my period as Minister the department decided to provide these services in copper piping so that they would have a longer life and, therefore, involve a lower replacement cost. It would be to the advantage of owners to pay a higher fee and have additional

services. I suggest that the Minister examine this matter and discuss it with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. The cost of much internal piping would be avoided and, although the department would be involved in the extra cost of laying the services originally and of maintaining them and reading the meters, the charge could be largely recovered from the owners, who would be glad to pay the additional costs if they could avoid the need for internal reticulation on their farms. For the reasons I gave when I commenced my speech, I support the Bill in so far as it applies to the water districts in the South-East.

The purpose of other clauses is to amend the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act to enable the quarterly payment of water and sewerage rates. The Minister said that the various Government departments, in anticipation of the additional clerical work, had provided for and installed a computer in the data processing centre for this purpose. I remind the Minister that this computer service was well in hand before he took office. Indeed, the computer had been ordered and provision had been made in the new waterworks building in Victoria Street and its installation was well in hand when he took office.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Yes, we do not make an issue of that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I merely point out that this had been envisaged a long time ago. I do not think the Minister intends to suggest that he or the present Government was responsible for it, because that would not be correct. Regarding the payment of water and sewerage rates by quarterly instalments, I think there can be no doubt that the public, particularly in the metropolitan area and possibly in country towns, will appreciate this arrangement.

However, there are one or two catches in this matter. Although the Minister proposes to make the assessment of January, 1967, become effective as from July, 1967, I presume that the accounts for the first quarter's instalments will be rendered immediately after July 1, 1967, and that they will be payable within 14 days. Therefore, I imagine that the Minister expects that by the end of July a big proportion of the first instalments will have been paid. I imagine also that on October 1 accounts will be rendered for the second quarter's instalments and that fairly prompt payment will be required. There are two matters that arise from this arrangement, the first being that accounts for excess water for the period from July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, will be

assessed on June 30, 1967. I presume this will be added to the first instalment for 1967-68 and that the total will be payable on July 1, 1967. I do not know if the Minister gets the point.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I follow.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I presume the Minister intends that the charge for excess water will be paid in a lump sum.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Yes.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: From my experience in the department I know that most accounts for water and sewer rates are paid, at least by metropolitan people, in September, October and November. I think the reason was that, under the old arrangement, the department could not get out all accounts on July 1, as it was necessary for the Minister to be sure that he was not going to increase rates in the coming financial year, and he had to declare an assessment for the various water districts. This took some time to prepare and gazette, and legally the notice to pay could not be sent out until the assessment was signed and gazetted. Probably the notices would not go out until August (perhaps even September) and then people would have some time after receiving the notice before payment was made. For that reason, payments tended to flow to the department in volume in September, October and November.

For a suburban householder who pays his next water and sewer rates, and possibly excess water, in October, 1966, all will be well until July, 1967, when he will get another bill for excess water (if he has used any) and the first quarter's instalment of his 1967-68 rates. So, within about eight months he will get two accounts. Probably, before a year has passed he will receive an account for the second quarter of 1967-68, so he may get three accounts for water and sewerage rates within 12 months, one of which may include excess water for the previous year. Probably he will get two accounts, if not three. I do not know what his reaction will be, but I leave that to the Minister's imagination. I know he will have thought of these things and that he will find it necessary, practically if not politically, to explain. Once this system gets going it will operate smoothly, but I think it will have an effect similar to that when pay-as-you-earn taxation was introduced and the Commonwealth Treasurer attempted to get two years' taxation in one year. Nobody was happy about that.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: There will be slight difficulties until this starts to work smoothly.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and I draw the Minister's attention to these things. The principle of having quarterly payments is sound for people on budget incomes, and I think they will probably appreciate it, but I am not sure about the owners of country lands. As Minister, I considered quarterly payments for the metropolitan area and country towns. I always thought there was something to be said for quarterly payments, but I am not sure that this scheme should apply to country lands.

Mr. Shannon: A farmer gets only one harvest a year.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member knows, the average farmer gets two main cheques a year. They may or may not be received close together, depending on the time when he does his shearing. He gets a wool cheque and a grain cheque, and generally he receives them in the first half of the calendar year. He does not take kindly to bookkeeping: he does what he must and sometimes pays others to do it for him. However, farmers at least have to write out cheques, and most would prefer to write out one a year for water rates. I do not know that farmers will have any option, as I understand that all rate-payers will be given four accounts each year. I have not yet decided to seek to amend the Bill, but, I suggest that the Minister consider this matter. I will support a move to remove country lands from the scheme. Although I have not conferred with my country colleagues, I take the responsibility for saying that I think most country people prefer to pay once a year. Other aspects of the Bill are minor and are mostly changes in verbiage.

I notice that assessors are to have some additional powers of inspection. An assessor is to be enabled to inspect land and premises which, I think, he has never been debarred from doing (at least with regard to an exterior inspection) by landowners. I do not know what the Minister has in mind, but there is always a public reaction against entering and inspecting; there is always public disquiet when an officer of the department is clothed with the right to enter a private house. Nobody can stop an assessor from inspecting a suburban house from the street, and I do not think anybody would object to an assessor's walking down the side of a house and seeing what outbuildings, if any, had been attached to the back of the house. I believe assessors have done this many times without objection from landholders. However, it is a different matter when an assessor enters a house to examine

built-in furniture and so on, all of which affects the value of a house.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is not the intention.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then why have this wording in the Bill? If the Act was adequate before, why change it?

Mr. Quirke: This power shouldn't be given.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the Bill gives the assessor the right to enter and inspect inside a house. If that is so, I will seek to amend it.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I will look into the matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased if the Minister will do that. Another provision of the Bill is designed to apply to country lands water schemes the same provisions regarding assessments on new mains and so on as apply to water districts in the schedule. I have no objection to that. With the agreement of the councils concerned, the Minister intends to inter-exchange the assessments for rating purposes. In the past it has been the practice for the Minister to accept the assessments of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and for the metropolitan councils often to use the Engineering and Water Supply Department's assessment for their rating. A problem often arises in this regard. I have heard suburban householders complain that their corporation rates have been increased. When they complain to the local councillor he says that he cannot do anything about it, because the department makes the assessment and is to blame. True, councils use the department's assessment but they are not bound to it. Often the Minister gets the blame for increasing council rates when, in fact, he has done no such thing. I sympathize with the Minister when this happens. Although it suits councils to use the department's assessment for the purpose of their rating by an agreement with the Minister, it does not obligate the councils to adopt it for their own purposes.

I am also concerned about alterations of assessments that can be made during a financial year. Clause 5 states:

Section 73 of the principal Act is amended:
 (a) by inserting after the word "assessed" where it secondly occurs in subsection (1) thereof the passage "or have been assessed but there has been a variation in any land or premises by reason of the erection, addition, alteration or demolition of any building, or part thereof, or the subdivision or re-subdivision of land, or for any other reason whatsoever."

This means that if an assessor, in the course of examining properties for the purpose of assessment, observes that since he last assessed the premises a new garage or some other improvement has been made, he will then re-assess the property and include in his re-assessment the added value that has been placed on the premises. It may be that he will not make this re-assessment until February of any year, by which time three quarterly rate notices have been issued and probably paid. The Minister proposes that the re-assessment, when so made, shall apply for the whole of the financial year, so that if the re-assessment is at all substantial then he must recover the added rate value on the final instalments for that year. In other words, as I surmise, if the new assessment is made in February and it involves a landowner in an increase of rates of, say, \$6, the whole of that will have to be added to the fourth notice for payment issued in March.

Mr. Shannon: Are you reading into this clause that, if a re-assessment is made in the last quarter of the year, that rate will apply to the previous three quarters?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that is what the Bill provides. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

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.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: We'll have a look at that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think it would be unfair if what I suggested were done. The alteration in the value of the property might not have been effected until, perhaps, Christmas of that year, and a man should not be rated for something he did not have before then.

Anyway, I have made my point. I appreciate that the Minister has agreed to look at it. Those are most, if not all, of the points that I discovered when looking at this Bill. The only two points I have made that I think are of real importance to the Opposition are, first, the right of an inspector to enter inside and inspect premises. We oppose that on principle, and particularly as in this case the internal fittings have only a minor effect on values anyhow and there is no justification for an inspector's requiring the right to go inside and inspect. Secondly, I reserve the right to

move against an instalment plan in relation to country lands if, on further inquiry, I consider that such a move would be in the interests of country lands ratepayers. With those qualifications I support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Briefly, I concur in the remarks made by the member for Flinders. I would never agree to allowing a waterworks assessor, even with the permission of the householder, access to assess the inside of a house: he can do it easily from outside. The house is generally of stone, brick or wood and iron, and the assessor can estimate values from outside. What is inside the house should be of no moment. Externally some houses are of the same type, yet one contains \$6,000-worth of material in the way of cupboards and furniture while another house, adjacent to it, may have less than \$2,000-worth of material inside it.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Furniture and improvements to the house?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. It is not right or necessary for an assessor to go inside: an assessment for waterworks purposes can be made from outside. The assessor can walk around a house but should not be allowed to go inside. That is my main objection to this Bill. I think the Minister is not too sure whether or not he intended that to be in the Bill, but this can be construed from reading clause 3. This Bill should not pass this House with that provision in it. I support the member for Flinders on that point.

At this juncture, I point out that 64 per cent of Engineering and Water Supply Department income is absorbed in charges. Returns from metropolitan water services show a surplus of \$288,000 and country services a loss of \$4,000,000. If the country has a loss like that and the metropolitan area has a profit, it must be remembered that the metropolitan area has as many houses in one street as there are sometimes in 100 miles of country. The tremendous cost of laying mains is a big factor in the annual loss in the country, when charges are made on the capital cost and maintenance of those mains, but the fact remains that, loss or no loss, in years like last year and this year it can only be that the cost of mains throughout the country is money well spent, as it has probably earned a great amount of revenue for the State through increased production. Therefore, the loss is not real when the State itself can benefit directly to such a great extent from the increased production

resulting from more mains giving water all over South Australia in the settled areas.

It is impossible for anybody who has not lived under conditions of having only dam or well water and rainwater (the most precious of all sources of supply) and then suddenly having all his worries lifted from him by being connected to a reticulated water system, which is permanent and reliable, to really appreciate the benefit of such a supply. I have had the experience of proposing water schemes for districts and having them opposed by the people whom I was trying to help; but I have eventually persuaded them to take a reticulated supply. It was always refused on the ground of expense, that it would cost so much, that they had a well that had done for them and for their forefathers before them. No-one without that experience can possibly realize the value of permanent, clean, reticulated water, the supply of which does not fluctuate as does the supply of water from dams when they dry up or from wells when their salt content increases. But best of all is rainwater supply. Somebody suggested we could save much water by installing rainwater tanks (even 1,000-gallon tanks) outside houses. An authoritative source replied that that would make very little difference, because 100,000 houses each with a 1,000-gallon tank would not mean much water.

Mr. Clark: It is a good deal of water if it is kept off the roads.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but the point is that it is not only a question of 1,000 gallons of water. I have a 6,000-gallon supply inside a 24in. rainfall area and only once since Murray River water has been on tap have I had to turn it on. I have a 6,000-gallon tank running over. It is most valuable. In fact, 1,000 gallons of water in a 16in. or 20in. rainfall area can mean many thousands of gallons in 12 months. It is time we looked at this again. Of course, once having used rainwater for making a cup of tea in my home at Clare, it would be difficult to wean some people from it. We use rainwater in baths and showers; it is seldom that we have to use Murray water for those purposes. That shows how much water can be saved by installing a tank. A 2,000-gallon tank is not excessively big on a block of land with a 50ft. frontage and a depth of 160ft. With that quantity of water, a man can, in a comparatively few years, offset the cost of the tank by the water rates he does not have to pay. People should be encouraged to conserve a supply of rain water and not be entirely dependent on the mains. Once people had this

rain water they would be reluctant to give it up. Many people today do not know of the benefit of beautiful clean rain water; if they did, they would invest in tanks tomorrow.

Mr. Clark: I have been saying that for years.

Mr. QUIRKE: I agree entirely with the honourable member. If people had these tanks millions of gallons of water would be saved. An inch of water on an acre is 22,500 gallons, and if that rain fell on a house with a 12-square roof much rain water would be caught. This is not a wet year by any means. Recently I drove some fence droppers into the ground at Clare, where we have had some rain, and after I was down about 9in. I had to use a 7 lb. hammer to hit them in. The crops look beautiful, but they are growing in the surface; I hope and trust we will get the rain necessary to bring about their total salvation. Water this year is a very precious commodity, both for crops and around the house.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the main clause of the Bill. I agree with what the honourable member for Burra said regarding the installation of tanks. A 3,000-gallon or 4,000-gallon reservoir of water will keep the average country house going during the summer, and if people in the city had tanks there would not be anywhere near the drainage problems that now exist. Provision for the quarterly payment of accounts is perhaps necessary for a small section of the community. However, several elderly people have told me that they have enough difficulty now going to the bother of paying one account a year, and they entirely disagree with having to make four payments.

Mr. Clark: Many people are used to doing that with electricity accounts.

Mr. McANANEY: Some elderly people have told me they would rather pay the one account.

Mr. Jennings: This is optional.

Mr. McANANEY: The motor registration fee can be paid once a year or, for a small extra payment, twice a year. Payment four times a year will involve extra work. I consider that many people, particularly in the country, would prefer to pay their water and sewer rates once a year, rather than four times a year. I understand that this data processing system was installed long before the question of quarterly payments arose, yet from some of the remarks I have heard one would get the impression it was put in to save the extra expense that will be incurred by this new procedure.

It has been said many times that we should get around to the principle of paying for water actually used. The member for Burra said that he had had difficulty in getting people to accept water schemes. At Strathalbyn, where in one place there is an area of salt and in another place an area of good water, many people have wanted a scheme for many years but have been prevented for getting one because the underground water there has been of no advantage to them. If there was an approach similar to that adopted by the Electricity Trust, where they would be asked what their requirements were and there would be standard charges according to the quantity of water used, people would be assisted in getting water schemes in many areas. A similar type of country exists around Callington and Monarto, where some of the people want a scheme and some do not. When the Strathalbyn water scheme was installed production was increased by 50 per cent to 75 per cent in some instances, and the value of some land was increased by \$6 to \$8 an acre and even more. However, in some instances the adjoining neighbour who also had water did not increase his capacity to produce even though he was on the same rate and had the same commitment.

The scheme for a water supply at Kimba has been postponed. I think that district council area carries about 250,000 sheep, and a water supply would be of immense value to the people there, for it would add to the capital value of their land. A system of payment for water actually used would be beneficial, for this would enable schemes to be implemented much more quickly. I consider that we should have a uniform payment for all services. Landowners pay rates for roadworks irrespective of the use they make of roads. Owners of motor vehicles pay registration fees according to the size of their vehicles, and through petrol tax they pay for the roads according to the extent they use them. The system of paying for services rendered is preferable to the present rating system. It is not right that this system of quarterly payment should be inflicted on everybody. I admit that it will be of benefit to some people, but I know that to some it will be of no benefit at all.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I commend the Government for bringing this Bill before the House, for I consider it is long overdue. My main concern is that relief should be given to people in the low-income bracket, many of

whom find difficulty in meeting a yearly payment.

Mr. Lawn: The former Leader of the Opposition said it was impossible.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and it is mainly because of his statement that I am now speaking on this Bill. The member for Gumeracha (the then Leader) said 12 months ago that this provision was impracticable and therefore it was not possible to introduce it. The then Leader said that in an attempt to embarrass the Government and to influence it against introducing this provision. He said that the question had been considered by the previous Government before the election of March, 1965, but that it was decided not to do anything about it because its introduction would place a financial burden on the people who pay water and sewer rates. Those remarks are in *Hansard*, and if members of the Opposition want to dispute what is contained in *Hansard* they will have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. McAnaney: Before or after the computer?

Mr. RYAN: Does it make any difference? A benefit given to a section of the community will help all the community. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said that he preferred to pay yearly. I wonder what the honourable member would say if this Government had power and introduced legislation to provide that from next year it would be compulsory to pay electricity accounts yearly, and dispense with quarterly payments?

Mr. Jennings: He supported it.

Mr. RYAN: Every Opposition member who has spoken has agreed with the Government, and it is apparent from their comments that they support the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: They are learning!

Mr. RYAN: True, but 12 months ago they said it could not be done.

Mr. Clark: They are listening to the public, too.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, let the public decide. What about the person on a moderate salary who for 30 years has received the water and sewerage account at the same time as he received an account for council rates? These accounts were received at Christmas, when most working people have to take leave under industrial agreements: they were not in the financial position to be able to pay the accounts. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has records of how many people asked for the deferment of the payment of the water rates or asked that payments be made quarterly or by instalments.

Mr. Lawn: Thousands do that.

Mr. RYAN: Of course.

Mr. Hurst: What about the pensioners in our districts?

Mr. RYAN: Nearly all pensioners applied because they could not pay on the due date, which coincided with Christmas, and they asked to pay by instalments. The department gladly granted their requests.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That request was always granted to pensioners.

Mr. RYAN: That is correct. I am not disputing that, but this Government is legislating for the people to have the right to pay by instalment. The previous Government never gave the people that right. The member for Flinders was the Minister in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but he did not consider this matter, nor did his Government.

Mr. Lawn: They said it was impossible.

Mr. Jennings: He administered the department sympathetically!

Mr. RYAN: Perhaps: I quote from *Hansard* of May 26, 1965, 2½ months after Labor came to power and when matters were being raised in this House by the Opposition to embarrass the new Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Will the honourable member speak up!

Mr. RYAN: Don't accuse the member for Port Adelaide of not being game to speak up on behalf of the people he represents. When a controversial matter is raised, Opposition members run for cover and are not prepared to speak in this Parliament or on behalf of the people they represent. I am not going to be side-tracked by that comment, but perhaps the honourable member is frightened of the statement I am about to quote. We have introduced in less than 12 months more legislation than the Liberal Party introduced in 30 years. With our record we can go to the people in March, 1968, and tell them that it is a record that did not apply in 30 years of Liberal Government. So that it will be recorded in this debate, I am quoting the extract in full, as follows:

Mr. COUMBE: Numerous requests have been made to me by pensioners and people on fixed incomes, who would prefer the method of frequent billing of water rates at regular intervals to the present system. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Works recently that he was prepared to reconsider a new method of assessment and of rendering accounts for water supplies, will he see whether it is possible to introduce a scheme, especially into the metropolitan area, to provide for more frequent readings of

meters and rendering of accounts to users of water, somewhat along the lines of the system used by the electricity and gas supply authorities, which regularly bill their consumers? And the public appreciate that, too; that has been recorded in *Hansard*. The quote continues:

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter is at present being considered, and it is hoped that the installation of computers, which are under order by the Government, would enable the Engineering and Water Supply Department to render accounts quarterly. The then Leader then jumped in (I do not know how people can somersault so much, yet face their electors), and the report states:

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the reply given by the Minister of Works, the Government has under active consideration a scheme where payments for water rates will be made at more frequent intervals than at present, when the rates are paid after the period for which the water has been supplied. The Government of the day, the defeated Playford Government, considered this question closely to see whether there was any fair and equitable way of providing water accounts more quickly so as to enable people on fixed budgets to benefit from making small payments at intervals rather than one lump-sum payment. The Government found that the present system could not be changed to the system now suggested by the Minister. The new system would cause grave injustice to the people paying the bills, because two years' accounts would be brought in in one year.

Mr. Jennings: And yet today they are supporting the Bill!

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The quote continues:

I hope that no action will be taken under the guise of making it easier, so that instead of the payments being as they are now at the end of the period, they would be paid at the end of the period plus the new payment which would come immediately after. If the normal period for payment was June 30, a person would receive at that date his account for a full year's rating and then three months later would receive another account. That would cause a grave injustice to the consumer and I hope the Government will not lightly change the present system. I know that the suggested scheme would be attractive to the Treasury and bring in much more money. However, the change would mean that the consumer would be making a duplicated payment in the year in which the scheme was introduced.

Has anyone heard such rot as this statement by the then Leader of the Opposition? The member for Flinders was previously the Minister in charge of this department, yet that statement emanated from his Leader!

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have said they would have to pay twice in one year, and I say it again.

Mr. RYAN: That is not true, and the honourable member knows it. Every Opposition speaker has agreed with this Bill and has said he will support it: no-one has referred to quarterly payments but only to portions of the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You should have been listening more closely when I spoke.

Mr. RYAN: I paid every respect to the member for Flinders and listened to every word he said on this matter. However, it is now my turn to speak, and to support the Government in bringing down legislation which is long overdue and which the public of South Australia desires. There will be no duplication of payments, but the ex-Minister apparently cannot understand that. Indeed, if he did not have the capacity to understand such matters when he was Minister, it is obvious why he is an ex-Minister now. If he studied the Bill he would see that accounts would be rendered quarterly. I challenge any member of the Opposition to interfere with the policy of a semi-Government instrumentality that supplies a service, and to ask for payment on a yearly basis. I think the average householder's yearly sum for water and sewerage is about \$40. Many people on a fixed income find it a grave financial injustice to have to try to pay anywhere near that sum on a yearly basis. The ex-Minister would know that from the applications his department received from people wishing to pay for water in one sum and for sewerage in another, thereby halving the payment at that time. Indeed, I have made many representations on behalf of constituents in my district who have said they were not able to meet the payment. In my own case, I must make payment on a due date unless I make an alternative arrangement with the department. Many people cannot meet the bill in the stipulated time.

Mr. Quirke: They'll be paying for two years' excess water in six months.

Mr. RYAN: What has excess water to do with the rendering of accounts? Members of the Opposition said people would receive 2-year accounts, not for excess water but for general water and sewerage services, but that statement is not true. On July 1 next year any ratepayer, including me, will receive one account for water and sewerage on a quarterly basis. The Opposition is merely trying to camouflage the whole issue when it says that on July 1, 1967, people will be receiving a quarterly account involving the payment of rates for 2 years' supply of water and sewerage.

Mr. McAnaney: Who said that?

Mr. Quirke: You're not receiving any support; members on your side know you're wrong.

Mr. RYAN: Let us see what support the Opposition receives if a vote is taken. I hope the Bill will be carried unanimously because, so far in this debate, no Opposition member has definitely stated that he opposes quarterly payments as provided by clause 9.

Mr. Hurst: They're not game!

Mr. RYAN: The Opposition may have 17 members and one now, but if it told the public that the Government intended to introduce quarterly payments, which it opposed, it would be lucky to return with even seven or eight members.

Mr. Quirke: We'll come back with 27!

Mr. RYAN: This important matter could easily have been implemented by the previous Government. This Government wished to implement it 12 months ago but the people were misinformed and told that the scheme was impracticable. It is not, and the sooner this legislation is passed, the sooner its initial implementation can be considered. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): The member for Port Adelaide said that no Opposition member was game to oppose the Bill, and that we were all running away from the issue but he can be wrong more than once, and, in fact, he is wrong in regard to rendering accounts in July next year.

Mr. Ryan: All right! I'll go to Rocky River and tell the people you oppose the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do oppose it.

Mr. Curren: In its entirety?

Mr. HEASLIP: I oppose it on two grounds.

Mr. Curren: All of it?

Mr. HEASLIP: The Government has introduced a Bill that I cannot support, because it contains certain things to which I and the people I represent object.

Mr. Ryan: When I spoke to the Bill I should have said there was always an exception to the rule: you're the exception.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Flinders explained why, unless the Bill were amended, he would oppose it.

Mr. Ryan: Anything to do with payments?

Mr. HEASLIP: He referred to quarterly payments.

Mr. Ryan: He referred to rating over railway lines.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think the member for Flinders said he would try to have the Bill amended. I, too, strongly oppose the Bill as

it applies to quarterly payments and to the right of entry to anybody's house to obtain an assessment. A man's home has always been regarded as his castle, and the Government now attempts to compel families to open the door to an outsider. The Minister of Works, in his second reading explanation, said:

... 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. Cannot the Government be honest? Can it not tell the people why this legislation has been introduced?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It wants to get money more quickly.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course it does! This legislation, if enforced, will embarrass ratepayers when they receive two accounts in July. The member for Port Adelaide says that only one account will be received, but let us make no mistake about it: no Government will supply 12 months' water free.

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

Mr. HEASLIP: Before the adjournment I was speaking about what I considered to be the real purpose of this Bill—to get money quickly rather than to help the people who have been tardy in making payments.

Mr. Clark: You are being a bit uncharitable, aren't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I think I am being factual. There is no reason why these people that the Government says it is trying to help cannot pay in advance, as can be done with gas accounts, which are rendered monthly. Although an account is rendered monthly, one can wait for three months before paying it. Money can be paid in advance to cover the cost of supply for six months: there is no compulsion to pay every month. The same applies to Electricity Trust accounts. Although the trust renders quarterly accounts, it is not compulsory to pay them every quarter. If money is paid in advance, a person does not have to pay each quarter, but this Bill provides that a person must pay his account every quarter.

Mr. Hudson: Where does it say that?

Mr. HEASLIP: It says people have to pay quarterly.

Mr. Hudson: It does not. Read the words that say that. What is to stop your going in and offering a year's rates in advance? That is what happens at present. You pay in advance.

Mr. HEASLIP: Clause 9 provides:

Section 94 of the principal Act is repealed and re-enacted as follows:

94. All water rates and minimum charges for water supplied by measure under agreement shall be payable in advance . . .

Mr. Hudson: That is what happens at present.

Mr. HEASLIP: The provision goes on:

... by equal payments on the first days of July, October, January and April in each year: Provided that the Governor may by proclamation vary the days on which such water rates and minimum charges for water shall be payable and in that event such rates and charges shall be so paid accordingly.

Mr. Hudson: Do you mean that, if a person offers to pay one year's rates in advance, payment will not be accepted?

Mr. HEASLIP: This Bill requires people to pay quarterly, in advance. What will happen as a result of this? I do not know whether the computer is idle and going rusty and the Government wants to give it some work, but it will be used much more now. What about the people who have to pay these accounts? First, the Engineering and Water Supply Department will need additional staff to deal with these accounts, and postage must be paid every time a consumer or the department posts a letter.

Mr. Shannon: The Commonwealth Government will get that.

Mr. HEASLIP: I agree but, unfortunately, the consumers and taxpayers foot the Bill eventually. They have to pay for the envelopes and stationery used, yet the Government says this Bill is introduced to look after them.

Mr. Ryan: We look after the people we represent, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Government has doubled the tax on cheques. Normally, these accounts are paid by cheque, so people will have to pay the additional stamp duty on cheques.

Mr. Ryan: Who said they have to pay by cheque?

Mr. HEASLIP: If a person does not pay by cheque, he wastes time going down to pay.

Mr. Hurst: Wouldn't it be convenient to pay this account when the other accounts were being paid?

Mr. HEASLIP: I thought the member for Port Adelaide said there were no other accounts. I am glad to hear there are. There may be three accounts: the annual water rate, the quarterly rate and the excess water charge.

Mr. Ryan: You could refuse to pay, and have the water cut off!

Mr. HEASLIP: This Bill does not allow anybody to refuse; it compels. This is a Socialist Government, and it is compelling people to do something they do not wish to do.

Mr. Hudson: Have you read section 94 of the principal Act?

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Flinders said he was not sure whether country people would be pleased about getting four accounts. I am sure they will complain.

Mr. Ryan: How would you know?

Mr. HEASLIP: Because I represent them. This is an unnecessary cost and a waste of time, and the Government, not the people, will benefit, as it will get money more quickly. When pay-as-you-earn taxation was introduced, the Commonwealth Government got much more money than it would have got if that system had not been introduced, and the South Australian Government will get much more money under this Bill than it would get otherwise. The member for Glenelg may not know what I am talking about but, after all, he was at the university and should know that much. When people in his district get two or three accounts, perhaps they will let him know that they are paying much more. If he does not know what I am talking about, I am sorry. People in the country definitely know and will object. The people in the country work.

Mr. Langley: Those in the city don't work?

Mr. HEASLIP: Those in the city have much more leisure than those in the country. The people in the country have to keep their own books and pay their own accounts and, if they are doing that, they are not doing productive work. That will apply to everybody in South Australia. The member for Burra spoke about water tanks, and I think the member for Stirling supported him. I admit it is a good idea, but who will get the benefit? The people who provide these tanks will have to meet the cost of erecting and maintaining them. They will have the advantage of fresh, soft water but they will pay as much in rates as they would pay if they did not have the tanks.

Mr. Clark: They will probably need reservoir water, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, because most of the water used in the metropolitan area is used not for household purposes but for gardens. Unfortunately, under our system there is no incentive for people to save water: if they do not use it they have to pay just the same. Therefore, people may as well use the water.

Mr. Quirke: They shouldn't do it.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course, they shouldn't.

Mr. Quirke: Do you think people would let water run down the drain?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have seen cases where people have left their hoses on and the water has run down the drain.

Mr. Quirke: They are not good citizens.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course not, but that is human nature. The money the department receives is not from water it sells but from water it does not sell. People who do not use any water have to pay their rates, and that is where the department gets its money.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you know anybody who doesn't use any water?

Mr. HEASLIP: My first objection is to the clause that provides for quarterly payments. My second objection is to the clause that gives the right to an assessor to enter a person's house and assess his property. What has been wrong in the past that necessitates this change in the Act? Are we passing legislation merely for the sake of passing it? The Act has worked well, and assessors have been able to do their job without having this right of entry.

Mr. Langley: Where does the Bill provide that an assessor will have the right to enter a private house?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is there.

Mr. Langley: Where is it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope that when people are told by an assessor that he intends to enter their house they will object, and subsequently make their objection known to honourable members who support the Bill. If I were in their position I would object, and I am sure all members opposite would object. Under the Bill, people will not be able to refuse entry to an assessor who wishes to inspect their built-in furniture and so on, which is part of their house.

Mr. Shannon: This provision is in clause 4(d).

Mr. HEASLIP: Members opposite have said that the Bill does not contain this provision, but clause 4(d) states:

by striking out the passage "to inspect the same", after the word "aforesaid" in subsection (2) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "to have access to and inspect any such land or premises or any such book or document as aforesaid".

Mr. Quirke: You could have a book out in the shed.

Mr. HEASLIP: Perhaps, but this is unnecessary legislation. On the grounds I have stated I oppose the Bill. I do not believe either of clauses to which I have referred is necessary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I did not intend to speak on the Bill until I heard the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) say that members on this side supported the Bill. As far as I can see, the Bill has no merit whatever. It is designed to secure a little additional revenue a little earlier than it could be obtained normally. This legislation has some rather interesting history. Quarterly adjustments are not a new idea: they have been advanced by the department and considered by Cabinet four or five times over the years. On each previous occasion Cabinet was faced with the problem that at the changeover period, at least, the person paying would have to pay much more quickly (and face severe payments) than if the position were left as it was. As the Act now stands, people pay water rates at various times during the year but, on average, not before December.

Mr. Ryan: That's not right.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had a little experience in this matter, and if the honourable member looks at documents I can show him he will see that many people do not pay their water rates until well after Christmas. It is fair to say that rates are generally collected about December, although some people pay in November or before. However, many pay after Christmas, and it was rather significant that water rates were being paid as late as last June in respect of that financial year. Under this legislation a person will be able to pay on a quarterly basis, but a person who would not normally pay until December will have to start paying in July.

Mr. Ryan: They still won't pay until the last quarter, anyhow.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I point out to the honourable member, who is so anxious to have people paying, that, far from reducing a hardship, this legislation will mean that people will have to start paying six months earlier than they have to pay now. This will have a particular effect on pensioners and those whose budgets are tight. Those people, who would not normally pay until probably December, will have to start paying in July, and yet this measure is supposed to be a concession to them.

Water and sewer rates are paid before the service is rendered. Honourable members opposite may think that is a good thing, but if any tradesman presented a bill for a service he might render in the future an outcry

would be heard from members opposite. This provision is not a concession to the payer; it is undoubtedly a concession to the Government, which will collect revenue much earlier. That was the basis on which it was put up to Cabinet at least four times by the department; so it is not new to me. I opposed it in Cabinet and I oppose it here tonight, because I believe it will impose hardship on perhaps a limited number of people, but people in straitened circumstances. The second point is that payments for excess water will be collected very much earlier under this Bill than they would be in normal circumstances. So, on one July morning many people will get a three-monthly account, affixed to which will be an account for excess water, if any, for the previous year. Those honourable members opposite who are so happy about this legislation will not be nearly so happy then; they will be wanting to say, "Well, in this matter we had the support of the Opposition." Members opposite have not our support. If they are so anxious to help the taxpayer in this respect, let them insert a provision in this Bill giving people an option to pay either under the present system or under the new system. However, I am confident that there would, in effect, be no option—because as soon as people understood what was involved, I am certain they would elect to pay as they do now.

Another question which has been glossed over and for which no real reason has been given is: why are these additional powers to be given to the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department? In the past I have introduced legislation to enable inspectors to enter private houses, but there has always been some purpose that could not be achieved in any other way. For instance, inspectors of this department are allowed to enter private houses to inspect sewerage services, but that entry is for the purpose of carrying out a duty. What is the duty that assessors will carry out here? What is the purpose of it? Honourable members opposite are silent. No honourable member has given any reason for this infringement of what, after all, I believe to be a fundamental right of the citizen, the right to live in his own home undisturbed by officials. I should very much like to hear why it is necessary at this stage of the game to give this additional power to inspectors to enter private houses—for what reason I do not know. Previously, when there has been good reason to suspect that some infringement of the law was involved, we have given power to see that there

was no such infringement, but it is not considered here that an infringement of the law is involved. What is the reason for this power? No reason on earth is given for it. I heartily support the remarks of the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) on this matter.

What is the object of this legislation? No honourable member opposite can give any reason for it. It is purely and simply an arbitrary official power to be granted to a department for no earthly reason whatsoever. I want to say one thing more about the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I am not in the habit of criticizing departments, but a case came to my notice, either from the district of the member for Port Adelaide or from that of the member for Semaphore, of a person who had been an alcoholic but who had joined Alcoholics Anonymous. He had got very much in arrears with payments to all sorts of people, including the department supplying him with water. However, I checked on this case and found that this man had over a period of five years been able to pull himself together; he had not touched a drop of drink—I know it is a laughing matter for the member for Port Adelaide.

For five years he had been pulling himself together and had given up alcohol completely. It took him some time to catch up with his accounts. Then lo and behold, the department cut off the water from his house. When a neighbour offered to give him enough water to look after the children, the department threatened to cut off the neighbour's water if he supplied a few cans of water to enable this man to stay alive. I never thought we would see that sort of thing in this State. I strongly believe that people should pay their accounts, but that is going too far. I give the Minister of Works credit for the fact that, when the matter was brought to his notice, he did take action. I believe a limited supply of water has now been restored to the house of that unfortunate person and that some composition has been made for its payment.

When this case was first taken up, the first explanation was that it was in accordance with a decision of my Government. It is interesting to note that it occurred 18 months after my Government went out of office. I can assure honourable members that we never denied anybody a drink of water. Even when rates are not paid, a minimum supply should still be allowed to enable people living in the house at least to subsist during the period of financial difficulty.

I agree with what has been said by other speakers about this Bill. It does not give a concession to people paying water rates. It will, however, enable the Government to get money earlier and, to that extent, it may assist the Government's Budget; but it does increase enormously the department's costs. It is no good saying it does not, because we had these costs examined. One cannot render four accounts a year for the same cost as one can render one account. Even the postage makes it an expensive business. I know about the computer mentioned by the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan). My Government set up a committee that examined the advisability of establishing a computer, and it was my Government that took action to buy it. If honourable members opposite like to take the trouble of looking at what the committee found, they will see that it found that the computer was not a profitable adjunct, that it would virtually cost more than if we did not have it.

Mr. Ryan: I never mentioned a computer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Port Adelaide made a great song and dance about how it was possible to do this.

Mr. Ryan: I never mentioned a computer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is possible to do it only because there is the computer. The member for Port Adelaide may not have known that.

Mr. Ryan: I never said anything about a computer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot get behind the mind, if any, of the member for Port Adelaide, but let me assure him that he will not be able to put the responsibility upon this side of the House when there are objections to paying water rates, which will inevitably arise if this Bill is carried.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I congratulate the Government on introducing this measure. I also congratulate the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) on smoking out the Opposition. We knew that the member for Rocky River was sulking away in his little corner, and that the member for Gumeracha was sulking away in his back bench.

Mrs. Steele: At least he said he would speak on the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Burnside is sulking now.

Mr. HUDSON: Apparently the member for Gumeracha did not really like the decision of the member for Flinders, presumably backed by the Leader of the Opposition, to support

the measure. Just where does the Opposition stand on this issue? Here we had the members for Flinders and Burra, followed by the member for Stirling, all supporting the measure, and the debate was just about to peter out when the member for Port Adelaide, in what I thought was a very able and effective speech, stirred up the sleeping dogs, who perhaps should have been let lie and allowed to rest in peace. But now that the truth is out, now that the members for Gumeracha and Rocky River have opposed this measure, let us have the truth of the matter. Are they opposed to the general decision of the Opposition; has the Opposition any attitude on this Bill at all; and is the Leader of the Opposition going to support the position taken by his mentor and guide, or is he going to support the member for Flinders (his deputy) and the other honourable members who have supported the Bill?

Mr. Quirke: The honourable member who is speaking has great reservations on this Bill, too.

Mr. HUDSON: I will make my attitude clear. Let me deal first with the remarks on double billing made by the member for Rocky River and also by the member for Gumeracha when he said that this Bill would mean a little additional revenue a little earlier than would apply in normal circumstances. He got wound up in his remarks; he started off by saying it was a little additional revenue; then it became an assertion that the consumer would have to pay more quickly and more severely; and gradually he wound up so that at the end of his speech it became a claim that what the Government was doing was a complete and utter scandal. I think it is hard for a new Leader of the Opposition to have to put up with this sort of playfulness so early; it is unfortunate, because it does not give a very good picture.

Mr. Clark: Our hearts bleed for him.

Mr. HUDSON: Let us get the position clear. Section 94 of the original Act is the section dealing with the payment of accounts. A similar section applies in relation to sewer rates. Section 94 of the Waterworks Act states:

All water rates . . . shall be paid in advance by equal payments on the first day in July and the first day in January in each year: Provided that the Governor may, by proclamation, declare that in the water district or districts specified in such proclamation all rates . . . shall be payable in advance on the first day of July in every year, in which case the rates shall be so paid accordingly.

Of course, this is now the normal practice, except in relation to a number of commercial houses and factories that are large users of water, in which cases, I understand, the rates are paid monthly. The ordinary water and sewer rates are paid 12 months in advance, and accounts start to go out in July. Many people in West Torrens and in my district have been required, under the system that has persisted for so many years, to pay their rates 12 months in advance in July and in August, and obviously to any person in that position this Bill represents a considerable relief and a considerable gain. It will mean for the Treasury, in all probability, not a gain in revenue but, if anything, a slight postponement of revenue until later in the year, because I understand that the position is not as stated by the member for Gumeracha, namely, that most people pay their rates in December. The actual position is that the average date for payment of rates is early in November.

Let us assume that with these quarterly notices under the new system people on an average take one month to pay. This will mean that people will be paying their rates in August, November, February and May. These may turn out to be the average dates for payment of these quarterly accounts. If the average date for the payment of the yearly bill was November, then on average the rate-payers in South Australia will be paying one-quarter of their rate three months earlier than normal; one-quarter at the same time as previously; one-quarter three months later than usual; and one-quarter six months later than usual. This change, therefore, represents a gain to the average consumer, and what the member for Gumeracha had to say is simply not the case.

I think what has happened is that in some dim, dark and distant year the member for Gumeracha, when he was Premier, received a report from the department that was probably adverse to this proposal (or he decided it was adverse) and that incident has remained fixed in his memory ever since. One or two members of the Opposition, however, have obviously done a little homework: the honourable members for Flinders, Burra and Stirling realize that a benefit will accrue to the average consumer, so they are supporting the Bill. I suggest that the member for Gumeracha should not just rely on the homework he has done in the past but should keep doing his homework.

Mr. Ryan: You would think he would have more knowledge, seeing he was Premier for so many years.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. Further, we are told by the Opposition that this provision implies compulsion to pay rates quarterly. Do members of the Opposition seriously believe that if a ratepayer went along to the department and offered to pay for the full 12 months in advance (as he was previously required to do) the department would refuse to accept it? Can members imagine the raised eyebrows in the Treasury if the Engineering and Water Supply Department refused to accept that payment? I think we can be quite confident that common sense will prevail, and that any ratepayer who wants to pay his full year's rate in advance will be perfectly able to do so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They will still be able to do that.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, the Minister confirms it. This introduction of quarterly payment of rates is important not only to pensioners and people on fixed incomes but to many wage earners and salary earners in our community who find that the yearly demand for the payment of rates comes at a most inconvenient time. It involves their paying a lump sum, and that is difficult, as other accounts tend to arrive at the same time. An explanation why such a large percentage of ratepayers receive a final notice is the difficulty of meeting these payments. At present, many ratepayers do not pay their rates promptly, indicating that this Bill will be greatly appreciated by a large section of the community. Clause 4 amends section 69 of the principal Act, and this amendment would have been clear to the member for Gumeracha if he had looked at the principal Act, because this section applied during the years he was Premier. The section states:

The Commissioner, or any person having an order for that purpose under the Commissioner's seal, shall be entitled as of right, at all reasonable times, free of charge—

- (a) to have access to and inspect all rate-books and assessment books relating to any land or premises within any water district, and all other books and documents relating to any assessment thereof: . . .

The effect of the section was that it gave the Commissioner, or any officer of the department who acted under his authority, the right to inspect rate and assessment books and other documents relating to the premises or land. The member for Gumeracha made a good point when he said that he was prepared to introduce rights of entry where there was a specific purpose. The purpose needed here, and not provided for by section 69, is the right of entry to a property in order to make an assessment.

In relation to making an assessment, there should be no right of entry into the interior of a house, and most honourable members would agree that probably the Minister would be prepared to consider this aspect. The purpose, which is not provided for in section 69 of the principal Act, is the right to enter and make a proper assessment of the improved value of the property.

Section 69 needs amending because, at present, any ratepayer could refuse access to his property to any officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who wanted to assess it. He may not be wise, but he could create difficulties, and I understand there have been such cases, and the officers have had conditions made more difficult as a result. The amendment in clause 4 could be expressed in a way that confined the right of entry purely to entering the property to inspect the external characteristics and nature of the property, and excluded the right to enter inside the premises. If the amendment were altered to make that clear and specific (and nothing more was intended in any case), every honourable member would be satisfied. Undoubtedly, the Minister appreciates the remarks that have been made, and I am sure he will give full attention to this aspect and will be reasonable in this matter. The member for Gumeracha implied that the Bill will increase costs enormously because a computer is used, but that is not correct.

On an average, it will not impose a hardship on ratepayers, as they will pay rates a little later in the year than they do now. For many ratepayers this Bill will mean a significant advantage, as they will not have to provide finance for lump sum payments, as they have to do at present, for accounts that come at a time when other demands are made on them. I support the Bill, and I hope that we get a clearer picture from the Opposition of its attitude, and that in future debates there will not be this rabble approach that we have had to deal with now. Not rabble rousing perhaps, but leaderless.

Mr. Lawn: You could have said that about what has happened for the last 30 years.

Mr. HUDSON: The Opposition should tell the House where it stands and whether it supports the Bill or not. Is the member for Gumeracha giving us the attitude of the Opposition, or not? I make my position clear: I support the Bill, it is good, and I commend it to the House.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): It is refreshing for the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) to tell us we do not know where we are going in this matter, and more refreshing to hear that his perfect Bill wants amending. I do not hear often from supporters of the Government that Government Bills require reconsidering. I congratulate the member for Glenelg on his careful analysis of this Bill: if he does that all the time it will be helpful to the House and beneficial to his electors and to mine. However, I see no virtue to rate-payers in paying their accounts quarterly. I would be surprised if the Government introduced the Bill with the idea of giving something away: this would be the first time that that approach had been used.

This is not a "give away" Bill, it is a "take" Bill, with some profit to the Government, but there will not be as much profit as the Government thinks there will be. Computers do not work without paper or without operators. The company I have the honour to represent uses computers; it hires them. A computer cannot be made to work for nothing; each exercise given it must be paid for. I think the member for Port Adelaide suggested that the computer would overcome costs but it would not and could not. Further, the results of the computer's calculations must be processed on to paper, placed in an envelope and sent to the person concerned, which all costs money. We have not yet discovered a way of forwarding accounts without posting them. Computers are used for a certain purpose and, obviously, the *reductio ad absurdum* in this matter may be to render accounts monthly. However, the Government must realize that the cost of rendering monthly accounts would be out of all proportion to what the Treasury actually received. The cost actually starts when the material finally comes out of the computer.

The member for Flinders referred to clause 3, the relevant part of which states:

... but if the assessment is lawfully altered then the assessment as so altered shall be deemed to come into force from the commencement of that financial year and shall continue and remain in force until the end thereof.

An ordinary householder may erect a garage on his property which, when discovered, would represent an added asset to his land, involving an increased assessment. I dislike the retrospective provision, "shall be deemed to come into force from the commencement of that financial year", for that could give the Government an additional revenue for three-quarters of a year, even though the added cost existed

for only one-quarter. The member for Glenelg seemed to gloss over the proposed amendment to section 69, dealing with inspection. Although I have not discussed this matter with the Minister, as is my usual custom, I have heard him say that he would not desire to use such a power for an inspector or assessor to demand entrance to a house, but he will not be the Minister for ever. Such a power may well be necessary where it is believed that unhygienic conditions exist in a house, but the Bill deals only with an assessment of the property's value, and the power seems to me to be unnecessary. I hope the provision will be amended. If the member for Glenelg thinks I have been sold on this gold brick, let me tell him that there is a bit of tinsel in it. These provisions are weighted more in favour of the Treasury than the ratepayer; they will not provide relief for the ratepayer, and I defy anybody to say they will.

Mr. Hudson: Many final notices are at present rendered because people cannot pay the lump sum.

Mr. SHANNON: If I may say so, the honourable member is using a little sophistry. A certain type of individual pays only when he is made to pay, and that individual may now receive four final notices instead of one. That same man gets final notices from the shops in Rundle Street, too. I have a high regard for the Minister of Works, for good reasons, but I tell him that this Bill, when it is in operation, will not be as popular as we have been told by certain of his supporters that it will be.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I had not intended to speak in this debate but was more or less provoked into doing so by the member for Port Adelaide. I agree with the last two speakers on this side, and I am not jumping on the water waggon, either.

Mr. Ryan: This is only for loyalty purposes.

Mrs. STEELE: No, it is not. The member for Port Adelaide reminded me of an incident in this House a couple of weeks ago (perhaps not as long ago as that), when a question on notice was more or less evaded by the Government and that led to much more of an incident than it would otherwise have done and provoked much more publicity. What the member for Port Adelaide has said has had exactly the same effect. It has raised the interest of members on this side, particularly, and that is why there has been some divergence of opinion. I reckon that, if the member for Port Adelaide had said less and said it less forcibly, he would not have had this effect on the members of the Opposition.

I can see no virtue in this provision at all, except, as other members have said, that it will provide the Government with some funds, which it obviously badly needs, in advance of the time when it usually receives water rate payments. The strange thing is that, under this legislation, these services are to be paid for in advance. In fact, they are to be paid for even before they have been used, and this is borne out clearly by clause 9. I wonder why the Bill has been introduced at all and should like to know who asked for the legislation.

I cannot accept that it is going to be of any great service to people on fixed incomes, as has been said this evening, or to pensioners. People on fixed incomes and pensioners who have limited money with which to budget get into the habit of carefully budgeting with the income for the whole year and they make provision. They know that at a certain time of the year their water and sewerage rate accounts will come in and that, perhaps, in October their council rate accounts will come in and they have to make provision to pay these accounts in November. I cannot see that the proposed arrangement will benefit the people whom the Government says it will help. I believe they have become accustomed to paying their accounts in one amount and I cannot see that paying them quarterly, and in advance (which, I think will be resented), will be of any great interest to them.

I also believe that this will involve the department in extra expense, as other members have said. I was interested in this talk of the computer. I do not know whether the Minister has considered the use to which the extra staff can be put as a result of the use of the computer, but I know that another great instrumentality in this State saves postage and, at the same time, has not had to retrench employees, because it has used the very people who read the meters to deliver the accounts. These accounts are not sent through the post at all.

Some mention was made of the advantage that this measure would be in that money would be coming in to the department at regular times, four times during the year, as a result of the quarterly paying of accounts. It is rather interesting, when one looks at the Treasury statements for this financial year under the scheme that has been operating, to find that money is coming in all the time. For the information of members, I point out that in March of this year \$858,000 was paid to the department, in April \$420,000 and in May

\$464,000. The figure for March represents almost one-sixth of the estimated receipts for a quarter by this Government department, and the figures I have cited show that people are paying in at all periods of the year amounts due for rates. A few months ago, almost at the end of the financial year, the amount paid in represented one-sixth of the estimated receipts for the whole quarter.

The other point I want to make relates to the right of entry. Again, I cannot for the life of me see why the present Act should be altered to include this provision. I do not think it is necessary. I consider the great number of employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, as of other Government departments, to be courteous. They do not presume on the privileges and facilities they have regarding entering properties, but the occasional one is different, and to write into this measure that these people have the right of entry is to give the power and authority that some people need to make themselves more difficult and sometimes very objectionable.

I shall never forget something which happened a few years ago and about which I was very annoyed. We had a visit from, I think, a sewers inspector. He walked around the back of the house and did not let me know that he was there. I heard someone banging away, and went out to see who it was. I said, "Good morning." He was very gruff about it. I said, "Is there something I can do for you?" He said, "Inspector, Sewers Department, just testing your pipes," and so forth. He had a screwdriver in his hand and drove it straight through the vent that goes up from the sewers. Actually, there was nothing wrong with that at all, but I suppose he had to find something that was faulty and, in front of my eyes, he put the screwdriver through the pipe. This meant that I had to get a plumber in to do the job that was necessary.

Most employees of Government departments are courtesy itself and no-one minds because they have to visit places in the course of their duties, but I consider that writing this into the Act will give that little lever that some of them sometimes want to enable them to be officious and difficult to deal with. With those few remarks, I make it known that I do not support the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): First, I should like to thank honourable members for the way they have applied themselves to this debate. It was one of those occasions when the water was calm and

smooth and there seemed no need for a lifesaver, but a lifesaver appeared and stirred up the mud. Nevertheless, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said that he was delighted to hear that some members on this side admitted that they were prepared to have a second look at matters. I assure honourable members that I am always prepared to have a second look. I appreciate the careful and honest examination given to the Bill. Accordingly, some comments made have caused me to have a second look at some of the provisions in the Bill.

It seems that three principal exceptions were taken to the Bill, even by some who supported it. The first objection was to the right of entry to a property by an assessor. I assure the House that I will have another look at this provision to see what it means and to see whether it is desirable. During the course of his remarks, the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) said that he had introduced legislation providing for the right of entry, and I appreciate that admission. He went on to say that there had to be a reason for this right to be given. I will carefully examine the relevant clause to see that sufficient reason exists for its inclusion. Some things come readily to mind in regard to assessing the value of properties. I am well aware that built-in furniture, as a feature of many houses today, becomes part and parcel of the house and is not disclosed by outside observation. Of course, it adds considerably to the value of a house. If the present method of assessing is continued, we must assess houses at something like their true value.

Mr. Shannon: It is a bit tough if you are going to assess a house with built-in furniture and let off another fellow who might have movable furniture.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Recently, I had a case where land was acquired by the Government on which there was a house, and costly compensation was paid because of built-in furniture. If the furniture had not been built-in it would not have been part of the house. The second exception taken to the Bill concerned country land. I am prepared to have another look at this aspect and to see what would be the result of the provision in certain cases. I was delighted when the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said that his view was his own and that he would consult with his country colleagues to see how they felt about the matter.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They are pretty firm about it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am willing to have another look at this provision, as I am not dogmatic about any legislation I introduce. I hope that all members who introduce legislation are sure that it is in the best interests of the majority and also have regard to protecting the rights of the minority. I would never introduce legislation that worked in any other way, and I hope honourable members will accept my assurance. The third exception taken to the Bill concerned the assessment in respect of garages or other improvements.

Mr. Shannon: Assets added.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. I do not intend that retrospective charges should be made and I am confident that the department does not intend that they should be made. If necessary, I shall amend the Bill to provide that they are not made. We must be sure about this, because it would be unfair in any circumstances to assess an addition for a period of, perhaps, six months when the improvement had not been made during that period.

It has been said that most people would rather pay rates annually than quarterly. Some people might prefer to do this. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) asked who had suggested that quarterly rating be introduced, but the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) made it clear that the request had been made many times. He was honest and straightforward and told us who had made the request. He also said that he had often declined the request, and I concede that that was his right. I submit, however, that this request has been made of me by senior officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who have said that their long experience has shown them, without a shadow of a doubt, that many people have found it difficult to meet the accumulation of water, sewer and council rates that seem to fall due at the same time of the year. To be honest, until the time I said that the Government might introduce the quarterly rating system no approach had been made from the public on the matter, but since I said we might introduce this system, I have had requests to go on with it not only from individuals but from many organizations representing those in the lower-income groups. These organizations urged that this system be introduced in order to spread the burden of paying the various rates.

My predecessor, the member for Flinders, knows full well that it is difficult for some people to meet these accounts, and he admitted as much this afternoon. The member for Onkaparinga said that this would be the first time I had given anything away, if I was giving something away in the Bill. I do not pretend for a moment that the Bill is a "give away". While I am a Minister I do not intend to give away public money: I intend to spend it to the best advantage of those who really own it. The reason for the Bill is to save public money and to relieve people of the burden of paying lump sums, mostly near the Christmas season. The cost factor has been referred to, but I urge members to appreciate the department's difficulty in ridding itself of a mass of accounts at one time. This necessitates the department's using additional staff; by spreading the work over a period fewer clerks will be needed.

Mr. Shannon: You are going to multiply the work four times.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We are not: we will have a steady run of work.

Mr. Shannon: Instead of putting the accounts through the machine once, they will have to be put through four times. It will be the same for all your customers.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I never thought I would live to see the day when I would hear the honourable member for Onkaparinga condemning private enterprise, which is so willing to render monthly and quarterly accounts. For instance, the South Australian Gas Company issues monthly accounts, and the Electricity Trust quarterly accounts. I am sure the honourable member would not at any time condemn the administration of the Electricity Trust.

Mr. Shannon: I am only pointing out that extra cost is involved in rendering accounts every three months.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that this point is being investigated. Before the debate is concluded, I will get some facts on the costs involved. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) drew attention to the method of rating and said that it should be based on quantity consumed. This matter is being looked at closely by the department at the moment.

Mr. Clark: And has been looked at over the years, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. I was surprised because, in the very next breath, the honourable member referred to the proposed Kimba water supply and said that if Kimba

was granted a supply it would improve its production. This is a fact, but also, because it would improve production, it would improve the capital value of farms in the area. Accordingly, I see no evil in assessing by the present method but I can see many pitfalls in rating by quantity alone.

Mr. McAnaney: I said that the carrying capacity of some land was greatly increased when water was available, and that the capacity of other land was not, and that quantity would possibly be a fairer basis for assessment.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am sorry if I misunderstood the honourable member (it is easy to do that) but I thought he argued against himself. The member for Rocky River spoke of people having to pay postage on their accounts but, unfortunately, he is not up to date because we are now making arrangements whereby accounts can be paid at any branch of the Savings Bank, and it will not be necessary for postage to be paid on sending in accounts. It will not be necessary for ratepayers to travel to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, although they may if they wish.

Mr. Heaslip: How far does one have to travel to a Savings Bank branch in the country?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Unfortunately, the honourable member always draws comparisons with what one has to do in the country. I happen to have lived and walked in the country with a swag on my back. Wherever one pays accounts in the country, one has to travel to do so. Is the honourable member so much concerned about the department's expenditure as to ask us to send out a collector to his house? If so, he is arguing contrary to his earlier argument. He maintains that this legislation generally has worked well. If it has, I have yet to learn why he or anyone else would be making this suggestion. Surely he is not reflecting on the intelligence and integrity of the men who have framed this legislation? I do not think he is. I believe he made that statement just for the sake of something to say, and he probably now regrets it. I hope he does. The member for Burnside said she saw no virtue in this legislation. I regret that there are people so privileged in our community that they fail to appreciate the difficulties of other people on limited incomes. I assure the honourable member that those people on limited incomes will find it a great advantage to be able to pay their accounts by quarterly instalments. As the member for Flinders

acknowledged this afternoon, if an application is made to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the deferment of a payment, it has always, where the case has been just and reasonable, been prepared to grant that deferment and it has gone to great lengths to help people. I had a case recently where I undertook to tell a person in no uncertain manner that he should not have an extension of time in which to pay.

My only other point for the moment is that raised by the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), who referred to a case (I have heard about it) where the water was cut off altogether. He was good enough to say that, when this was brought to my notice, something was done about it. This was a most unusual and unfortunate case, but I assure the House (and I am sure the honourable member who raised the question knows this) that it is not the general policy of the department. When we have to restrict water supplies, we always leave sufficient water for sanitary and health requirements. Unfortunately, however, there is the type of citizen who will not pay until pressure is brought to bear on him, and that pressure has sometimes to be exerted. At the outset of my remarks I said I was going to investigate one or two points on which I should like to satisfy members before we went into Committee. Accordingly, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

Adjourned debate on the question "That this Bill be now read a second time."

(Continued from July 13. Page 479.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I move:

To strike out all the words after "That" and insert "the Bill be withdrawn and that a Select Committee of the House be appointed to inquire into and report upon all matters appertaining to the occupancy of Aboriginal reserves."

Mrs. STEELE seconded the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the House for allowing the suspension of Standing Orders. This action has been forced on me because the Government wishes the debate on this matter to proceed today; had we not been proceeding until tomorrow, I would not have needed to move this motion. I shall explain the reason for the motion presently. Again and again since a Bill similar to this was introduced last session I have sought information on the matter, and again and again I have been asked by

people why we are to have an Aboriginal Lands Trust and what its purpose will be. To my mind, these questions have not been clearly answered at all. We have had much argument from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs on certain aspects of Aboriginal administration, but we have not had a clear description of what this Aboriginal Lands Trust will do and what its real purpose will be. I have no doubt that it has the appeal of giving the appearance of a very real advance in Aboriginal administration, but, quite frankly, appearances are not enough. Unless this Bill affords a significant, substantial and material advantage, I do not think we should go on with it until we have had a chance to make proper inquiries. We have not yet made those inquiries.

In fact, the establishment of this trust in relation to the Aboriginal people is quite out of step with what exists in other parts of the world. There is little or no similarity between the Aboriginal question (as we call it here) and the question of indigenous peoples in other parts of the world. These Aboriginal people are not warrior tribes, such as those in North America who fought wars with the European population and with whom treaties were made: the Aboriginal people are not like that and never have been. There have never been treaties in that sense at all, and there have never been wars with the Aboriginal people. For those reasons alone, there are very distinct differences between North America and South Australia. If anything is to be done in the way of settling Aborigines on the land in South Australia, it should and could be done under the Crown Lands Act, which has been the medium by which much agricultural settlement has taken place in this State. The Lands Department is the most experienced authority on settling people on the land; its legislation is designed to allow it, and there is no reason why the Aboriginal people should not be settled on the land under the Crown Lands Act if that was desired.

Why we should at this stage, after 130 years of settlement, start to establish an Aboriginal Lands Trust, I am at a loss to know. I do not see the necessity for it at all. If an inquiry were to establish a good reason for doing it, I would be satisfied, but until we have such an inquiry I cannot see any advantage in it at all. We are dealing basically with a race of people who are nomadic by nature and who have never been agriculturally inclined in any sense.

Mr. McKee: And they have never had the opportunity to be, either.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: True. As I say, they are not so minded. Why at this stage we should start to establish them as agriculturists, I do not know. If it is required that we should settle them on the land, there are other ways, as I say, of doing it than through an Aboriginal Lands Trust. The Aborigines in South Australia can be divided (as in the words of the Act) into Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood; in effect, we could say full-bloods or mixed bloods. The mixed bloods are themselves divided, and they are extremely variable by reason of the admixture of European and Aboriginal blood. There are many persons of Aboriginal origin in South Australia of whom we know nothing as to their origin and of whom I am sure the authorities also know nothing. They have merged into the community and are no longer recognizable as having any admixture of Aboriginal blood in them. That is very good, and I say, "Good luck to them". In some cases those people may never reveal that they have any relationship to the Aboriginal people, while in other cases they will reveal it. The thing we must not forget is the tremendous variation between full-bloods and people with only just the slightest admixture of Aboriginal blood in them.

Although this is a discussion that is sometimes carried on rather fruitlessly, we hear much at times about the difference between assimilation and integration. If Aboriginal people wish to become assimilated in this community and have opportunities to do so, I see no reason on earth to prevent it. On the other hand, if they do not wish to become assimilated, we should not try to force assimilation on them. That does not mean that we should try to discourage assimilation. However, I believe that the establishment of the Lands Trust as envisaged in this Bill will discourage the assimilation of the Aboriginal people. The Minister is looking his usual uninspired self.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Your speech is no inspiration.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is trying to be a record breaker in this question of Aboriginal administration, and I believe that that is probably more the reason for this legislation than anything else.

Mr. Langley: That is a bit personal, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is just the sort of thing the member for Alexandra would say.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I believe the Minister is trying to establish a name for himself as a record breaker in this respect. Unless we have better evidence than this, we should not put the clock back by differentiating between Aborigines and Europeans in this State. The Minister gave a history of what had occurred since the colonization of South Australia, and I do not quarrel with that. No doubt it was accurate, but whether it was balanced or not I do not know. The underlying message is that we have filched land from the Aboriginal people. We should be careful before we talk in this liberal way about the Aboriginal problem and the wrongs to Aborigines, because this is widely misunderstood.

People in other parts of the world consider that we compare with Rhodesia or have a problem similar to that in America, but this is unjust and inaccurate. We must be careful not to build up this problem into something it is not, and we should not exaggerate. It is a considerable human problem, but statistically it is not a big problem. The proportion of Aborigines in this State is comparatively small. Recently, I received a note from a young man who travelled in the United States of America last year. He had given an interview on the radio in an American State as a young Australian travelling in that country. He writes:

The radio interview was played on Saturday morning and they had me in this answering questions on the phone to be reported back to the radio. Most of the questions were about our Aborigines: did we segregate them; could we become another Rhodesia, etc. Perhaps we should be more careful of the space devoted to them in our information booklets, or at least stress their scarcity.

That is what that young man met in America, and I think we should be careful to give a correct impression and not a false one. We are too loose in our descriptions of the wrongs done to Aborigines. Every administration I know has done something to assist Aborigines; most of them would consider they had done their best, and they probably did in the circumstances. We should remember some of the problems with which the administrators had to deal, and they should be kept in proper perspective. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said how the Commissioners in London, before the colonization of this State, issued a high-minded instruction about the development of land for the Aboriginal people. They set out that for every 80 acres, 64 acres only should be sold, and at the end of a prescribed time the settler should receive 64 acres

(selecting the first two divisions) and that the Protector of Aborigines should select one out of the remaining three divisions. This system was to apply but apparently never did. I do not know what it proves except that it is an utterly impractical situation.

Can anyone imagine what would have been done by Aborigines with 16 acres of developed land? We know what 16 acres of untended land can become today—a bushfire hazard, a weed and vermin harbour and a problem to neighbouring landholders. I do not wonder that the hapless Secretary of the South Australian Association said that this provision had not been acted upon, and was unnecessary. To me, it could never work. I am satisfied that the administration tried to do something for Aborigines and, although there have been cases of mistreatment by individuals and here and there by the administration, the reason for the fall in population of the Aborigines was not due to brutality in the blatant sense but was mainly a problem of health. The mortality rate must have been sickening in the early years of the settlement. Aborigines contracted diseases that they could not resist, but no doubt their hygiene standard was below that which would save them from infection. The mortality of adults and infants must have been high, but we must not forget that there were problems of mortality amongst the Europeans, who had a higher standard of hygiene and some resistance to disease. Today all that has changed. Aborigines are not diminishing in number but are rapidly increasing. I have heard the situation described by an authority on Aborigines as a population explosion, and I believe that to be correct. Cases were quoted of families with 16 children or more, and these families have created a severe welfare problem. In this Bill we are creating differentiations that seem to be pointless, and from which nothing will be gained. Why should we rush into this without appointing a committee of inquiry? There is no urgency about this matter, and such a committee would inform not only members of this House but the public and the Aborigines. Who understands this legislation? Assuming that the Minister understands it, who else does? Who understands what its development will be? The South Australian public does not understand it; members of Parliament, as a group, do not understand it; and of the Aboriginal people a small minority only understand what will come from this legislation. The Minister should have another think about this legislation. He has done many things since receiving

the Aboriginal portfolio; he completely lifted the liquor laws almost immediately.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On the unanimous recommendation of the Police Commissioner and the Aboriginal Affairs Board!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We do not know what the effect of that action will be. The previous Minister lifted the liquor laws at a more cautious rate. Naturally, some complaints were received from various parts of the State soon after the lifting of those restrictions by the present Minister, but we have not heard so much about the matter lately. We do not know how much misuse is made of liquor amongst Aborigines although, obviously, there is far more consumption of liquor by Aborigines than is good for them, comparing them with European citizens in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not believe that it is helpful to give instances of which I have heard, simply because they are unnecessarily embarrassing to Aborigines who do not drink to excess. However, I know that many Aborigines would have been much better off if the restrictions had been lifted more cautiously than they were. The North West Reserve is a large area, and we do not know how it will be affected by the lands trust. Honourable members may recall that last session the following heated exchange took place between the Minister and the then Leader of the Opposition:

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the Minister categorically: will the great North West Reserve be brought under the trust?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We do not know yet.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly, and this is the sort of Bill we have been asked to pass at 1.30 in the morning, having been previously told that it would not be debated this session.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We can't know until the people vote on it. The Leader is talking utter rot.

Naturally, *Hansard* could not record the Minister's last interjection as being shouted, but that is what occurred. That passage indicates that a vote will be taken on the North West Reserve on whether it should or should not be brought under the lands trust. Can anybody seriously say that a vote will be taken of all responsible people on the reserve in the proper circumstances? Or will the majority merely be carried along by the few who know a little more than the others? The Minister said, "We do not know", but I can definitely say now that we do know, as does the Minister.

In fact, the Minister will see to it that the Aborigines concerned will become convinced that the reserve should be brought under the lands trust and, eventually, that will happen. The North West Reserve partly consists of numbers of truly nomadic Aborigines, some of whom may live around the mission, and whose children receive continuous schooling, but others move between Western and Central Australia and have not the slightest chance of really understanding what the lands trust will do for them.

What will happen to those people if the trust is administered badly? Even though it may be administered well, those who have never learned what it is all about may suffer. It is the Government's responsibility to look after those people on the North West Reserve and not hand them over to another group. I fail to see how many of the people concerned can be at present responsible for self-determination, and I doubt the propriety of bringing them under the trust merely because the majority votes in favour of it. Certain safeguards in the Bill are, indeed, necessary. The secretary of the trust is to be the Director of Aboriginal Affairs, without whom the trust cannot meet. An absurd situation arises in respect of mineral rights. The Minister said the board was shocked and horrified to learn that much of the North West Reserve had been included in the company's lease for oil prospecting.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not only that reserve: every other Aboriginal reserve as well.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The board was "shocked and horrified", but I maintain that it and the Minister should have known immediately the present Government came into office that that had happened. The old board knew for at least 20 or 30 years that it was not involved in mineral rights.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Which old board are you talking about?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The previous Aborigines Protection Board.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Under the new Act which had been in operation for some time it had the right to say who was going on the reserve and who was not.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister knows that mineral rights had nothing to do with that board.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Have a talk with Professor Abbie, and see what he thought!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have talked with some of the people concerned with Aboriginal administration, and I know that

what I am saying is perfectly correct. The former administrators knew they had nothing to do with mineral rights. The present administrators should know that, too. This situation resulted in a disagreement in Cabinet. Fortunately, the Minister of Mines won, and was able to ensure that licences would be honoured. That is what happened to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and that is one good reason why I tell him not to rush into this matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did you say that the Minister of Mines won?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: He won every point in this argument. The Mines Department has a very sensible attitude on the matter and I do not know what the Aboriginal Lands Trust would do if these licences had not been granted. It would probably find difficulty in arranging for anybody to prospect for ore in the land that it controls. I do not know what the Minister wants to say this time. He can go on interjecting but I am not prepared to stop and deal with every interjection he makes, because I have much to say. I have heard the Minister on the subject of Aboriginal affairs both inside and outside the House.

The trust itself cannot search for minerals and it would not be in as good a position as the Government to arrange for other people to do it. I am at a loss to understand why it should receive the royalties from a mineral search, because the argument is simply an emotional one. What would happen if those royalties were not a modest amount but millions of dollars, or such a large sum of money that we have not yet dreamed about in South Australia? It is possible that that could be the position, and what would the trust do with the money?

I should like the Minister to explain at some stage, but not by interjection, just what the Aboriginal Lands Trust will do with this money and in what way it is empowered to spend it. It has power to make advances by way of scholarships and so on but beyond that the powers of the trust begin to try the imagination. Let us hear what it is intended that the trust should do, and not a story of what has happened in the past.

So far I have spoken about full-bloods but there are many Aborigines of mixed blood in South Australia. Probably one quarter of the known ones live in the metropolitan area and many more live in the settled areas. In the Government stations and missions around the settled areas of South Australia, the people

are mainly of mixed blood. There would not be more than one full-blood Aboriginal at Point Pearce or Point McLeay. Both these stations have been established for some time. The other stations are of varying ages. There is one in the Upper Murray area.

These stations have been quite successful in achieving their object of helping the Aborigines to live in community life in South Australia. Many Aborigines have come through these southern stations and have obtained employment in the community. Some have established themselves successfully in the community and others are establishing themselves. I think that one or two of them are farmers.

Mr. Quirke: A soldier settler in the South-East was settled under the Crown Lands Act.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the honourable member for the information.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He was settled under the Commonwealth war service land settlement scheme.

Mr. Quirke: It was under the Crown Lands Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was not a Crown lease.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If the Minister wants to be exact, we will settle on the war service provisions, but it was through the Lands Department. My point is that many more could be settled through the Lands Department and through the Crown Lands Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You should see what leases can be granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think the Minister is behaving stupidly.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I think you are behaving ignorantly; it is about time you knew what you were talking about.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is insistent on absolute courtesy when he speaks but occasionally he does his block, so to speak, by way of interjection. He has not done his block yet, but I am keeping my eye on him in case he does.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Apparently the Minister is supported in his rather discourteous attitude by the members for Port Pirie and Unley. These two members make few speeches but seem to interject more than anyone else in the House. The Minister is fairly versatile; he is good at interjecting and speaking, too. However, these three members are constantly interrupting me. I am talking about the attitude of Aborigines towards agriculture. Not many Aborigines

are capable now of taking on agricultural propositions and managing them. Not many Europeans are capable of doing this either under conditions where full credit has to be extended to them. That is what would happen under the Bill.

We cannot expect the Aboriginal Lands Trust to set up a successful land settlement scheme. The Minister is on the point of saying "nonsense" again, but I think it is time we were told just what the trust intends to do. Will it set up farming propositions on these reserves? We do not know yet and it is time we did. I do not think we shall pass the Bill until we know, because just what will happen is extremely important. The fact is that the areas that could be alienated under the Bill, provided the Minister made no objection, could be sold by the trust. I think the Minister would probably admit that. He has not said anything about this matter, but we should be informed about the future use of Aboriginal reserves in South Australia. Why should we be asked to accept this Bill which tells us absolutely nothing about these important matters? It is difficult for anybody to be a successful agricultural settler; it is doubly difficult if the trust is going to administer settlement of any kind on any of its reserves.

I know the Minister is keen on having open villages at Point Pearce and Point McLeay, and I understand that both those places are destined to become open villages. This has caused great consternation among the people living there, and I wonder what the Town Planner, too, thinks about it. I can understand it if one day the Town Planner is shocked and horrified that he was not told that these were to become open villages. Has the Town Planner been consulted on the future of Point Pearce and Point McLeay? I do not know but, after the Town Planning Bill has been considered, that will be one of the first things he will see to once he gets outside the metropolitan area.

What do we know about the financial arrangements for this lands trust? We know the department has a vote of money from Parliament. We have the figures in the report of what the department is granted by way of vote, and what it spends on various reserves. I imagine the lands trust will not receive money over and above the sum voted by Parliament. It will have to take its share of what is voted in the Budget. How much will it get? Will it get more than it is spending at present? Is the combined money voted to the department and to the lands trust to be greater than is at

present provided in the Estimates, or will it be less? In either case, relevant questions arise. If it is to be less, then we have a right to ask, "Who will suffer hardship and for what reason?" If it is to be more or the same we have a right to say, "Well, could not the Government itself administer this efficiently enough?" We do not know anything about the financial arrangements here. We have not been told anything about what the Minister proposes in this Bill. The House, generally, likes to know these things. That is one good reason why I think a Select Committee would look at this Bill with interest. It would be one of the first things it would examine. I have said previously that we cannot see what will happen under the lands trust. I am sure Parliament does not know. The Minister may know and some members of Cabinet may have some idea, but they have not told us. Whether they have told the members sitting behind them I do not know, but they have not told us in this House. The people of South Australia do not know and, even more so, the Aborigines do not know. We need more light thrown upon this matter.

What about the manned reserves and the missions? The Minister stated that the first action would be to hand over to the trust all the unoccupied lands and the occupied lands not manned by missions or departmental officers. How will the Administration work in with the missions? Nobody has given us any details of this. Some of these long established missions have made a tremendous contribution to South Australia, yet we do not know whether they are to be encouraged or discouraged in the future, or just what will happen to them. It is merely stated that this matter will be considered later. The Minister said that the proposal for a Select Committee was ill considered and went on to give the reasons. Boiled down, they come to this, that the problem was very complicated (we agree on that); that a great deal of literature was available on the subject of Aborigines (we agree on that, too); and he then said that a Select Committee could not possibly find a solution to the problem. Well, that could almost be claimed every time a Select Committee was suggested for anything, and one could thereby damn a proposal for a Select Committee on any subject imaginable. I believe, on the other hand, that a Select Committee would be an extremely valuable way of informing members, the public, and the Aboriginal people particularly just what is intended, because evidence would be adduced

and people would ask questions which I am asking and which have not yet been answered. Until we get this Select Committee, I am not in favour of this Bill. As I point out, there is no urgency in this matter, and we could very well have a look at this question through the medium of a Select Committee of the House.

One or two clauses of the Bill contain minor matters, one of which I shall raise in Committee. Clause 7 provides that the seat of a member shall become vacant on his becoming bankrupt or making an assignment of his property for the benefit of his creditors or compounding with his creditors for less than 20s. in the pound. I presume that that should read "one hundred cents in the dollar", and in Committee I shall seek that amendment. However, that is only a minor matter. Clause 16 is a very long clause setting out the conditions under which land can be transferred to the trust. Clause 16 (1) states, in effect, that the Governor may, by proclamation, transfer any Crown lands or any other lands for the time being reserved for Aborigines to the trust, with certain provisos. I shall want to know more about this power to transfer land to the trust. Happily, that is a modification of what the Minister thought in 1962. I should like to know whether that is as far as the Minister really wants to go, or whether he wants to go further. Speaking in 1962 in this House he said:

We believe that the Government should have power to declare other than Crown lands as reserves for Aborigines, if arrangements can be made to that effect and it is desirable that it should be done. We do not believe that it should be restricted to Crown lands.

Now if that was the Minister's attitude, I am wondering why he has modified it. That attitude has been modified in the Bill, and I certainly hope it will stay modified, because at present these provisions are covered with provisos that they are subject to the recommendation of the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Irrigation. Clauses 17 and 18 deal with the assets of the trust. Clause 17 states:

All moneys held by the trust including the proceeds of any sale or lease or other dealings with any land vested in the trust shall subject to payment thereof of the costs of administration of this Act, be held by the trust and used by it for the development and improvement of lands the property of the trust and the acquisition and development of further lands for the purposes of the trust and for the purposes of Section 18.

In other words, the trust can develop and improve land and it can spend money in accordance with the purposes specified in clause 18, which states:

Subject to the approval of the Minister the trust may grant technical or other assistance or advance moneys to Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood or to recognized Aboriginal groups for such purposes in connection with trust lands and upon such conditions as the trust thinks fit: Provided that no assistance shall be granted and no moneys shall be advanced under this section to any member of the trust or, except with the consent of the Minister, to any relative of a member of the trust.

That is all that is stated about what the trust may do with the money, but I cannot see what it can do. I imagine that it could advance money to Aborigines for worthy purposes, and could improve and develop land, but beyond that I do not know what it can do. It may receive money voted by Parliament and large sums from royalties on minerals of which we know nothing at present, but it will be embarrassed and in doubt about what to do with the money. We should consider carefully this legislation through a Select Committee, and the attitude of Government Ministers, while I am putting these points, is a sound reason for doing this. Perhaps they have listened, but they do not give information about the matters I have raised.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: When we give you information you get so upset!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister's idea of giving information is to shout "Rubbish!"

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You wouldn't listen to what I was telling you.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I could think of that myself about almost anyone who

spoke on the other side of the House. I do not blame the Minister for being able to think of it, but he should try to answer some of my questions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I will answer them in due course.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be pleased to know whether the real truth is that the Minister is trying to break records by being the first in Australia to make this lands trust a success.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't be stupid!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Unless further information is given about this Bill, I am satisfied that injustices spoken about over the years do not exist at present, and that Aborigines do not require the land in the form that is proposed. There may be a case for settling Aborigines on the land, but that could be done through the normal channels of the State Administration. However, there are tremendous problems in that, and I should like to see more effort put into solving those problems. This Bill seems to be an emotional and banner-waving type of Bill, and I ask members to support my amendment to the motion.

Mr. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 20, at 2 p.m.