

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 20, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. HALL: An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Freight Rates Opinion", states:

Refrigerated cargo rates from Australia may rise substantially if European shipping lines are granted increases.

The article states that the estimated overall increase in freight rates will be 7½ per cent on refrigerated cargoes. Because several important South Australian primary industries export perishables, including meat and horticultural products, can the Premier say whether he has consulted the Commonwealth Government on the increased freights to ensure that they will be kept to the lowest possible minimum?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Already certain representations have been made by Cabinet on this matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: At present, this State is commencing a series of important exports that are vital to our trade economy. The wool-selling season about to commence will extend over the next 12 months; the export of fat lambs is about to commence; and the fruit industry is greatly concerned in this matter. The Premier said that representations had been made, but I should like to know to whom they were made. I hope they have been made directly either to the Commonwealth Minister for Trade or to the Prime Minister. I hope, also, that the Premier in his representations stressed the great effect of these proposed increases, coming as they do after a recent increase of about 6 per cent in freight rates. Will the Premier indicate to whom the representations were made; what result if any, has accrued from them; and what he is able to report on the result of these representations to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I said that Cabinet had considered this matter, and if I have to give details of Cabinet discussions it may be awkward, as the business of Cabinet will then be made known. Cabinet has taken action and although the letter has not yet been sent, it has indicated what it wants done. Wool, fat lambs, and fruit have been referred to, and no doubt information will be received

on these and other matters. I have always communicated with the Prime Minister, whoever he may be. I have communicated with Sir Robert Menzies when he was Prime Minister, and with Mr. Holt since he took over that position, as this matter has to be considered at top level. However, any Minister of a department has been given the courtesy of receiving a copy of any letters sent to the Prime Minister. As this matter was first considered on Monday of this week, perhaps it is early for a report to be received, but I shall obtain the information as soon as I can.

ELIZABETH OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Elizabeth Occupation Centre, and when it will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that construction of the new building for the Elizabeth Occupation Centre, including painting and floor coverings, has been completed. However, Education Department officers have decided that it would be dangerous for these children to occupy the centre before siteworks, including ground work, drainage, paving and fencing, have been completed. Public tenders have been called and a recommendation has now been made for the acceptance of a tender, and every effort is being made to ensure that these siteworks are completed at the earliest possible date. The installation of oil heating is programmed to be effected prior to the completion of the site works.

PHOSPHATE ROCK.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: According to this week's *Sunday Mail* a Canadian geologist, Mr. David Seymour, who came to Australia four years ago on behalf of a giant Canadian mining company and who is now living in South Australia, claimed that the South Australian Government was doing little to foster the use of local deposits of phosphate rock. Such deposits have a definite local agricultural value and, in addition, South Australia was extraordinarily endowed with gypsum, lime, and dolomite reserves. Oversea authorities encourage the use of these readily available materials. He went on to say that, in spite of the apparent lack of official support, the necessary capital and technology will be readily available from overseas to exploit any large discoveries of phosphate. In view of these comments will the Premier, first, say what

is being done to foster the use of local deposits of phosphate rock and, secondly, say whether an approach has been made to the Government by or on behalf of oversea companies for the exploitation of any large discoveries of phosphate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no doubt that geologists are actively concerned with this matter, but I shall obtain a report from the Minister of Mines.

SOLDIER SETTLERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to Loxton soldier settlers who, under the present arrangement, receive a living allowance of \$1,600, as against \$2,690 paid to settlers on King Island. Although I admit that an adjustment has to be made regarding King Island settlers, the discrepancy should not be that much. I realize that the Minister of Repatriation must contact the Commonwealth Government on the matter, and is no doubt aware of the recent basic wage rise of \$2 which has increased the cost of living. However, as the matter has now become rather urgent and is aggravating some Loxton soldier settlers whom I interviewed last night, has the Minister received a reply from the Commonwealth Government; can he determine this matter; and, if he cannot, can he say how long it may be before we can expect a positive answer to this important question?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In reply to the member for Burra on this matter, I said that in view of the recent basic wage increase the matter had again been referred to the Commonwealth Government to review the situation. I am aware of the vast difference between the living allowance paid to King Island settlers and that paid to settlers in this State, although the honourable member has already referred to the reason for that. I have not heard from the Commonwealth Government on this matter but, in view of the honourable member's question, I shall undertake to send the Commonwealth Government a reminder and inform it also of the urgency expressed by the honourable member.

HENLEY AND GRANGE SEWERAGE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question follows a letter appearing in yesterday's *News* in the "Letters to the Editor" section, concerning a matter that has been given considerable prominence by that newspaper. The correspondent refers to the sewerage plans for the Henley and Grange area and, without justification, attacks the Minister of Works and

the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Honourable members will appreciate the considerable difficulties that exist in this area, but I have found that both the Minister and the Director and Engineer-in-Chief have been sympathetic to my past representations on behalf of residents in the area. Can the Minister say what the department intends to do to relieve the difficulties experienced by residents of Henley and Grange?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Having seen the article referred to by the honourable member, I should say at the outset that it is regrettable that people should write to the press criticizing a public servant who finds it difficult to reply. Without fear of contradiction, I can say that no man in South Australia shows a greater interest in the welfare of the State than does the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan). For a person to say that he and I could not care less about this problem shows that that person has a selfish interest and feels complete unconcern for the welfare of others in the State. The honourable member said that he had received the greatest co-operation from the department and from me. I do not believe any honourable member could say otherwise, because we always try to help members with water supply and sewerage problems. The honourable member has applied himself with much energy to obtaining services for the area concerned as early as possible. As he was good enough to tell me he intended to ask a question on this matter, I obtained the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

Earlier this year a small area surrounding Shandon Avenue, Seaton, was provided with sewers and a temporary sewage pump was installed to cater for the area. The sewers were constructed in this area as a result of the conditions existing with relation to the septic tank effluent disposal problems.

I believe that indicates some concern. The report continues:

At the end of July or early August, construction of about five miles of pumping main will be commenced from Cudmore Avenue to the Port Adelaide Sewage Treatment Works. Construction of the main trunk sewers in the area will commence in September of this year and the laying of reticulation sewers will be started in January, 1967. Houses will be connected to the sewers as work progresses.

I trust that the press will give the same prominence to this reply as it gave to the letter.

DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: I listened intently to what the Minister of Works said last evening about the quarterly payment of Engineering and

Water Supply Department accounts and also about the use of a computer. As the Electricity Trust uses a computer and meter readers, and as it issues quarterly accounts, will the Minister say whether he has considered the possibility of the department's using a similar system to that used by the Electricity Trust—whereby accounts are placed in letter-boxes—as such a system might result in reduced costs?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful for the suggestion. I think it was probably made yesterday, in different language, by the member for Burnside. It will certainly be investigated and, if any saving can be achieved, I am sure it will be adopted.

GAS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Natural Gas Job of Government", appears the following report:

The reticulation and sale of South Australia's natural gas resources should be left to private enterprise, the Deputy Leader of the Federal Opposition said in Adelaide yesterday.

As this statement appears to be in conflict with another by the Premier's own Minister of Mines which is reported later in the same news item, I ask the Premier whether the expression of opinion by Mr. Whitlam represents Government policy (I personally hope that it does not) or, if it does not represent Government policy, whether the Government has yet formulated its policy on this matter.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When I returned from the conference that was held in Canberra about June 16 of this year, I told the House that I had made certain representations to the Commonwealth Government for a special loan to construct a pipeline from Gidgealpa and Moomba to Adelaide, the money to be spent so that at the end of the amortization period of 20 years the Government would at least own a pipeline. The Government of this State has not altered its attitude on that matter. At that time the Commonwealth Government did not commit itself in any way. Since then an investigation has been proceeding to obtain further information so that, after the case has been presented to the Prime Minister or the Commonwealth Treasurer, the Commonwealth Government will arrange a special loan to my Government of the amount specified at that time (\$40,000,000) for this developmental project.

OAKLANDS HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: The new high school to be built on the land immediately north-west of

the Oaklands Road and Morphett Road intersection has been referred to so far as the Oaklands High School. This school will in fact be situated in the postal district of Glengowrie. However, the Oaklands Road and Morphett Road intersection brings together the suburbs of Glengowrie, Morphettville Park, Warradale and Oaklands, and whichever one of those names is selected as a name for the high school a certain amount of confusion will be created. Two suggestions have been put to me regarding a possible name for this school, one being that it should be called Hamilton or Hamilton Park High School, as it is situated right next to the winery. The other suggestion was that because years ago most of that area was referred to as Lower Sturt it might be appropriate to call the school the Charles Sturt High School. Will the Minister of Education consider those suggestions?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. I will inform the honourable member when a decision is reached.

MOUNT GAMBIER OPPORTUNITY CLASS.

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago the Education Department established an opportunity class at the East Gambier Primary School, and this has supplied a much needed facility. Can the Minister of Education indicate the department's plans for providing additional classroom facilities for opportunity classes in Mount Gambier?

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

BOOL LAGOON.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the future of Bool Lagoon as a game reserve?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government intends to provide sufficient funds to purchase the improvements of the Bool Lagoon's leases which have expired or will expire during 1966. It is not possible to commence the Bool Lagoon game reserve on a full-scale basis this year and consideration is being given whether the outgoing lessees can have some use of this land during the next 12 months. It is expected that discussions towards this end will be held with the lessees during the next few weeks.

MODBURY SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: As a new school to be known as the Modbury South Primary School is being erected adjacent to the high school in Pompoata

Road, can the Minister of Works say whether sewerage is to be extended to connect to this school?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From memory, I think the answer is "Yes", but rather than mislead the honourable member I shall inquire and obtain a considered reply.

CITRUS PACKING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the last few weeks I have asked several questions about a licence for a fruit packer in my district who desires to continue to pack citrus fruit. During the weekend, this packer handed to me copies of four letters from growers at Mypolonga expressing concern, if not alarm, at the fact that he had been deprived of his licence. This reinforces the points I have put to the Minister that this is an urgent matter, and that this man's business is being jeopardized because of the refusal to grant him a licence. Can the Minister of Lands, in the unfortunate absence of the Minister of Agriculture because of illness, say whether this packer will be licensed or not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am unable to give a specific answer. The matter will be dealt with by the Citrus Industry Organization Committee at its meeting on Friday next as this matter is on the agenda, and the answer to the honourable member's questions will be supplied by the committee early next week.

KAROONDA HOSPITAL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Karoonda Hospital Board and the district council have approached me about appointing a doctor at the local hospital, and we have contacted a Dr. Nassef of Lebanon who is prepared to come to South Australia and to practise at Karoonda. According to reports received, this doctor is well qualified and highly regarded in his own country and, in fact, represented his country at a medical conference in Spain. However, I understand that the Australian Medical Association in this State is loath to approve the appointment of doctors who do not hold the recognized degrees to practise in this State. Consequently, Karoonda and other places are left without the services of a doctor.

The Karoonda Hospital is about 45 miles from Murray Bridge and many residents are farther away than that. As people in the district are perturbed about the present situation, particularly regarding maternity cases, will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, ascertain whether the Government will see that the A.M.A. agrees to approve the appointment of doctors like Dr.

Nassef, if only for a probationary period, so that country hospitals can be adequately staffed by medical practitioners?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member is aware that discussions have taken place with the Australian Medical Association in this regard, but I shall refer the matter to the Minister of Health and bring down a reply.

GLENELG SUNSHINE CLUB.

Mr. HALL: As two people from the Glenelg Sunshine Club visited me this morning, I wish to raise a matter that was first raised in the House by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), concerning the controversy that exists regarding the management and running of the club. The two people I saw were concerned that only one side of the story had been put to the House, and they handed me a petition and a letter that states:

We ask you in Parliament to repudiate statements made in an alleged petition signed by Hugh Hudson, M.P., which were never verified with the Secretary. The management had not held an annual meeting for years according to this statement. Our annual meeting this year was held on March 15 in the community rooms of the Glenelg Town Hall when most members of the club were present, all being notified previously that the annual meeting would be held and nominations called for. Last year, owing to the illness of the Secretary in hospital, our annual meeting was not held until a later date. There are no life members of the club except the President and an 85-year old lady, not in the homes, but in a rest home very ill.

How does Hugh Hudson know of the workings or anything else connected with the club? He is not, nor ever has been, a member and we doubt if he ever heard of the club before entering Parliament. Life members allegedly are told if they do not comply with the wishes of the management they will be evicted. As there are no life members, how can they be evicted? Persons in the homes have to obey the rules and by-laws of the club and sign a statement to that effect when entering the homes. The only misery in the homes has been caused by these people to the President and Secretary, who have done all the work of the club for 19 years, gratis, as well as putting their life savings into the homes long before the subsidy was granted, and with the committee have been caused great trouble and embarrassment, and these people have forced the club into legal action.

The petition, addressed to my predecessor (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), states:

We the following members of the Glenelg Sunshine Club whose signatures are affixed wish to state that we are perfectly satisfied with the Committee of Management, the running of the club also the President and Secretary, who have all done a splendid job for the Glenelg Sunshine Club Inc.

There are 41 signatures to the petition and I am informed that there are about 50 members in the club. In view of the serious matter raised by the member for Glenelg concerning whether the club should continue to receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government, can the Premier, if I hand him this petition, take it into account when examining the position, as he promised to do for the member for Glenelg?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am always agreeable to accepting a petition, and will have this one examined.

YOUTH FACILITIES.

Mr. LANGLEY: In reply to the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) yesterday, the Minister of Social Welfare gave a lengthy and interesting account of a survey made in Norwood about the provision of youth facilities. Other inner suburban areas are similar to Norwood, and as I am interested in facilities being established at Unley, especially with a strong element of people from other countries in the district, to encourage friendliness and physical fitness, can the Minister say whether this project could be established in other districts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Norwood youth project is a pilot project designed at the moment to give us some answers to the questions raised by the university Department of Social Science which took a survey in the area over about three years. When the results of the pilot project have been established, the question of what assistance can be given by the Government to organizations and local government in other areas for similar facilities will be reviewed. In the meantime, it is intended that a comprehensive review of existing facilities be undertaken.

MODBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 7 the Minister of Works said that, although a sewer main is laid past a property, it is not compulsory for the property holder concerned to connect his property to the sewer; nor is a time stipulated for that to be done. As the principal reason in this case for the property holder not connecting to the sewer is lack of finance, can the Minister say what is the sum charged by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for a sewer connection, and whether the department is prepared to arrange with property holders for payment by instalments? If the department is so prepared, is every step taken by the department to notify property holders

of this fact, thus encouraging connections to be made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The answer to the question can be determined only when the department knows of the circumstances of a particular case. If the honourable member will give me the name of the party or parties concerned, we shall have the matter investigated and ascertain whether we can give practical assistance.

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the delay in proceeding with the building of the training centres at Strathmont and Elanora will occasion continued hardship to mental patients, and that in order to participate in the subsidies which the Commonwealth Government is making available to the States for this purpose in the triennium to June 30, 1967, the Government should take immediate steps to implement the policy for mental hospitalization enunciated in the policy speech of the present Premier in 1965.

I have moved this motion because of the concern felt by the public generally at the delay in providing for these two mental training hospitals. The whole purpose of what I want to say is highlighted by the fact that not only in South Australia but in the whole of the Commonwealth there has been an increasing realization of Governmental responsibility at all levels. As a result, the Commonwealth Government entered the field as long ago as 1955 when it introduced legislation at that time to give effect to its policy, and it is the delay in taking advantage of the current agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments that prompted me to put this motion on the Notice Paper. In doing so, I believe that I have not only the concern and support of most members in the Chamber, (certainly of all members of this side) but also the concern and support of the community at large.

The interest of the Commonwealth Government was initially caused mainly by people becoming much more aware of public responsibility for seeing that this branch of public health should be lifted from the position of neglect in which it had lain for so long. This realization came, of course, because of stirrings of concern all over the world that these were forgotten people, who for so long had been hidden behind the high walls of asylums (and I use that word advisedly) and for whom life-long incarceration seemed

to be the only answer. Of course, this thinking was not peculiar to Australia: it was typical of thinking the whole world over. In making these comments, I do not mean to say that those in charge of such places were unfeeling and were not trying to alleviate the conditions under which mental patients were housed and treated. However, the fact remains that until fairly recent years people, both children and adult, were admitted to these places and left to eke out their days in misery and isolation.

Everyone is aware of the great advances that have been made in all branches of medicine in recent years and of the dramatic advance of modern drugs and new techniques in all aspects of the ills of the human race. Perhaps these have been more spectacular in the last 25 years. It is tragic, but nonetheless true, that the horrors of war and the resultant destruction of human life and, what is perhaps more dreadful, the maiming of both mind and body were the precursors of enlightenment in medicine in all its many branches. One has only to think of an eminent South Australian, so recently installed as Chancellor of the National University in Canberra, Lord Florey, of Adelaide (and undoubtedly one of this city's greatest sons), to immediately have come to mind the saving and healing powers of penicillin and all other antibiotics. Research in this field has revolutionized treatment of almost every disease known to afflict the human race, and has bestowed untold blessings on sufferers. These benefits, wisely used, are seemingly endless, and humanity owes a tremendous debt to the pioneers and researchers who devoted themselves untiringly to their tasks, often with little recognition and with their labours largely unknown or unsung. However, with the opportunities for education and general knowledge provided within our modern society, people have been gradually awakened to the fact that there are those in the community who are less fortunate than themselves and for whom a greater public responsibility must be assumed.

This is evident in South Australia where, in the past 20 years, we have seen the provision of diversified centres of education for children afflicted with mental or physical disabilities. I think most members know that these centres have not come about either easily or quickly. The provision of the facilities that we now enjoy originated, first, from the efforts of parents supported by sympathetic medical practitioners. Much water flowed under the bridge for many organizations now well established before the Government, as it were, came to the

party. This was the experience of groups not only in Adelaide but throughout the Commonwealth, and the process was always the same. Most of us are parents and probably we are familiar (if not from personal experience, then from the knowledge of what has happened to friends and neighbours) with these problems. The experience has been that parent groups, supported by the medical profession, have had to go about raising funds, opening centres, making representations to either the Education or the Health Departments, and then, as the result of pressure both from within the departments from people who understood the problems, to the responsible Minister, and also lastly (because of pressure from without per medium of public opinion), to members of Parliament. Largely this has been the pattern that has followed the establishment in South Australia of many organizations that work for the physical and mental welfare of children. I believe Adelaide can be proud that we have achieved so much in such a short time.

It is interesting to remember how occupation centres began. I remember in the early 1950's or late 1940's that, with the late Mr. Alex Melrose (then President of the Royal Institution for the Blind at North Adelaide), I waited on the then Minister of Education (Mr. Rudall). Mr. Rudall was obviously concerned about something and when we mentioned this worry he said that he was concerned because late the previous afternoon he had given approval for the setting up of what were to be known as occupation centres. He said, "I wonder if I have done the right thing in making provision for some kind of day centre to which children who are mentally retarded can go, and so that their parents can be afforded relief from the constant care necessary with this type of child. You know, I spent a sleepless night wondering whether I had done the right thing." Honourable members know the answer to that question, because occupation centres have almost mushroomed all over the State. Not just one but practically every member of this House has clamoured at some time or another for the establishment of an occupation centre in his district. That was the beginning of this now very large branch within the Education Department.

Then we have seen the setting up of speech and hearing centres and classes for brain-damaged children, classes for children with dual handicaps, and so on, and it is with much pride, Mr. Speaker, that I claim for South Australia that in many instances we led the

field in various types of education for handicapped children. We all know, I think, that opportunity classes were the brainchild of Dr. Constance Davey when she was the Senior Psychologist with the Education Department some years ago, and that other States have followed our example. I just wonder how many hundreds owe their place in society today as happily adjusted adults to the advent of occupation classes. I do not know what the number would be, but I know that opportunity classes provided the slow-learning and backward child with a chance to benefit from education and also to have the opportunity of social readjustment. These are the children who 50 years ago or perhaps less would, in many instances, have ended their days in a mental institution—a hateful word, and, thank goodness, less and less used in these enlightened days. They would have ended their days in conditions which no-one even likes to think about at present.

It is in the field of mental health that perhaps the greatest revolutions have taken place and are taking place everywhere in the world today. With the emergence of psychology and psychiatry as disciplines of the greatest benefit in the treatment of man's mental ills, with new techniques of treatment, with new drugs, with the application of all forms of therapy, with the development of specialized nursing training, and with the co-operation of voluntary bodies working for the welfare of the patient suffering from mental stresses, we have seen an entirely new approach which is most enlightened, and this applies to the whole gamut of mental diseases. I say fervently, "Thank God, and may this enlightened attitude continue until we see a state of affairs that is a credit to the State, to the nation, and to the community."

Because of the tempo of modern living and all the factors that contribute to the stress under which men and women live and work in this highly developed technological age; because of the high standard of living which is generally enjoyed in the affluent society in which many of the nations of the so-called Western world live today; because of industry's high production rate of cars and television sets and other kinds of luxury items, as well as household appliances, with their accompanying high-pressure salesmanship; because of the far too easy, at times, accessibility to highly publicized tranquilizing drugs; because of the high incidence of broken homes and marriages and the break-down of family life; and because of resort to drinking to

forget all these problems, the numbers of patients in mental hospitals have increased in recent years. Admittedly, many patients are voluntarily seeking treatment and, in consequence, the average stay of mental patients in mental hospitals is being reduced dramatically.

Rather than tire the House by quoting statistics from the report of the Director of Mental Health, I suggest to members that they study these dramatic figures. It has been proved that, although the number of people under treatment has increased, their stay in hospital is becoming shorter indeed. These short-term patients have accounted for the rise; but it does in fact show a much better state of affairs. Along with all these improvements, we must see that facilities for hospitalization, for nursing, for treatment, for therapy, for follow-up after discharge are complementary to the welcome advance that is evident today.

One of the greatest influences in the community towards this end is the Mental Health Association. I have referred to this body when speaking in this House on other matters, but I think the matter bears comment again. Since its formation 10 years or so ago, the work of this organization has been rewarded by profound changes within the community in South Australia. It was this organization that first brought home to the public the conditions in our mental hospitals and the plight of their inmates, the need for reform in medical teaching in psychiatry, and the need for the public to be educated in matters of mental hygiene—to be the watch-dogs, as it were, of the community as far as the welfare of the mentally afflicted was concerned. It was the efforts of this body that led to a Chair of Mental Health being established at the University of Adelaide, which was later to have as its first incumbent no less a person than Professor Cramond, whose coming to South Australia (I think in 1962 or 1963) was the beginning of a new era for the mentally ill. It was under his guidance and as a result of his quiet, crusading zeal that the whole issue of mental health was brought out into the open and the public made to realize how far behind South Australia lagged in its attitude to mental health and mental patients.

The Mental Health Association and Dr. Cramond as Director of Mental Health in South Australia left no stone unturned and used every device possible to bring home to the people of South Australia their responsibility in this matter. As a result, we in South Australia benefited from the visit of world and

Commonwealth authorities to advise the Government and to awaken the public to the neglect which for so long had characterized the mental hospital services of this State. We on this side, as the Government then, must bear some responsibility for slowness to move in this work. Dr. Birch, in the post-war years, had a most difficult task, because with the industrial development of the State at that time funds available to the Government had to be spread over a wide diversity of public works. Despite these competing claims, two new wards were built, two more modernized, and some toilet annexes built, all of these at Parkside, whilst at Northfield four new wards were provided, as well as a completely new boilerhouse and kitchen. Dr. Cramond, in his first report as Director of Mental Health in March, 1964 (which had the effect of combining the annual reports for 1962 and 1963), says:

Throughout all this difficult period of stringent economies and frequent frustration, Dr. Birch kept the mental health services together uncomplainingly and with tremendous personal devotion to the cause. It is certainly hoped by all his former colleagues that he is enjoying a well-earned retirement.

He went on to say that he thought (and so do I) that steps should have been taken much earlier to remedy the run-down mental health services. In his report Dr. Cramond continues:

We build on the foundations laid by our predecessors. The advances we hope to achieve are only made possible by the work which has been carried out in the years before.

Latterly, acting on the advice given to the Government by Dr. Cramond, as he then was, many improvements have been made pending investigation of the whole matter of re-building and re-organization. In 1959, I think, shortly after I was elected to this House, I visited Parkside for the first time. This was while Dr. Birch was still the Director of Mental Health and Superintendent of Mental Institutions, and lived in the grounds of the Parkside Mental Hospital. On this visit I was accompanied by Dr. Shea, the present Director of Mental Health, on a tour of all the hospital wards except Z ward which, as most members realize, is the block for the criminally insane. Dr. Birch said he would spare me this because he thought it was better that I did not enter that block. I have been back to Parkside many times and have also been inside Z block, as I have addressed several meetings of patients interested in public affairs at the instigation of the Department of Adult Education.

Nothing I subsequently saw there affected me more than my visits to the other wards and the dining rooms. I had, because of my long

lay interest in social work, seen some harrowing sights, but nothing had prepared me for the heart-breaking atmosphere of some of these wards. I do not know whether members are familiar with mental hospitals, but it was not so much the tragedy of lives old and young afflicted in this way that wrung my heart, as the effect on wives, husbands, fathers, mothers, sons and daughters who visited these hospitals. It did not leave much to one's imagination to realize how much they suffered when they saw their loved ones who were patients in the hospitals. I know that handling and caring for these patients, a great many of whom are aments, must produce conditions that are far from ideal. We should make a special effort to provide the best possible conditions for those amazing people who devote themselves to the nursing and to the daily care of these unfortunate people, and to spare the feelings of members of families who visit them. On subsequent visits I found conditions much improved: better toilet and ablution conditions were evident, and clothing was better.

Once, the then Minister of Lands accompanied me to the hospital during the winter and we were concerned that the people walking around the grounds looked so cold. As a result of my being accompanied by a sympathetic Minister, this condition was brought to the notice of Cabinet and much better and warmer clothing was provided. On subsequent visits, too, I found that fences had been lowered and locks removed from gates and doors, taking away the environmental and atmospheric aspect of a prison. Patients were engaged in occupations of therapeutic value. Buildings to alleviate difficulties of segregation, accommodation and nursing were either completed or under construction, and perhaps what was most symbolic of the changing character of Parkside was the lowering of the stone wall around the property. This enabled patients to look out and feel they were indeed part of the outside world. It showed to the public the beautiful grounds of the Parkside Mental Hospital, and indicated that no longer were patients to be shunned and shut up but that they were domiciled, for the time being, in a hospital into which the warm winds of change were blowing.

The years 1960 and 1961 saw the completion of many improvements recommended by Dr. Birch both at Parkside and at Northfield, where wards for patients with varying degrees of intellectual deficiency were made available until a separate hospital for children could be established. At the same time we saw structures at Parkside that had been there for so many years

pulled down. I think some were erected in the 1880's. It is clear from studying this matter that some buildings requested by Dr. Birch, supported by the Public Works Committee and recommended by it in 1952, were not completed until 1960 or 1961. No doubt there were competing claims by other public works, but it is tragically true that this seems to have been the pattern that even now dogs the progress of improvement to existing mental hospitals.

The work of members is made extremely difficult when undertaking research in this field because there is a considerable lag in the presentation of reports by the Department of Mental Health. I and other members have referred to this matter before. This delay seems to have accrued over the years, and obviously reflects the administrative difficulties of the Director and the great burden of work imposed on him and his staff. The last report available to members is for 1963; this, a combined report, was tabled on October 6, 1965. It is difficult to get figures or any information about improvements and trends for hospitals for the last three years. It is to be hoped that the changes envisaged in all branches of the service, the improvements in administration and nursing, and the increase in medical staffs will mean that reports will be expedited so that their contents may be more closely related to the present time, as it is difficult to find current information. When one reads the report on mental health services year by year, one realizes that many improvements and recommendations currently being carried into effect had their origins in the 1930's, were continually re-studied and re-stressed in the 1940's and became apparent as additions and improvements in the 1960's. We on this side must bear some responsibility for this. In his report for the year ended 1961, Dr. Birch said:

One may ask did the substance of these reports reach those in high places?

I believe it is only fair that, when criticizing the present Government for delay in implementing proposals, we should admit that the delay extends to a period before the present Government assumed office. However, I do not believe that that admission can in any way excuse perpetuating the delay, particularly when funds are available from the Commonwealth Government to help with the provision of finance for the new hospitals that have been recommended. After Professor Cramond came to South Australia, certain recommendations were made to the Government of the day, after the situation here had been studied. Changes

were made in administration; the Director of Mental Health became responsible for the administration of mental health services and, to expedite this, a central administration was established with secretarial and administrative personnel. Each of the mental hospitals was placed under the daily control of medical superintendents, each responsible to the Director of Mental Health. From this new arrangement stemmed the ability of the Director of Mental Health to devote more time to considering psychiatric services in the community, and the ultimate but fairly rapid effect of this was the establishment of two psychiatric out-patient departments, one at Enfield, and the other on the ground floor of the nurses home at Parkside.

For ease of administration and to serve the needs of the patients better, the State is now zoned into north and south, with Enfield serving the north and Parkside, the south. In addition, a day psychiatric centre is now functioning at St. Corantyn on East Terrace. These splendid developments are greatly assisting both patients and medical staffs. One of the problems associated with mental health administration in South Australia has been the fact that there is no division between mental hospitals and training centres for the mentally retarded. The term, "mental defective" covers not only those mentally ill but also those who are intellectually retarded, and who are creating social problems. Realizing this, one of the first tasks undertaken by Professor Cramond, on taking up his appointment, was for medical and nursing staffs to classify all patients regarding age, social behaviour and whether or not they were mentally ill or intellectually retarded. Following this classification, the Director of Mental Health recommended the establishment of two small hospital training centres, each to be of a 572-bed capacity. Much early planning and research was carried out by the staffs of the hospitals in collaboration with architects of the Public Buildings Department. The idea is that, when completed, intellectually retarded patients will be transferred from Northfield and Parkside, and that some of the buildings from which those patients will be transferred will then be demolished (and not before time, as some of the Parkside buildings date back to the last century, and have long outlived their usefulness).

The sites for the two projected training units have been purchased; Strathmont will be located on land near the Northfield Psychiatric Hospital, and Elanora is to be built at Sheidow

Park on land purchased for \$174,000. The reason for the two small centres rather than one large hospital is to make conditions for patients and staff less impersonal and, in addition, to make visiting by relatives less arduous and harassing. As Professor Cramond said in his latest report submitted to Parliament in October, 1965, which I have previously quoted, the idea was to make a less impersonal atmosphere and to improve staff-patient relations, as well as making it easier for parents and relatives to see patients in the hospitals. In his report for 1962 and 1963 Dr. Cramond said:

One of the great hazards in designing hospitals is to make them too large. In large institutions there is a real danger that the patient becomes lost and that the staff-patient relationships become impersonal. Not only that by the erection of a large central hospital there is lost a certain community feeling and relatives often are faced with long journeys at visiting times. It was with these thoughts in mind that the concept of two small hospital training centres rather than one large one was adopted. The name has been chosen to show the purpose of the institution. Not only are they to be places of care and treatment but the positive approach of training for life in our society is stressed.

The welfare of child patients has definitely not been overlooked in the recommendations made by the Director of Mental Health, after studying the whole position in South Australia. I think members are fully aware of how the Child Guidance Clinic in Wakefield Street functions, of what a great benefit it is proving to the community, and of what a boon it has proved to the parents of handicapped children. Dr. Covernton has given outstanding service in the field of child mental health, and has applied his specialist knowledge of pediatrics to this problem. There are now training schemes for children at Northfield and Parkside, staffed by Education Department teachers. The success so far has been most encouraging, and I pay a tribute to the people who undertake this work, dedicating themselves to the service and welfare of the children concerned. Side by side with these developments have been the great advances made at Minda Home which for so long carried the burden, under great disability, of catering for young mental patients. Recent years have seen many developments in this field: the establishment of the Suneden Home, the foundation of the Mentally Retarded Children's Association, and the Education Department's participation in occupation centres and a sheltered workshop at Kensington.

From this activity on the part of existing organizations, parents, doctors, teachers, and Government departments, has arisen a splendid spirit of co-ordination and co-operation, with everyone contributing facilities and resources to ensure that the best possible opportunity is afforded to the mentally retarded. At the same time, consideration has been given by those responsible for administering our mental health services to the development of nursing staffs to cope adequately with the changed situation in our mental hospitals. Members may recall that last year legislation was introduced in this House which made a division between the various kinds of nursing under the control of the Nurses Board of South Australia. There were two branches in regard to the nursing of mental patients: mentally deficient nurses and psychiatric nurses. I believe that better conditions in training will lead to an improved status for these nurses, and will have the benefit of attracting people to serve in mental hospitals.

As a result of all the recommendations made and the action taken, the quality of entrants has already improved considerably. The old attitude of being a custodian to the mentally sick has been replaced by compassion and understanding. That is most noticeable to the visitor to mental hospitals today, and the dignity of the patient, his self-respect, and his sense of independence have been fostered, factors that are of paramount importance in the ultimate recovery and welfare of a patient. A beauty salon has been established at Parkside, to which salon women patients are encouraged to go to be trained and helped in taking care of themselves. That has had the marvellous effect of lifting patients' morale. I think the public should know of the services that trained people give voluntarily, by visiting mental hospitals and helping the women patients in this way, teaching them how to make the most of themselves. This kind of therapy is happening at Minda, too, where the young patients are encouraged, in the same way, to look after themselves, to take note of their personal appearances, and to improve their appearance in every way. I know the medical staffs place a high value on how this boosts the morale of patients, both young and old.

Following up the welfare of discharged mental patients is another fairly recent development in the field of mental health, and one that has exercised the minds of many people over a long period. A start was made in this

direction by the previous Government to establish after-care hospitals to provide, as Professor Cramond said, half-way house accommodation for people who are sufficiently well to be out of hospital and yet not completely able to cope with society at large. Here again, practical and understanding support has been given by church groups, clubs, voluntary agencies, committees of responsible citizens, and individuals, and the result has been that there is now a more understanding public with an informed acceptance of the needs of mental patients, and also a knowledge of what mental hospitals and centres are doing for the people for whom they care.

Perhaps it would not be out of place to refer to the after-care club which owes its existence to Miss Marjorie Black. It was good to see that Her Majesty the Queen honoured her by conferring the M.B.E., because her services to the lonely, insecure and vulnerable, who have difficulty in establishing social relationships once they leave the shelter of mental hospitals, have been outstanding. I make no apology for taking so much time to give the background to this for so long neglected branch of our medical services. This story should be told and should be understood, particularly in this place which is responsible for voting moneys for the maintenance and improvement of our medical services. In 1955, the Commonwealth Government passed the Commonwealth States Grants (Mental Institutions) Act which provided for a grant to the States. The 1964 Auditor-Generals' Report states:

The Commonwealth States Grants (Mental Institutions) Act, 1955, provided for the grant to the States of financial assistance in relation to mental institutions. The amount payable was one-third of the amount expended in connection with the erection or alteration of buildings or acquisition of equipment, for mental institutions. The total amount payable to South Australia under this Act was limited to £895,000, and as at June, 1964, £719,000 had been received by the State. On May 13, 1964, the above legislation was repealed and the State Grants (Mental Health Institutions) Act, 1964, was enacted. This Act provides that "there are payable to a State, by way of financial assistance, amounts equal to one-third of amounts expended by the State, during the period commencing on July 1, 1964, and ending on June 30, 1967, for or in connection with the buildings or equipment of Mental Health Institutions".

In order to qualify for the grant of one-third of the amounts expended by the States in the triennium ending June 30, 1967, the previous Government instructed the architects of the Public Buildings Department to confer in detail with the Director of Mental

Health and to draw up plans for the building of what were to become known as Strathmont and Elanora. Whilst this was being done, new buildings, alterations and additions were undertaken at mental hospitals, the Government having regard to the need to discriminate between urgent and immediate requirements and the need to conserve funds to be spent on the new and projected training centres.

Referring back to the plans for Strathmont and Elanora, I well remember that Dr. Cramond, accompanied by an architect or architects of the Public Buildings Department, spent some time in New Zealand studying mental hospitals there. In addition, he had his own specialized knowledge and experience of mental establishments in the U.K. to draw upon, and we should remember, too, that he came to South Australia from Scotland with an outstanding reputation in the field of mental health. He showed within a few months in South Australia, when he had had time to assess the position, that he intended to press with vigour and determination for the implementation of reforms in this State. When the plans for Strathmont and Elanora were complete they were referred to the Public Works Committee which, after taking evidence and studying the plans in the thorough way which we have come to expect of this body, recommended that they be proceeded with. For the edification of the House I should mention that the Strathmont project was referred to the committee on July 16, 1964, and on July 13, 1965 (one year later)—after much expert evidence had been taken and many investigations had been made—the committee recommended that the building of Strathmont be proceeded with at an estimated cost of \$5,702,000. The Elanora project was referred to the committee on November 5, 1964, and on July 19, 1965, the committee recommended that the building of Elanora be proceeded with at an estimated cost of \$6,372,014. I have spoken to the Ministers of the previous Government who have pointed out that these plans, having been submitted to the Public Works Committee by Cabinet, would have been proceeded with immediately had that Government been returned at the 1965 elections.

I wish to refer to the 1965 policy speech of the then Leader of the Opposition, a speech which I feel is of great historical significance and in the light of what has not happened since is a unique and frequently referred to document. The then Leader of the Opposition had much to say about mental health and sickness. He said:

On the question of mental health and mental sickness, a comprehensive report was compiled by Messrs. Stoller and Arscott for the Commonwealth Government in 1955 dealing with mental health facilities which (he averred) was a complete condemnation of the treatment provided in this State. The report indicated that there should be four beds per 1,000 population. On that basis we would need 4,000 beds and at the present time we have approximately two-thirds of that requirement, so that the mentally sick persons have only two chances in three of obtaining hospital accommodation before they can receive medical treatment, and the report indicated that, at that time, both Northfield and Parkside were two mental health centres which were suitable for development as training centres.

Apparently that report was not agreed with, because in the light of what has happened we know that the people who were capable of being trained were to be taken away from Northfield and Parkside. The policy speech continues:

The plans that are now envisaged for Reynella and Hillcrest (now known as Strathmont) are so very long overdue that the Reynella project is still awaiting the consideration of the Government. Whilst we have had some success as the result of our efforts in Parliament concerning the long overdue improvements needed in mental hospitalization, they are still far short of the requirements. Labor has always insisted that the health of people is of paramount importance, and it is a State obligation to make the necessary provision for hospitalization for general purposes and also the mentally sick, and we also recognize that there must be a greater contribution of finance from the Commonwealth Government.

I do not know whether at this stage the Australian Labor Party had heard of the Commonwealth States Grants Act. The speech continues:

In many cases, people have become mentally sick on account of age and they undoubtedly will require attention—possibly not to the same extent as those who are mentally retarded, and whatever programme of works may have been already committed under the present administration, this must be speeded up to completion as there will also be a need to make provision for children, both mentally sick and mentally retarded.

I find this a rather amazing reference, Mr. Speaker. Continuing:

The Labor Party is most mindful of the work being performed by Dr. Cramond and commends him for his insistence upon the Government for better provision for the care of the mentally sick. His task would have been much easier had the Playford Government paid attention to the recommendation of Dr. Birch in 1950 when he was Director-General of Mental Health, and when he reported to the Government that additional infirmary accommodation was needed, but again the Government

failed in its obligation to the people. Labor will:

- (1) Immediately increase Government infirmary accommodation; and
- (2) Subsidize the erection and running of small cottage district infirmaries in co-operation with voluntary organizations which have already indicated their willingness to help in such projects.
- (3) Immediately—

I stress that word—

speed up the re-housing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

That is what the present Premier had to say in his policy speech last year. In the Governor's Speech delivered on the opening of the first session of this Parliament on May 13, 1965, there was a very general reference to the Government's intention regarding the State's health services. It said:

My Government will pursue an active policy in connection with the health services in the State. Two new general hospitals are being planned, and additional teaching hospital provision is included. Improvements will be effected in connection with the care and treatment of the mentally sick and mentally retarded patients.

By this time, a few months after the Government had taken office, it was already beginning to go slow on its hospital-building programme. It was already, I suggest, embarrassed by its extravagant promise to provide a 500-bed hospital for Tea Tree Gully, and the opposing and well justified claims of the university authorities for a teaching hospital adjacent to the new university at Bedford Park, now known as (we know) the Flinders University of South Australia. It was making all sorts of excuses, spreading the rumour that the Government had found the Treasury bare, like Mother Hubbard's cupboard, suggestions which were roundly refuted only a few short weeks ago when the previous Premier and Treasurer, now gracing the seat which I previously occupied, produced a Treasury document compiled only a few days before his Government went out of office showing the true state of affairs, which was a very favourable one to the incoming Government.

Persistent questioning by the honourable members for Mitcham and Torrens and me in this Chamber, and by the previous Minister of Health in another place, have been singularly unrewarding, and it is perfectly obvious that the Premier and the Minister of Health are very touchy on this subject. Some months ago the Chief Secretary made public a list showing priorities in hospital building, and it was quite obvious from that that the Government

was procrastinating regarding embarking on approved medical establishments at Strathmont and Elanora. This procrastination was clearly shown by the scant reference in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech at the opening of this session of Parliament. In that Speech again a very short paragraph deals with the Government's policy regarding health. Paragraph 11 states:

My Government continues to pay attention to provision of adequate hospital services throughout the State particularly in the field of mental health. Consideration is being given to the drafting of a completely new Mental Health Act designed to bring administration and practice in this field up to date.

One sentence, Mr. Speaker, disposed of the Government's policy for this session of Parliament. On June 25 we had the public announcement by the Minister of Health and Chief Secretary that Dr. Shea, the new Director of Mental Health (a young man who was here in the mental health field several years ago and then went as Director of Callan Park in New South Wales, and a person who I consider we are most fortunate to have attracted back to South Australia to take charge of this branch of the hospital services), was to attend a mental health conference overseas, and whilst there was to investigate the latest trends in design and administration of mental training centres. I leave it to the House to imagine what this means. Does it mean that again the plans that were submitted to and recommended by the Public Works Committee are to be set aside and that we are to start all over again with some new trends that Dr. Shea may see overseas? This is all to be done within a short space of less than a month, because Dr. Shea is due to return to South Australia on July 27. The Minister's announcement goes on to say that after attending a meeting of the Executive Board of the World Federation of Mental Health, Dr. Shea would spend a fortnight in England (a whole two weeks) inspecting centres and hospitals for retarded and geriatric hospitals and, in addition, interviewing applicants for positions as psychiatrists in South Australia. Are we being told that the whole of the year spent by the Public Works Committee in investigating hospitals here and elsewhere in Australia and taking expert evidence is to be set aside for what Dr. Shea, for whom I have a great admiration, might learn in a few days.

Mr. Langley: You lost him, and this Government brought him back.

Mrs. STEELE: I am not saying anything about that at all. I have the greatest respect

for Dr. Shea, and I said in this House when he was brought back by the present Government that it was a good day for South Australia. I still maintain that he is an excellent person for the position of Director of Mental Health. The point I am making is that it is fantastic to suggest that even a person like Dr. Shea can in a fortnight, after attending a mental health conference, investigate hospitals and interview people for possible appointment as psychiatrists. To further suggest that the plans for these two new training centres should be delayed on the basis of such a lightning re-investigation is quite unrealistic. I suggest that it is no wonder the public is alarmed at the delay in proceeding with these two new centres, in view of the urgency to relieve the present mental hospital congestion and the need to segregate the mentally ill and the intellectually retarded. It is not surprising that Mr. Watt (President of the Mentally Retarded Children's Association) said at the weekend that he and his association were concerned that by the time the two hospitals were built they would provide sufficient hospital accommodation only for the mentally retarded patients at present living in segregated wards at Parkside and Hillcrest, and that further accommodation would be needed. This has been the history of many public buildings and especially schools. By the time the buildings are completed they do not provide the necessary accommodation. It is not surprising that parents of young mentally retarded patients at the existing hospitals are losing heart and giving up hope of having their loved ones accommodated in modern comfortable hospitals, with opportunities provided to train them and improve their chances to make something of their lives.

It will be tragic in the extreme if South Australia loses a grant equal to one-third of the capital cost of building and equipping these new centres, that the Commonwealth Government is prepared to make under its legislation. I have spoken to the Commonwealth Minister for Health on this matter because, like many other responsible citizens, I am appalled at the prospect of this grant slipping through our fingers. I am sure the Premier must have had some replies to the letters he says he has written to the Prime Minister, and Cabinet must be aware of the necessity to take some action before the deadline of June 30, 1967. Yet, the other day when replying to the comments of Mr. Watt, the Minister of Health said that plans were expected to be ready for building to commence at Strathmont

at the latter end of next year, well after the deadline set for acceptance of the Commonwealth Government grant. Dr. Forbes told me that other States had taken advantage of their eligibility to participate in these funds, and I, with other members, deplore the fact that with less than 12 months before the deadline all the Government can do is to have the Minister of Health announce publicly that a start will be made towards the end of next year.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion, and commend the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) for the work that she has done on this important subject. No doubt she is more qualified than most other members of this House because of her long association in the field of voluntary work. The background of this matter was given in great detail and should be of interest to all members. Last year when the Loan Estimates were debated I raised this matter, following the report of the Public Works Committee on this subject. The committee had exhaustively inquired into all facets of this problem both in South Australia and in other States, and it reported favourably on the establishment of centres at Strathmont and at Elanora. Naturally, members of the committee, and those on this side of the House, fully expected the Government to provide finance to start this project. The committee's report disclosed conclusively that it was an urgent matter, particularly because of a shortage of wards for this type of patient. The building of these hospitals would also relieve the pressure on accommodation at Parkside and Hillcrest. The Opposition considered that if nothing were done physically, at least something should be shown on the Estimates to cover planning expenses, so that initial steps could be taken to plan the first of these centres at Strathmont, with some physical steps taken in the financial year 1967-68. The Minister of Works replied nebulously, so I followed with a direct question early last session. In his reply the Minister said that he would consider the matter and that, although no provision was made on the Estimates, he would see whether something would be done about the planning. Up to this stage, the Opposition knew of no positive steps having been taken by the Government on this urgent project. In addition to the humane aspect and the urgency, it was pointed out that if this work did not proceed we would lose the Commonwealth Government subsidy that was available. In view of the Government's comments about the parlous con-

dition of the Loan Account, it is imperative that advantage should be taken of collecting subsidy money from any source. As yet, the Loan Estimates have not been introduced, but the Opposition hopes that something will be granted for this project. The Opposition is justified in raising this matter, because for the last nine months nothing has been done, and Opposition members would be delighted to know that the Government intended to proceed with this project. The member for Burnside made an outstanding speech, which was well documented and correctly founded. I believe that her comments demand a reply from Government members, rather than allow this debate (as it nearly did a few moments ago) to terminate on the voices. I support the member for Burnside on this important motion and invite a Government member either to adjourn the debate or to reply to the pleas and charges that have been made.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

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

(Continued from July 13. Page 481.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): In speaking to the motion I thank the Premier and the House for the courtesy extended to me last Wednesday afternoon of allowing me to proceed with the motion at this stage, and so overcome a procedural difficulty. The Opposition is deeply concerned at the unemployment position at present prevailing in South Australia, and at the Government's apparent inertia and lack of enterprise in the field of industrial expansion. We desire to bring forcibly before the Government and the general public the fact that South Australia does not seem to be attracting any major new industries at present, and that we are apparently being outbidden by other States, and falling behind those States. We firmly believe that the time has come to debate the unemployment question as well as the whole subject of industrial development in this State. We wish to draw the attention of the House and the public to the way in which the present Government, instead of developing the State

fully and providing a stimulus to industry to establish here, is at present throwing away its chances and chasing not very positive matters—one could describe it as “chasing shadows”. The Opposition believes that, instead of displaying initiative and a positive, practical approach in this matter, the Government is displaying ineptitude. We further assert that if industries had continued to come to South Australia at the same rate as they came in the past, the present unemployment position could largely have been averted. The Government seems to be, by reason of its socialistic ideology, neglecting to develop the industrial and natural potential of South Australia to its utmost. I and every member of the Opposition keenly and sincerely want this position reversed; we wish to see the previous rate of expansion maintained and, in fact, accelerated, and to see an end to unemployment, which is one of the reasons for this motion.

Instead of having the present position, we wish to see vigorous, practical and positive methods adopted to secure further industries for this State because, if South Australia can expand its industrial growth, it immediately and automatically creates more employment and a greater work force, which results in an improved standard of living for all sections of the community. I intend to approach the debate by introducing three main points; first, that the work of the Premier's Department is really ineffective; secondly, that this matter is urgent and is a constructive approach (because the Opposition is always constructive); and, finally, to move for the establishment of a Department of Development to encourage industrial expansion in South Australia, and to exploit our natural resources more fully. So that my remarks will not be misconstrued, I say at the outset that any criticism I make is directed completely at Government policy and not at any particular Government servant. Like other members in this House, I have a high regard for South Australia's Public Service. However, the Opposition is concerned at Government policy-making decisions and at the directions given to members of the Public Service. Knowing Mr. John White personally, I appreciate his work in the Premier's Department as Secretary to the Premier; I know, too, of the work Mr. Lloyd Hourigan was doing in that department before he became Secretary of the Public Works Committee, and I know of the work Mr. Belchamber is doing, following his appointment to take Mr. Hourigan's place.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: And you still want to say it is not satisfactory?

Mr. COUMBE: I should like to see the work of the Premier's Department expanded; my comments are directed not at the officers concerned but at Government policy in this regard. The Premier's Department was set up by the Labor Government shortly after the last election and among its expressed duties and functions were decentralization and the encouragement of industrial expansion in this State. These were stated by the Premier as the objects of the Labor Party, when the announcement to establish this department was made. Everybody held high hopes for the department, and it was presumed that it would carry on the realistic expansion programme so successfully undertaken for many years by the Playford Government. That work was carried on with outstanding and acknowledged success. The purpose of the department was to keep the ball rolling and to ensure that the growth rate in regard to the initiation and fostering of industries in South Australia would not slow down, and all members will recall that this picture was presented when the department was set up. However, the position today is not what we were led to believe it would be. When we consider the present employment position and the fact that there is not an influx of major industries, it is hardly conceivable that such a dramatic and calamitous change could have occurred in industrial conditions in this State in just over twelve months, a period that seems to coincide rather unfortunately with the time this Government has been in office. At present, not only is our industrial economy sagging but no new major industries are coming here.

These comments can be confirmed by inquiries outside the House, and the new department does not appear to have any effective results to show so far. I listened with interest to the Premier's concluding remarks when he was winding up the Address in Reply debate. One point he made was that the purpose for which this department was set up was to promote decentralization. However, as I have said in another debate, decentralization seems to be a forgotten word today: we do not hear it mentioned. The Premier and the Government have, by their actions, acknowledged that the position is not as it should be, because within two days of my giving notice of this motion, the Government suddenly woke up and decided that it was time it did something about the matter.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It was two days too late, wasn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: I am not as late as the Premier. Within two days we were told that

a Public Relations Officer, Mr. Crease, was to be appointed to the Premier's Department. I immediately acknowledge that negotiations on this matter had been proceeding for some time. However, the first that the public and members on this side knew about this appointment was the announcement that was made two days after this motion appeared on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It was announced at a luncheon and mentioned in the press.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not move in such exalted circles as the Premier. I am not cavilling about the appointment: I am referring to the timing. In addition, it was announced that the Public Relations Officer in the Attorney-General's office was to be transferred to the Premier's Department. So, suddenly we had two officers experienced in public relations work working full-time in the Premier's office. The third point is that I gave notice of this motion on, I think, the Tuesday, and on the next Thursday night the Attorney-General made his usual radio broadcast. He praised the work of the Premier's Department, said much about what it was doing, and went on to deprecate the attitude of the Opposition for having had the audacity to criticize the department by moving the motion of which I had given notice on behalf of the Opposition. The Attorney-General's broadcast was interesting because, after he praised the work of the Premier's Department, he fulminated at considerable length and concentrated on many projects that did not materialize in past years when the Playford Government was in office and completely ignored all the beneficial and lasting accomplishments. He referred to only those projects that did not materialize, such as the salt project in the North of this State and the proposal for a deep sea port. This is an old means of smearing one's opponents.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: When you haven't an argument.

Mr. COUMBE: Exactly.

Mr. Langley: What are you trying to do now?

Mr. COUMBE: I am giving the facts, for the benefit of the member for Unley. All this indicated immediately to members that the Government realized that it was open to criticism on this score and that, after all, everything was not so rosy. We then had a radio talk by the Premier and this was reported in the *Advertiser* of July 16. I agree with what the Premier has been doing: let there be no mistake about that. The report stated:

The public relations office attached to the Premier's Department is to make a film to advertise South Australia overseas. The Premier (Mr. Walsh) said in a broadcast last night that the documentary film would be made in the next two months. It would be sent to the Agent-General in London (Mr. K. L. Milne) and to other overseas representatives to inform them of the primary and secondary industry in South Australia and the opportunities for new industries. What I have seen overseas has convinced me that visual aids are necessary in an industry promotion programme, Mr. Walsh said.

The report continued:

The competition with other States makes it necessary to devise a new approach in attracting industry to South Australia. The Opposition claimed more should be done to promote industrial expansion by setting up a Department of Development, he said.

Those things happened immediately the Opposition had given notice of this motion to draw the attention of the Government and public to the lack of initiative by the Government regarding industrial expansion. We had the appointment of two public relations officers, a broadcast by the Attorney-General, and a talk by the Premier. The highlight of all was the supplement in the *Australian* of July 14 regarding the future of South Australia, particularly regarding industrial expansion. This supplement dealt with all facets of South Australia and mentioned Aborigines, social welfare, education and industrial expansion. A feature was a half-page advertisement, with a map of South Australia and a list of the many industries that had come to South Australia in 1965. This is what it said:

These are the companies which either announced, started or recently completed expansion projects in South Australia involving an expenditure of more than \$100,000,000.

It appeared from this supplement that all this had been done by the Labor Party or during its regime. It was a very shrewd move by the person who prepared it: the journalists who were employed did a first-class job for the Labor Party. About 100 industries were mentioned, and on checking I found that 90 per cent of these were initiated by Sir Thomas Playford when Premier. Some of the industries claimed to have been set up under the aegis of the Labor Government were even opened by Sir Thomas. This supplement is the best advertisement I have ever seen for the industrial administration of the Playford Government. The Labor Party paid the Liberal Party a back-handed compliment, as very few of the industries mentioned were established as a direct result of the setting up of the

Premier's Department by the present Government, although the Labor Government claimed full credit. The people will not be fooled. They know what has happened, and they have found they cannot live better with Labor, as they were told they would.

Mr. Langley: How do you think you look now?

Mr. CUMBE: Very good.

Mr. Clark: That is wishful thinking.

Mr. CUMBE: The previous record of industrial expansion in this State will stand for many years. This article and the broadcast by the two Ministers have indicated that the Government is concerned and that everything is not as rosy as members opposite want us to believe. The only information the Opposition can obtain about industrial expansion and the number of industries setting up in this State is contained in a paragraph in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that refers in a hopeful and naive manner to inquiries being made and makes great play of the decision by Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. to erect a new factory near Port Stanvac. The Premier also mentioned this a few days ago when closing the Address in Reply debate. All members welcome the decision of this firm to set up a foundry and engine plant at Lonsdale (near Port Stanvac), as this will be a great adjunct to the growing estate there. However, every member knows that the negotiations for this factory were conducted by Sir Thomas Playford 10 years ago. When the initial negotiations commenced, this firm vacated its Keswick factory and established a plant at Tonsley Park. An inquiry was held subsequently, and it was decided to build a spur line to the factory.

Mr. Shannon: It was an integral part of the project.

Mr. CUMBE: Exactly. The next decision was to build at Lonsdale so that all the firm's activities would be concentrated in this State. As a result, this State is now the home of the motor-building industry, about which you, Mr. Speaker, know so much. This firm, by deciding to construct a plant near Port Stanvac, has paved the way for further expansion in the area, and this is associated with the Housing Trust's development there. From what I have said it can be seen that the new Premier's Department did not initiate this major industry, although this is the only industry mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, the industry about which the Premier made such a play the other night, and the

industry that took pride of place in the supplement to the *Australian*.

My comments apply also to the new steel mill at Whyalla which, as we all know, was opened by the present Premier about three weeks after the last election. This undertaking was fostered and started years ago by the previous Premier, and it was a major achievement for this State to obtain this multi-million dollar project. Further developments to take place at Whyalla are in the same category, as is also the development of the sands at Coffin Bay. The latter major development, which is to be opened next week, was initiated in the former Premier's time. Credit is claimed for the Premier's Department for many of these things, but it is farcical and demonstrably untrue to suggest that it had anything to do with them. All that members have been told about the new Premier's Department in the first year of its operation is contained in the following words in His Excellency's Speech:

Inquiries from other sources are evidence of the success of this policy and of the confidence which industrial and commercial interests have in the prosperity of the State.

That is the only tangible thing I can find.

Mr. Shannon: I am glad you think it's tangible.

Mr. CUMBE: The statement that industrial and commercial interests have confidence in the prosperity of the State is a complete misstatement of the facts.

Mr. Shannon: What about the unemployment position!

Mr. CUMBE: Exactly. So much confidence has been displayed in the Labor Government that, apart from a few isolated cases of factories and warehouses (many of which would have come here anyway) coming here, nobody appears to want to come here under the present Government. No-one has the confidence that has been glibly referred to in His Excellency's Speech, yet the statement about industrial and commercial interests having confidence in the prosperity of the State appears three times in the *Australian* supplement. This tragic change has occurred in just over 12 months. When the previous Liberal Government went out of office there was plenty of confidence, and things were going along nicely.

Mr. McKee: That is why you went out of office.

Mr. CUMBE: Things were going along nicely, and I am not talking now about political Parties. In a moment, I will point out to the member for Port Pirie (who so glibly interjects from time to time and whose interjections have so little substance behind them)

some facts that he cannot deny. Let us consider the matter of prosperity, which has been so glibly referred to. When I spoke in the Address in Reply debate I quoted some figures to bring home forcibly to the Government the serious employment position in South Australia. Those figures were never refuted. Today I shall refer to those figures and to others to emphasize to the Government the absolute necessity for immediate steps to be taken to overcome the present position, to get the ball rolling again, and to take up the slack in employment. Something must be done to restore confidence to industry.

Mr. McKee: Why not make a suggestion to the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Port Pirie and I differ in one respect. I said I would criticize and make concrete suggestions. He is different from me, for all he does in the House is to move disallowances of regulations, make interjections and criticize. The object of this motion is to get business back on its feet as soon as possible, to restore confidence in the State and to get the Government to do something about the matter, as it does not seem to be doing anything now. We want to see confidence restored in the business and industrial community, confidence that seems to be so sadly lacking now.

Mr. McKee: What have you in mind?

Mr. COUMBE: I have more in my mind than the honourable member has in his mind. The Premier has referred to several matters now in the course of negotiation. I will be the first to compliment him if these negotiations come to successful fruition. The Opposition would welcome wholeheartedly any announcement by the Premier of the decision of a major factory to establish itself in South Australia. I hope that the negotiations to which he alluded will be successful.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: How long do you think I have been holding negotiations with Chrysler's?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know; I would assume that such information is confidential. However, if the Premier will give that information when he replies in this debate, I shall be happy to hear it. All the Opposition knows is that, in the last 15 months or so, the only industrial activity that has taken place in South Australia has been with regard to the Chrysler factory at Port Stanvac, the initial planning of which took place during the previous Government's regime.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. COUMBE: That is a fact. Examine what I said: I said "The initial planning".

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. COUMBE: I welcome interjections, Sir. Mr. McKee: Explain what you said.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have just asked honourable members to refrain from interjecting. I hope they will co-operate.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall quote a series of figures to explain the present position to the House.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think these projects require much initial planning?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes.

Mr. Hudson: Then if they have not yet come to fruition there must have been a deficiency before.

Mr. COUMBE: If the honourable member has patience he will hear what I intend to say in this regard. I shall quote these figures deliberately to point out the position that exists and to illustrate the urgent need to do something about it. The *Monthly Review of Business Statistics* of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, No. 343, shows that in March, 1965 (the time of the last election), 640 unemployed people were on benefits in South Australia. In March, 1966, exactly 12 months later, that number had risen to 1,635. In less than 12 months the number had almost trebled. I shall now refer to the position in Western Australia, a State that is at present attracting many industries. The position in this State is in direct contrast with that in South Australia. In March, 1965, 1,231 unemployed people were on benefits, and in March, 1966, that number had dropped dramatically to 620.

Mr. Hudson: Give the figures for Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. COUMBE: The monthly summary of statistics by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for South Australia, No. 83, of June 1966, shows that in March, 1965, there were 1,129 male unemployed people registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service. By March, 1966, this number had risen to 3,397—a threefold increase. To assist the member for Glenelg I shall also refer to the figures for New South Wales.

Mr. Hudson: And Queensland and Victoria?

Mr. COUMBE: I shall refer to building approvals. The building industry, which is having a hard time at the moment, employs a great variety of tradesmen and also many semi-skilled men. The same publication shows that new building approvals in the metropolitan

area as at March, 1965, were 1,429 and in March, 1966, the number had dropped to 1,138. The other day, the member for Glenelg asked me what the figures would be for the whole of the State, as he suggested that metropolitan figures might vary because of the building going on outside the metropolitan area. As I always like to accommodate the honourable member, I obtained figures for the whole of the State. In 1965, there were 2,280 building approvals issued; that number dropped to 2,036 in 1966. That illustrates that building approvals have fallen.

Mr. Hudson: What month was that?

Mr. COUMBE: Those figures were for March, 1965, and March, 1966. They are the latest figures available to me.

Mr. Hudson: The April figure is in the monthly bulletin. You will find it shows an increase.

Mr. COUMBE: Recently, in a debate the member for Unley (Mr Langley) displayed some interest in employment in the building industry. In March, 1965, the building industry, including all trades, employed 15,588 persons. In March, 1966, this figure had dropped to 14,086. The figures are here for all the various grades, including electricians, if the honourable member for Unley would like to look at them.

But the significant and disturbing interpretation of the figures is that, whilst unemployment is rising in South Australia, the figure for job vacancies is dropping at a far greater rate. Table 34 in the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics* shows that in March, 1965, when the Liberal Government went out of office, when we had full employment, and when we had a great shortage of skilled tradesmen, the job vacancies registered at the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service here numbered 5,032. In April, 1966 (the latest figures available) this figure had dropped from 5,032 to 2,071. In other words, there were two and a half times fewer job vacancies whilst unemployment in the same period was up threefold.

Let us look at the *Economic Outlook*, a journal known to many people, and particularly to the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), produced by the well-known economist, Mr. P. S. Schrapnel. Here we find that the South Australian building approvals from April, 1965, to April, 1966, were down by 16.6 per cent; yet throughout the whole of Australia for the same period they were down by only 1.7 per cent. To show the concern felt in the community at the present down-turn in the build-

ing industry, I quote once again the comments of Mr. E. H. Thorp (South Australian Secretary and Federal President of the Builders Labourers Union). He is a highly respected and well-known leader, and I suggest that his comments on this would be well-informed and in agreement with the views of members opposite. The member for Glenelg is not a member of that union, and that is why he can afford to laugh so fatuously at this moment. Mr. Thorp said:

My committee views with alarm Government announcements of the further curtailing of public works. The building industry is part of the backbone of the State's economy, which is already weakened by serious droughts. Instead of grappling with the problem on a sound basis, the Government is chasing shadows trying to stimulate the economy with lotteries, T.A.B., and 10 o'clock closing. These things are useless to men walking the streets without a dollar in their pockets because they cannot get jobs. In the past month an average of 30 a week have come to us looking for work. On one big city construction job, eight foremen have returned to tradesmen's or labourer's jobs to keep themselves employed.

This is a considered comment by a reputable trade union leader that appeared in the public press. If a member of the Labor Party had said that, he would have got the same treatment as that received by Mr. Cross, M.H.R., who returned recently from Vietnam.

Let us look at what is happening in other parts of Australia. A recent Treasury White Paper issued in Canberra expressed confidence in the overall position throughout the nation, and the following statement commenting on this appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 23 last:

There is an encouraging rise in the number of building approvals given last month. All States except South Australia and Tasmania recorded the upward trend. In fact, the statistics show that South Australia's approvals for new houses and flats in April 1965 were 11.4 per cent of the Australian total—

mark that date—

but 12 months later, in April, 1966, this figure had dropped to 10.2 per cent of the Australian total.

Mr. Hudson: Why won't you quote the figures from that book?

Mr. COUMBE: I am leaving them for the honourable member. I must leave him some ammunition. He asked me about the position in the other States. Of course, he is well aware of the statistical record as shown in the book he kindly gave me yesterday. I now quote an interesting article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of July 2. It was the outcome of a survey taken, following some comments made by the

member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) in the debate on the Address in Reply, of the other States of Australia in regard to their present position, their industrial expansion, following the criticism by the honourable member that in South Australia we were slowing down while the whole of the rest of Australia was not. This comment appears about the position in Victoria:

The Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte) says his State is going "on and on and on . . . developing faster than any other State, both industrially and agriculturally." . . . The steady expansion of industrial production, both primary and secondary, had given Victoria virtually full employment. "Victorians have every reason to be optimistic about the future," he said.

Then this comment appears about the position in Queensland:

Never before has the State had such an impressive list of major developmental projects in hand. Those scheduled to come into production will add millions of dollars to Queensland's overall earning—and spending—capacity.

I have already mentioned Western Australia, but let us see what is said about Perth:

Stimulated by iron ore developments in the north of the State and almost over-full employment, Western Australia is enjoying a period of exceptional prosperity. Indeed, conditions are so buoyant at present that there is a danger that the community will suffer seriously from local inflation.

Now let us see what the position is in New South Wales, to which the member for Glenelg has referred. It mentions first of all the large deficit, which I believe to be a record deficit for New South Wales.

Mr. Hudson: Who is "it"?

Mr. CUMBE: It says:

Building construction in Sydney is booming, but observers believe there is a considerable surplus of office space.

Mr. Hudson: Who wrote this article?

Mr. CUMBE: It continues:

Meanwhile, Australia's tallest office building is under construction in the city.

Then follows this comment in heavy dark type—

Mr. Broomhill: Who made the comment?

Mr. CUMBE: The Chief Secretary and Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Willis, who said:

New South Wales must pull up its socks to catch up with other States. During the past 10 to 15 years our rate of population increase has been the second slowest of all the States—mainly because most of the immigrants are going elsewhere.

Members can immediately see the answer, because for 25 years previously which Party

was in power in New South Wales but the Labor Party? Then let us look at the smallest State of all, little Tasmania, which is under a Labor Government and has been for many years—and it does not look like changing. It says:

Tasmania, Australia's smallest State in size, population and resources, is on the brink of its biggest boom in history. In the next few years upwards of \$150,000,000 is going to be poured into the State's primary and secondary industries—and the Government can take a lot of the credit. The biggest boost to the State—slandered as recently as last year as Australia's economic backwater—is the development of the huge iron ore deposits at Savage River.

We can see from that survey that the other States are getting on with the job, that they are expanding, and that this unemployment that we note here in South Australia is not so rampant. We find here today that tradesmen in the building industry are walking the streets looking for jobs. Western Australia, where things are booming, recently attracted 40 South Australian carpenters over there to work. I checked on that fact and on those figures with the Department of Labour and National Service. Those 40 carpenters, who were out of work here, were found jobs by the department here for the Western Australian operators.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And some boiler-makers who went from Whyalla promptly returned to Whyalla because they could not find work in Western Australia.

Mr. CUMBE: I do not know about that, but I know that those 40 carpenters are still there working and look like staying there. They left their families here simply because they could not find work in South Australia. It is a tragic thing when tradesmen such as these cannot find jobs in their own States, especially under a Labor Government which is supposed to be the friend of the working man. Why is it that there is so much work in other States which are running under Liberal Governments? Construction rates were going along nicely here up to March, 1965, and there was plenty of work about. Members opposite cannot conscientiously blame the Commonwealth Government for this state of affairs when other States of the Commonwealth have plenty of work to offer.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In fact, the Agent-General for Western Australia is at this moment undertaking to guarantee migrants a job as soon as they arrive in Western Australia.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. The Minister of Education interjected and said that my remarks

were not correct. However, I direct his attention to an article in last night's *News* headed "Jobless Rate Worst in South Australia." All the other States get their increments from the Commonwealth Government, so why is our position the worst of any of the States? The article goes on to state:

South Australia has the highest unemployment percentage of any Australian State, according to the latest figures released in Canberra. The figures, released by the Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Bury), show the State's unemployment running at 1.7 per cent of the work force.

At the time of the last election in March, 1965, South Australia had the second best employment position in Australia, yet today we have the worst.

Mr. McKee: Tell us about 1961.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member is up to his usual form. What I am trying to ascertain is how circumstances could have altered so dramatically within the last 15 months. I am comparing that period with the period immediately prior to that. If we had such a good employment position when the Liberal Government went out of office, why is it that we now have the worst employment position in Australia? This seems to have happened so rapidly. We are concerned about this position and want something done about it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you know that Whyalla has many vacancies for both skilled and unskilled men?

Mr. CUMBE: I was aware of that, but still we have this number of unemployed people and we have these carpenters walking the streets. I understand that most of the vacancies at Whyalla are for men to work in the metal trades industries in some category or other. I would be the first to admit that even today, outside the building industry, there is a definite shortage of skilled men in the metal trades. However, this does not apply in the building industry. From the figures I have given and the circumstances I have outlined it would appear that other States are forging ahead but that South Australia is lagging behind.

The other evening the Premier referred to our Loan expenditure and said that he hoped that when the Loan Estimates came in some of this slack could be taken up. I hope he is right. He also said that the Government was spending every penny possible under the Loan Estimates to carry out its capital commitments on new work. This was reiterated by the Minister for Works. However, the Minister said also that some of the Loan programme

projects would have to be slowed down or deferred because the Government did not have enough money for all the projects on which it would like to spend money. This may be the case today, but it was not the case in February and March of 1965, because at that time the then Leader of the Opposition, in the election campaign, promised that if the Labor Party was elected to office it would carry out the whole of the Loan programme work that the Liberal Government was undertaking. However, that has not been done. Now the Minister has been forced to say that he has had to defer certain works and that he might have to stop others altogether. The point is Loan works that we hoped would have created employment and taken up some of this slack have had to be deferred.

Loan funds are not used to run the Premier's Department, so expenditure on that department would not result in the curtailment of capital works already approved. Therefore, the excuses that the Government is using all its Loan funds, whilst true in one sense, are not strictly true and valid in all cases. In fact, it is not using all the money possible to overcome unemployment. I believe that more could be done in using the resources of the Premier's Department to bring large employers of labour here and so take up this slack and thereby revive public and commercial confidence in this State. What was the principal recipe for success under the Liberal and Country League Government in attracting industries to South Australia, and what were the conditions that attracted industrialists to establish here? The first was stable Government; secondly, we had very little industrial strife, and, thirdly, we had lower State taxation. When an industrialist is looking around for somewhere to set up his factory and go on producing his goods he looks for two main points: somewhere where he can market his products, and somewhere where he can make a reasonable profit. If he cannot do those things he is not going to set up, because he would not stay in business very long.

In the past we had stable Government and good industrial relations between employers and employees. Our conditions were good, and our State taxation was low. I wonder whether this position prevails today. The latest report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission (covering the year 1963-64) shows that State taxation in South Australia was \$30.02 a head, whereas the Australian average was \$40.61. Therefore, we were at that time, under the L.C.L. Government, almost \$10.60 a head of population

below the Australian average. At that time we had the lowest rate of State taxation, and we spent the highest rate on social services. When the now Attorney-General was member for Norwood in the Opposition, he continually quoted from this authority about social conditions. In the same period, for social services South Australia spent \$65.32 when the Australian average was \$62.57. This State was well above the Australian average for social services and well below it for State taxation.

I doubt whether that position prevails today. Last year, according to my estimates, State taxation rose by about \$10,000,000 or by about \$10 a head of population. No doubt, this year it will be greater, and industrialists wishing to establish here may not find the same favourable conditions. The Opposition submits that the work of the Premier's Department has been ineffective in encouraging and fostering industrial expansion in this State. We consider that a separate Department of Development should be set up, because we believe that this is the only effective way in which a true policy of industrial expansion, and of the full exploitation of our natural resources, can be carried out. Other States have it, why not South Australia? This department should be under the direct control and responsibility of a Minister, and should not be, as at present, included in the numerous duties of the Premier.

Mr. Lawn: Do you mean that an additional Minister should have the sole responsibility of this department?

Mr. COUMBE: Whoever is Premier of this State, he has many duties in addition to those of Premier. He is the Treasurer, Minister of Immigration (in charge of tourist activities), Minister of Housing, Minister in charge of prices and development; he is the head of the Government; he is the Leader of this House. He has much to do with the normal affairs of the State and of this House, and cannot be expected to direct the policy and make necessary decisions that would be required in such a department. The head of the department should be an officer well experienced in industrial matters, with plenty of drive, personality, and initiative, who is familiar with industrial management circles; he should have experience in the ability to negotiate with firms of national and international standing; he should be prepared to travel to other States to make contact with industrialists and, if necessary, to travel overseas at short notice to seek potential customers. He should be a super-salesman.

It occurs to me that a person like the late Mr. Wainwright, a former Auditor-General, who

did much work in the early days of the Butler and Playford Governments in initiating and encouraging industries to come to this State, would be the ideal man. The position requires a thoroughly trained and competent man who can talk on equal terms with industrialists and who is prepared to travel to see these men on their home ground. The department should be staffed with first-rate, highly qualified, and experienced officers. This State has public servants of this calibre; if not, they can be trained, or an applicant drawn from other circles. The department need not be numerically large, but it must be staffed by competent and experienced men under a dynamic leader, and Ministerial direction must be given to it. It is essential that this department have close liaison with the Agent-General and Trade Commissioner in London. He could represent this State not only in Britain but at conferences on the Continent and at the trade fairs held in the leading cities of Europe. The main function of this department would be to seek new industries and entice them to establish in this State against the competition of the other States that are most active in this field.

Further, it would be necessary to advertise the advantages of this State, and to assist the expansion of existing industries. The Industries Assistance Branch, a section under the control of the Minister of Labour and Industry, could assist in these matters, particularly regarding existing industries. This proposal is not new and there is a precedent for setting up such a department. In 1963 the then Liberal and Country League Government introduced an amendment to the Constitution Act to provide for an extra Minister whose main duty was to attract new industries to this State, and to assist the expansion of existing industries, but the Labor Party defeated this Bill. Again in 1964 we tried, but again the Bill was defeated by the Labor Party. Prior to the last election the L.C.L. Government had eight Ministers. The Labor Party, when stating its reasons for refusing to accept the additional Minister, said that it would not agree to this appointment until the number of members in the House was increased. This idea did not prevail for long, as one of the first things the Labor Party did last year was to appoint an additional Minister—and we supported that move.

Mr. Lawn: We supported the Bill for a larger House, too.

Mr. COUMBE: We do not have a Minister for Development. When we introduced these amending Bills we stated that we wanted an extra Minister specifically to be responsible

for industrial expansion. During his broadcast, the Premier chided the Opposition for not doing anything about the industrial expansion and said that we claimed more should be done to promote industrial expansion, by setting up a Department of Development. Further, the Premier stated:

... but the Opposition in its 32 years of continuous Government did not see fit even to establish a Premier's Department for this purpose.

The Premier conveniently did not tell the people the whole truth; he did not say that both in 1963 and 1964 the Labor Party stopped the Liberal and Country League from appointing a Minister of Development and establishing a Premier's Department. We still do not have a Minister directly to look after industrial promotion, although every other mainland State Government, as well as the Commonwealth, has a Minister of Development in its Cabinet. South Australia, therefore, is the only State which, in the eyes of the Labor Party, does not merit a Minister of Development. The Commonwealth Government has a Minister of National Development; Victoria has a Minister of State Development; Queensland, a Minister of Development; Western Australia, a Minister of Industrial Development; and New South Wales, a Minister of Decentralization and Development. Neither South Australia nor Tasmania has one. I have seen some of the departments at work and know a little of the work they do.

However, it is extremely significant that all Liberal and Country Party State Governments and the Commonwealth Government are progressive enough to believe in and to appoint a Minister of Development, and that the only two States without one are Labor-governed States. Does this mean that the Labor Party is not interested in development, although plenty of precedent exists for the establishment of a department for this purpose? When the former Government was in office we saw Sir Thomas Playford snatching industries from under the noses of some of the other States, especially the Eastern States. Governments in other States that have set up their own departments are in the direct field of bidding on the industrial market, and are most aggressive and businesslike.

Mr. Hughes: You said Sir Thomas Playford snatched industries from under the noses of the Eastern States; how does that support your argument in regard to a Minister of Development?

Mr. COUMBE: I previously said that that does not seem to be happening today. In

1963 and 1964 we said we wanted this work expanded, because the other States were beginning to set up their own departments, and the conditions to which I referred no longer applied. The market now is very competitive. I cite the Hon. Charles Court, a Minister in the Western Australian Cabinet. Some of us have met him, and most of us have read about his work, or listened to his broadcasts. His dynamic leadership and vision have led to many new discoveries of minerals and to the opening up of vast areas, particularly in the North-West of Western Australia, as well as to the establishment of industries in the metropolitan and country areas.

What is taking place in that State is an exciting saga, so much so that oversea industrialists planning to establish in Australia are now going to the West. It is correctly said that Western Australia is now expanding at a faster rate than is any other State in the Commonwealth, and bears watching in the future. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) raised a query about the Ministerial control of this department, but the motion is purposely left somewhat open concerning the Minister. I am not necessarily recommending an additional Minister, although he could well be used, because the work merits complete control by a Minister. I am suggesting that if the Government does not wish to appoint another Minister it can re-arrange the portfolios, but that is the Government's business. Along with the move to form a Department of Development I believe that we could examine another Government department that has played a significant part in exploiting the natural resources of this State, namely, the Mines Department, which is staffed by extremely able and experienced officers, and the Director and Assistant Director of which are held in high repute.

Mr. Casey: So is the Minister!

Mr. COUMBE: No doubt. The history of this State's exploitation and mineral discoveries has been closely bound up with the Mines Department right from the early days of copper finds. The department's laboratory work is recognized today throughout Australia, and its close association with the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at Parkside is extremely useful. Indeed, the department's work is acknowledged to be of a high technical calibre. We all know of the work undertaken by the department at Radium Hill, Port Pirie and Thebarton, in addition to its search for minerals and water, and the various surveys it makes throughout the State. Today, the really

exciting discoveries in Australia are not being made in South Australia; they are being made in the North and in the North-West of Western Australia, in Queensland and in the Northern Territory, where in the past few years huge mining companies, employing thousands of men, have been exploiting the resources discovered in those areas. I believe, however, that the Mines Department could do with some encouragement and a little prodding, for it seems that similar departments in other States are outstripping our efforts in South Australia. Our Mines Department once had the reputation of being the leading body of its type in Australia, in conjunction with the old School of Mines Assay Department. This applies not only in Broken Hill but also in places overseas and I consider that, with Ministerial leadership, this department could play an even more significant role in future.

However, we in South Australia might find our land barren of future discoveries. We should step up the work of this department in order to see that no stone is left unturned (if I may use that pun) and to ensure that the work of our Mines Department is expanded so that any mineral deposits in the remote parts of the State are found and exploited to the fullest extent. It appears logical to the Opposition that the administration of the Mines Department should be under the Ministerial control and the direction of a Minister of Development, so that one person would be Minister of Development and Minister of Mines. In many cases, their work would be parallel and complementary.

I now wish to deal with the discovery of natural gas. Because of this discovery, the position that I have just outlined is strengthened. The Mines Department has been closely associated with the development of the field at Gidgealpa and Moomba. The Director and Deputy Director of that department have been abroad with the Premier and the Minister of Mines to see the latest developments in connection with natural gas so that they can advise us on the best way to go about exploiting this wonderful newly-discovered asset. When natural gas is available, there will be a golden opportunity to attract to South Australia industries that can use this new source of fuel. I stress that this is where a Department of Development would come into its own. It would work in close co-operation with the Mines Department and, because of the potential of this fuel, the departments could really sell South Australia to industry.

Even more important are the by-products of natural gas. Such a department could surely induce people to come here to set up plant for the manufacture of such by-products as fertilizers, carbon, black rubber, acetylene, plastic, P.V.C. and methanol. The proposed Department of Development is the natural authority to sell this opportunity to industrialists. That department could say to people interested in coming here, "We have the gas available as fuel. Come here and use it. Opportunities are limitless." Who could do this job better than such an expanded department?

Therefore, the Opposition strongly suggests that a Department of Development should be set up rather than that this work should be done, as it is being done at present, by a section of a department under the control of a Minister who is overloaded with other work and who cannot give the direction that this work warrants. If the Government is sincere in its efforts to develop South Australia, it must support this part of the motion. The Opposition has today deliberately drawn the Government's attention to the downturn in our industrial economy, to the somewhat sagging growth rate and to the apparent lack of Government pride in this connection. We hope that more initiative will be shown by the Government. We have pointed out that the Premier's Department is not fulfilling what has been stated to be its main purpose.

Decentralization was an important facet of speeches by Opposition members about a year ago but we have not seen decentralization put into operation. The Opposition has expressed much concern at the sudden rise in unemployment, especially in the building industry. We take no delight in mentioning these figures but do it to emphasize that we sincerely consider there is need for industrial expansion salesmanship by the Government and we urge that it take steps to alleviate the present position. We consider that, if the Premier's Department is changed and a separate Department of Development is set up, a more positive approach can be made to encourage industries to come to South Australia, and so to create more employment.

The average man is interested more in his own job than in many of the items of legislation that appear on the Government Notice Paper today. A man without a job would certainly not be interested in some of those items. All States except Tasmania and South Australia have such a department, so why can we not have one? I suggest that it will be

difficult for the Government to argue logically and to refuse to set up such a department. Let us follow the example of the other States who have done so much in this regard and let us get on with the development of South Australia and the exploitation of our natural resources for the full benefit of all our citizens.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I second the motion and am sure all members must consider that there is probably no-one in this Chamber more capable of dealing with this matter than the member for Torrens. This is not tit for tat for what that member said when I was speaking a short time ago, but he is known for his participation in industry and his great study of it. I do not think anyone is better fitted to move this motion and for that reason, I have much pleasure in supporting it. He has gone thoroughly into the subject and I do not intend to speak for as long as he spoke.

In the course of his remarks regarding various industries, he was interrupted by the member for Glenelg, who said, "Do these need much planning?" I consider that this shows either how naive is the member for Glenelg as far as the promotion of industry is concerned or that he has not done much work on this matter. I suggest that this was the secret of the successful drive that the Playford Government made for the establishment of industry in South Australia. This drive did not begin, as the former Premier would be the first to admit, with the Ministry that was led by Sir Thomas. It began in the time of Sir Richard Butler, whom the member for Gumeracha succeeded as Leader of the Government Party, and at a period just after the serious depressions of the late 1920's and early 1930's.

Sir Richard Butler realized that, if South Australia was to succeed and to be able to compete with the other States, planned development in this State would be required. He had a very worthy successor in the man who followed him and was in power for so long. The period from the 1930's until last year was known and renowned for the far-sightedness, imaginative policy and planned development of the Liberal Government. It was because that Government looked ahead and saw what was needed to attract industry to this State that we attained the high industrial standards that we enjoyed until recently. The facilities necessary to attract industry here were water supplies, cheap electricity, housing for people who would be attracted by the establishment of industry (we all know that for many years this State has enjoyed the biggest percentage of migrant

intake in the Commonwealth), hospitals, schools, and other things. The houses were constructed by private enterprise and by the Housing Trust, which is a semi-Government institution.

The reply to the comment made by the member for Glenelg is that our success was due to planning. This is the very thing that has been copied by the present Minister of Industry in Western Australia, and that State is enjoying a tremendous boom. The W.A. Minister made no secret at public meetings here of the fact that much of what he knows about attracting industry and providing the necessary things for it to function he borrowed from the previous Premier of South Australia. He has gone from success to success, and he says he has improved on the methods used in South Australia. We were able for a long period to provide the right kind of industrial harmony and climate that would not only attract industry but would attract the people who would be employed in industry to settle here. We know that the population increased tremendously and a high standard of industrialization was obtained because of the very careful and imaginative planning of the previous Government. Yet it never lost sight of the fact that our export income was derived from the development of primary industry. Until this State started to expand industrially it depended almost entirely on the income derived from primary production, so this was always safeguarded by the Government. What do we find in this year's opening Speech about primary production, the great basis upon which South Australia has been built? The member for Gumeracha pointed out a few weeks ago how this subject had been dealt with by the Government.

We realized, because of the continual development of this State, that it would be to our advantage to have a Ministry to deal only with industrial development, so we introduced legislation for the appointment of another Minister, but this was turned down by the present Government when in Opposition. Obviously, the Government learned a lesson from us, because it had been in office for only a short time before it introduced legislation specifically to establish a Premier's Department to attract industry to this State.

The financial position of this State when the present Government took over has been dealt with in great detail on several occasions. It was dealt with very effectively only a few weeks ago by the member for Gumeracha, who produced a statement showing the state of

affairs when he went out of office. Tributes have been paid to him on having been such an outstanding Treasurer who was able to battle for this State and get better conditions at Loan Council and Premiers' meetings. When he announced his retirement, the daily press published a tribute by the Premier of Queensland. When I came back from New Guinea in 1961 I was entertained at Parliament House, Brisbane, and taken to lunch by some members in that State. This was the year in which Sir Thomas battled for and obtained an extra \$10,000,000 from the Commonwealth Treasurer at the Loan Council meeting and the other States were just as jubilant as we were about this. This was typical of what went on during the whole time he was Premier and was battling to compete industrially with the other States. What do we see now? After one year of this Government's administration we are not only facing a record deficit of \$8,000,000 but we are falling back as far as industry is concerned.

The member for Torrens is doing a great service to the public in moving this motion so that the matter can be debated, because hundreds of people in the community are most perturbed and disquieted at the fact that we are falling behind and that industries that would have come to South Australia in the good old days are now being won by Western Australia and the Eastern States. It is important to remember always that we must provide an enticement for industries to come here or they will go closer to the markets, where they do not face the same difficulties as this State used to face before facilities were made available to industry. At the risk of boring the House, I mention again that the member for Gumeracha said (and this was quoted by the Western Australian Minister of Labour and Industry) as a rule of thumb that it was necessary to attract to South Australia each month an industry worth \$1,000,000 to keep us in the picture and enable us to compete with the Eastern States. Several small industries have been set up here within the last 12 months, and the Chrysler (Australia) Limited plant is expanding. We should pay a great tribute to that company for the interest it has shown in South Australia by continuing to be associated with this State in one of the biggest car producing industries in the Commonwealth. Perhaps it is one of Australia's failings that it depends so much on the motor industry for its very existence. Even though this industry employs many hundreds of thousands of men and keeps many small indus-

tries going, this country is based on a motor industry economy. I do not know that it is a very good thing, because one sometimes wonders how millions of cars can continue to be produced in the world and the market can remain as fluid as it is, with such a great output of motor vehicles.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know how many new industries have been established since the Labor Government assumed office?

Mrs. STEELE: I know there have not been many. I refer the member for Wallaroo to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, which refers specifically to the Chrysler proposal and states that several other inquiries have been made.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know the number?

Mrs. STEELE: I know that there are not many.

Mr. Hughes: You should be able to tell the House the number; you should've done your homework.

Mrs. STEELE: Perhaps the honourable member could tell me the number.

Mr. Hughes: I could.

Mrs. STEELE: Then tell me.

Mr. Hughes: You are making the speech.

Mrs. STEELE: The honourable member should do his homework and find out the number.

Mr. Hughes: I can tell you now.

Mrs. STEELE: Well, do so.

Mr. Hughes: No, you are making the speech; I will give this information later.

Mrs. STEELE: I will take the honourable member's interjection at its face value, because that is all it is worth. I know some industries have been established because, as do other members, I read the press carefully.

Mr. Clark: Do you believe everything you see in the press?

Mrs. STEELE: No, but again as have other members, I have other sources of information.

Mr. Langley: What are they?

Mrs. STEELE: The member for Unley made a profound statement when the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) was speaking during the Address in Reply debate. He said, "We are catching up with other States in many ways now." He must have been asleep, like Rip Van Winkle.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot allude in this debate to a previous debate.

Mrs. STEELE: I apologize, Sir. There has been a dearth of new industries in South Australia in the last 12 months. I recall seeing a few paragraphs in the press about the establishment of an industry employing

12 people. I also remember the Premier, with a great flourish, opening a potato crisp factory, a commodity well known and enjoyed by most people. I know some other industries have been established, but some of the larger ones were well under way before the Government came into office a little over 12 months ago. I wonder whether the Government has any real plans for industry. Although I did not have a copy before, a colleague presented me with one, and I am now the proud possessor of the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party*. On page 42 this profound sentence deals with the development of secondary industries:

Encouragement of manufacturers for development of secondary industries in accordance with Labor's decentralization policy.

Decentralization of industry and population is dealt with by five points.

Mr. Coumbe: Is that an official copy?

Mrs. STEELE: Yes; it was printed in June, 1965.

Mr. Millhouse: It has been amended since.

Mrs. STEELE: Decentralization receives somewhat better treatment than the development of secondary industry. As the member for Torrens said, much was heard some time ago about the Government's policy on decentralization of industry. Perhaps the Government can do what the Industries Development Committee could not do. That committee made exhaustive inquiries in an endeavour to find various places throughout South Australia where industries could be economically established, where they would be close to markets and where necessary raw materials would be available. The committee (on which were representatives of both sides of the House) unanimously reported that, in general, it was difficult to find places in South Australia where industries could be established economically in the interests of the decentralization of industries in South Australia. Since the member for Torrens first placed this motion on the Notice Paper, members opposite have tried to justify the Government's failure to attract industry to South Australia or at least to maintain the industry we have here. Also, they have made excuses, blamed the previous Government, or apologized for the lack of industries attracted to this State and also for the present conditions here.

About a fortnight ago I was anxious to see something on television, and at about 6.45 p.m. I went into the strangers' lounge for this purpose. I found myself amongst a gathering of about five or six members (and I do not

know whether they knew I was there because I was sitting at the back of the lounge). After a while, one by one, members opposite filed into the lounge and began watching television. It suddenly occurred to me that this was the night when the Premier was to speak. As the press next day stated, the Premier came came on television in "a bid to dispel gloom". He more or less implied that a rumour was being spread around that we were on the verge of a depression. I thought the Premier would give an account of the industries that had been attracted to South Australia during the last 12 months but, instead, he devoted his time entirely to the public works programme. He referred to the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and to the dental hospital, to 13 new, or major additions to, primary and infants schools, to three new high schools, to six craft centres and to the first stage of the Bedford Park Teachers College. He referred to the Fort Largs Police Academy, to the new Government office block in Victoria Square, to the big additions to the Public Library and to the new Magill reformatory. True, these are public works, but what happens if we run out of this type of work? These buildings will eventually be completed. Already the public works programme has been cut down, which has led to criticism by various trade unions on the grounds that their tradesmen are out of work. Talk of public works will not dispel any gloom because, if people think about it, they will realize that, with the limited funds the Government says it has and with the huge deficit that there will be, there will again be a decrease in the sums spent on these works. I should have thought the Premier would try to say what the Government was going to do to attract industry to South Australia—but there was not one word about that. It is the well-established and new industries that will pull South Australia out of the wood again; it is not public works that will keep people employed for all their working lives.

Then the Attorney-General took part in a broadcast and said much the same thing—that the position was due almost entirely to the fact that the Commonwealth Government was refusing to release moneys for capital works sufficient to keep our manpower and resources at full employment. In the light of what I was saying today about the delay in building mental hospitals, it is inconsistent when he says that the Commonwealth Government is refusing to make funds available. The State Government does not move quickly enough to take up

the available grants. The whole effect of the two leading members of Cabinet appearing within two days of each other and trying to excuse the Government for its lack of promotion of industry fell as flat as a pancake, as far as I was concerned, and did not impress members of the public, either.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There were no cheers from the gallery.

Mrs. STEELE: No. From the speeches made in the debate on the Address in Reply, followed by the putting on the Notice Paper of this motion by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), followed by the Premier's appearing on television in his usual weekly programme trying to justify what the Government was doing, followed by the Attorney-General's broadcast, we see that at last the Opposition has drawn blood and has the Government on the defensive in this matter. All I can say is that these actions taken inside and outside the House have done nothing to assuage public concern: in fact, I think they have done just the opposite. Everywhere in the community people are commenting on the fact that the State's economy is running down and that no fresh capital is coming into it to help rectify the position. Now, too, we have the recent increase in the basic wage mentioned. The Minister of Transport claims that that will contribute still further to the State's difficulties in the financing of the Government's programme. One matter we all feel will stimulate the economy of South Australia is the advent of natural gas if a satisfactory and economic plan can be evolved to bring this gas to Adelaide to serve industry both in the city and *en route*. I shall not develop this theme because the member for Torrens, who is well informed on this subject, has dealt with it at some length.

I do not believe that the legislation that the Government intends to introduce in respect of a totalizer agency board, lotteries and licensing hours will help the State financially, because much money will be required to set up these organizations, and will not provide employment for many people. We on this side of the House were blamed for many things that did not come about last year. We were blamed for the financial deficit because we opposed some financial measures introduced into Parliament. It is foolish to budget before the money is in hand. Even a woman budgeting in her own home knows she must have the money in hand before she can spend it. Therefore, in introducing the legislation that it did last year and banking on its

receiving revenue from the operation of that new legislation, the Government was foolish and got itself into its present difficulties.

I hope I have said enough to show that I support the remarks made by the member for Torrens on this motion. I know that other speakers on this side will develop these matters still further, and I hope that honourable members here and the public are convinced of the real concern that members of the Opposition have about the present run-down in industrial development in South Australia. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1966. Read a first time.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee.

MILLICENT BY-LAW: TIMBER TRANSPORT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

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

(Continued from July 13. Page 480.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): In view of the assurances given this afternoon, I move that this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

BEACHPORT BY-LAW: TIMBER TRANSPORT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

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

(Continued from July 13. Page 480.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): Following intimations that have been made, I move that this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

**MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW: TIMBER
TRANSPORT.**

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

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

(Continued from July 13. Page 480.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): As an assurance has been received, I move that this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 19. Page 529.)

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): In reply to the Leader's point regarding paragraph 12 of the schedule, the housing agreement provides that the housing authority shall keep books of account in a manner and form that accords with approved methods of accountancy, and that at the end of each financial year it shall produce accounts and a balance sheet. Since this Bill has been on the Statute Book the appropriate authority has always submitted the necessary information and it has always been forwarded to the Commonwealth Government of the day. It must also be remembered that we have an Auditor-General to supervise these matters.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), spoke of the designs of Housing Trust houses. Although the Housing Trust builds to standard designs, any person may submit his own design to the trust and have the house of his choice built by the trust. Obviously, in these circumstances, such a house would be more expensive than one of the trust's standard design houses. From time to time I have helped young couples by giving them information about where the trust is building at a particular time, and I have arranged for them interviews with representatives of the Housing Trust so that their personal problems might be considered. The trust has always been able to help people provided they can find a reasonable deposit for the type of house they select. The trust is continuing to meet the requirements of the people.

Certain discussions took place yesterday regarding the lack of money to purchase houses. I know that some applicants for \$100-deposit houses are not able to find even that deposit,

and in those circumstances I do not know what can be done. Frankly, the policy of the Labor Party was that the minimum deposit on a house should be 2½ per cent, which is much more than \$100. That 2½ per cent is little enough equity in a house, considering the repayments that are involved. The rate of interest that has been made available under the agreement is assisting the Housing Trust to build these \$100-deposit houses.

During the last financial year the trust received \$10,200,000 under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement at 1 per cent rebate of interest. This figure includes the extra \$1,000,000 allocated by the Commonwealth Government after the Housing Ministers' conference this year. The point I make is that it is because of the 1 per cent rebate in interest charges that the trust is able to continue building these \$100-deposit houses. I certainly do not intend to introduce legislation prescribing a 2½ per cent deposit. I have observed this type of housing in my spare time. Only last Sunday I inspected an area where the trust had erected these \$100-deposit houses, which are quite satisfactory. What I am greatly concerned about is the amount of Loan money required by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to provide the necessary water and sewerage facilities for the houses that are built. We must not run away with the idea that because we can build a certain number of houses it is easy to keep up with the demand for the essential services to those houses. I believe that records for the last 12 months would show that probably a greater length of mains was constructed in that period than in any other period. This work is closely linked with the house-building programme.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The average cost of connecting water is \$200 and for connecting sewerage, \$325. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question on paragraph 12 of the schedule, the reply to which is that the Housing Trust receives payment on its investments above what is provided under the agreement, and it does not conceal anything because it can meet its commitments out of the income from its other investments. There is nothing to be alarmed at in the matters that have been raised.

The building industry and the unemployment of carpenters and bricklayers have been referred to. Probably honourable members would be as wise on this matter as I, but I do not believe

that unemployment in the building industry has been caused by any reduction in the Housing Trust's house-building activities. In the construction of larger buildings, however, an entirely different approach is adopted now from that of a few years ago. Steel is now used for the mainstays of large buildings such as the Government building in Victoria Square and the building being erected opposite this House. These buildings are being erected by private enterprise, and it is a pity there are not more. Steel is used instead of timber for boxing up concrete, and this practice has reduced the employment of carpenters. The usual practice in these buildings is to use aluminium window frames. The usual bricks and mortar construction is not used, and the building is closed in with glass so that there is no masonry construction on the facade. Perhaps a small quantity of polished granite is used on the lower levels. No timber doorways are used in the interior, and little timber is used anywhere in these buildings. The stage has been reached where it is difficult to obtain a timber desk because of the use of steel. The introduction of aluminium, particularly for decorative purposes, has reduced the demand for carpenters and other tradesmen in the building industry. Also, cut-throat competition now exists. During my time in the building industry, I opposed the "labour only" system of pricing, and I hold the same view today. Because of modern methods, operatives decided they could do more for themselves by quoting for labour only, and in some cases work is done seven days a week. One day should be left for rest, and for prayer if one so desires, but people now work seven days a week to make wages under this system.

Mr. Langley: That is all they do make.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: These aspects influence this Bill. The agreement is for five years, but if this system continues the only solution is for operatives in the building industry to quote a price for labour only and have it registered through the appropriate tribunal so that everyone will have all the facts. A conference of representatives of the various States was held earlier this year in this building and, after some negotiation, it was agreed that this legislation should be introduced and retained for the next five years. I have covered the major points raised in the debate, and I now ask that the second reading be carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Power to make advances to Home Builders' Account."

Mr. QUIRKE: Yesterday the member for Light mentioned \$7,000 houses the payments on which, at 4 per cent interest, would be \$33.42 a month.

Mr. Freebairn: I referred to loans, not to the actual price of a house.

Mr. QUIRKE: Taking \$7,000 at 4 per cent for 30 years, the cost would be \$18,000, so that \$11,000 would be paid for the right to borrow \$7,000. That is too much.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): A deliberate attempt was once made by the late Mr. Chifley, whose financial records placed Australia in a favourable position—

Mr. McAnaney: Nonsense!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member may talk nonsense, but I do not. At the time, the rate of interest on house loans was less than it is today. The agreement refers specifically to \$500,000.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

That this Bill be now read a second time, which the Hon. D. N. Brookman had moved to amend by striking out all words after "That" and inserting "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".

(Continued from July 19. Page 554.)

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I oppose the amendment moved by the member for Alexandra, and support the motion in its original form. I understand that the honourable member has been in this Chamber for about 18 years; I oppose his amendment because I believe that it is 18 years too late and that the honourable member is 18 years behind the times. I think most honourable members will agree that we have an obligation to Aborigines and that this Bill is a step in the right direction, as it will at least give them independence, which is the right of every man, irrespective of colour. In the first place, the Aborigines' economy and way of life were completely upset by the intrusion of Europeans into their areas. These people were then obliged to try to adapt themselves to changed methods of living, and

many of them were unable to do that. However, today many of their part-Aboriginal descendants and some full-bloods who have been given the opportunity have become well adjusted so far as their economy is concerned. I think the member for Yorke Peninsula and other members who have Aborigines in their districts will agree that that is so. In Port Augusta and parts of Yorke Peninsula these people have adjusted themselves. This adjustment can be made if they are given the opportunity. I listened intently to the member for Alexandra last night and, in summing up his remarks, I had no doubt that his views towards the Aboriginal people were similar to the attitude of Governor Gawler.

Mr. Clark: Governor Gawler was a pretty good bloke.

Mr. McKEE: In 1838, Governor Gawler decided that he would celebrate the Queen's birthday, and he arranged a barbecue for the natives. Of course, he also made a speech, and this is how he started:

Black men, we wish to make you happy but you cannot be happy unless you imitate good white men, build houses, wear clothes, work hard and be useful. Above all, you cannot be happy unless you love God, who made heaven and earth and men and all things. Love white men, love other tribes of black men, tell other tribes to love white men.

He was having \$5 each way. One can imagine him, dressed in his plumes and striped trousers, and eating European food, while the Aborigines were squatting in the dust with no food. There were no witchetty grubs, because they had been chased away when the kangaroos were chased out. He also said, "If any white man injure you, tell the Protector and he will do you justice." Well, it was some justice, and this is the type of justice to which they have been subjected ever since! I could not find in Governor Gawler's speech any reference to matters that would provide benefits for the natives. I have also studied legislation introduced by the previous Government without being able to find any benefits for these people.

The member for Alexandra said that to give these people royalties from mining leases would be a terrible thing and he wanted to know what they would do with the money. That is the type of question he asked! In this Bill we intend to do something for them, and the money they will receive is needed to improve properties, build houses and provide other improvements. I think the wealthy oil and mining companies can easily pay royalties to these people. I said that Governor Gawler was having an each-way bet, and it could be

that the member for Alexandra was doing that, too. Of course, this is the attitude of that member. He considers that these people should be kept uneducated and ignorant. That would make it much easier for the people who support him to exploit the labour of these people, and I challenge anyone to deny that the labour of these people has not been and is not being exploited.

Mr. Quirke: You are being unfair to the member for Alexandra.

Mr. McKEE: I am not, and the honourable member knows very well that what I am saying is true. He claims to be a man of the world who has moved among the people of the State, and he also claims to be an authority on those things. However, it is evident that he has not moved around much, because I know that in parts of the Northern Territory and in the North of South Australia Aboriginal people have been working for rations.

Mr. Quirke: I am saying that the member for Alexandra did not say what you claimed he said.

Mr. McKEE: I am stating the attitude of the member for Alexandra. He said that these people should not be paid royalties by the mining companies and that it would be dangerous to give them so much money. He was emulating the member for Gumeracha, who said on another matter when he was Leader of the Opposition, "It would be like putting poison in the hands of children." The member for Alexandra said it would be dangerous to give cash to these people.

Mr. Hudson: I think he said that they would be embarrassed by it.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. As I have said, he is 18 years out of date.

Mr. Hudson: Only 18 years?

Mr. McKEE: I am being charitable to him. The member for Alexandra said in the Address in Reply debate at page 264:

It is high time we had a Select Committee to inquire into the problems of the Aboriginal people.

Although his Party had been in power for more than 30 years, he claimed that it was high time a Select Committee was appointed!

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: There were two or three Select Committees, but the former Government did nothing about the recommendations made.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. What does the member want? Why do we need a Select Committee before giving land rights to Aborigines? Details of reserves and land were given to the

House last year by the present Attorney-General. The member for Alexandra will realize that all members have had the right to visit reserves and that they have had plenty of time in which to do so. Why should the Bill be delayed because the member for Alexandra has not obtained information that he, as well as every other member, has had the opportunity of getting if he so desires? Of course, the member for Alexandra had the opportunity for 18 years. He went on to say that the Government should remain responsible for the land. This is just a reiteration of the paternal attitude that has aroused so much resentment among the Aborigines. Can the member for Alexandra say why Aborigines should not be allowed to manage their own properties? After all, they are human beings. The honourable member said that sufficient land rights can be granted under the Crown Lands Act, but under section 5 (c) lands for any Aboriginal are limited to 160 acres. Is the member for Alexandra aware of that?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In how many parts of the State does that provide a living area?

Mr. McKEE: It doesn't, except in irrigation areas or in the hills. The member for Alexandra knows that 160 acres is not a living area unless it is in certain areas that are not available for this purpose. Areas where one can make a living of 50, 100, or 160 acres are not available. Few such leases have ever been granted. Can the honourable member say how many leases of 160 acres have been granted?

Mr. Shannon: What is a living area for these people?

Mr. McKEE: This depends on the nature of the country.

Mr. Shannon: What type of country is available?

Mr. McKEE: I do not know. Not much fertile country is available in South Australia for agriculture.

Mr. Shannon: I wanted to know what type of country was available.

Mr. McKEE: I thought the honourable member was trying to help me but he is only being a hindrance. The member for Alexandra could have discussed the measure with the reserve councils instead of trying to hold up the Bill just because the Government introduced it. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Over the years I have always advocated justice for Aborigines. I have referred to it many times before and I still adhere to my previous statements. Aborigines

have received a raw deal ever since the white man came to this country, and it is time some definite action was taken to recompense the remaining few in some way and to restore their dignity, for they were a naturally dignified people in their early days. I am rather disappointed with the Bill although it attempts to do only one thing—to restore land to Aborigines. However, this is only one aspect of the problem of what is necessary to restore dignity to the Aborigines. I do not think this measure will be successful in putting Aborigines on the land. First, it assumes that they want to go there but I doubt whether many will want to take the opportunity to go on the land. The Bill provides for Aborigines to be appointed to a board and this will give them dignity and status; they will act as a buffer between the white administration and their own people. To that extent, I think the Bill will be valuable.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Your Government took the view that it was suitable for Aborigines to go into cattle country.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not care what the previous Government did.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Your Government thought that was all right.

Mr. QUIRKE: If the Minister's Party thinks something then he is bound by what it thinks, but I am not bound by what my Party thinks.

Mr. Hudson: Did you say you were not bound by what your Party thinks?

Mr. QUIRKE: I am my own Party in this matter. I am not a slave to somebody else, as is the member for Glenelg. If I want to give my own views on the matter then nobody will stop me and nobody will take umbrage at my doing so.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You did not express those views when your Government said it was suitable to put Aborigines in cattle country.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am talking about this Bill. If the Government wants to put Aborigines into cattle country it will find it difficult, because it does not have cattle country.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Your Government did that.

Mr. QUIRKE: If the Government intends to use the land in the reserves, not many Aborigines will be able to be set up in this way because there will not be room for many agricultural living areas. Therefore, unless the Government buys land it will not be able to establish many Aborigines on the land whatever it does. To that extent, I think the Bill is a rather puffed-up measure. It is designed

to give people the idea that something big is going to be attempted, but nothing big can be done because no provision is made for buying land. The trust can acquire by means of agreement or exchange, or possess or dispose of property of every kind. That provision seems to apply to land that is already a reserve. Also, the trust may, with the consent of the Minister, sell, lease, mortgage or otherwise deal with land vested in it pursuant to the Act. Does that dealing in land include the purchase of land? If the Government intends to purchase land in good areas for this purpose then it will cost a great sum of money if many Aborigines want to go on the land.

It is provided that Aborigines shall have the freehold of the land. Does this mean that they will be given the mineral rights of the land, although people in other areas will not have the right? Of course, the position with regard to reserves is altogether different, and I have no objection to the freehold of reserves including mineral rights. However, if the mineral rights are included under this Bill then only a few people, instead of the total population, will enjoy royalties from any oil or gas found through drilling. This matter is extremely complicated and it cannot be simply glossed over and these people given the mineral rights. Before about 1880, mineral rights were sold with land. After the Torrens Title came into effect the mineral rights were deliberately excluded from the title and reserved to the Crown.

There are now no mineral rights with freehold properties unless the titles of those properties were taken out before 1880. In that time one could traffic in land. In my district there is an area of land belonging to the corporation of the district, but the mineral rights belong to somebody else. In those days it was common to sell the mineral rights but retain the freehold of the land. I do not know whether those sorts of complications can come into some of those leases in the Far North. I should think they could be cleared up. If we are going to give an Aboriginal freehold land, at 640 acres to the square mile, are we to include in his freehold rights the mineral rights for that land when the people around him are excluded from having such rights? I put this forward for the consideration of honourable members.

I reiterate that I stand solidly on what I said before: I want to see the Aborigines uplifted. However, we cannot do it all at once; it is necessary to proceed slowly. But this Bill gives us no information about what

is intended. My criticism is of the idea of just giving recognition to the right of indigenous people to own land. I want to know that the proposal has more than the bare bones of wishful thinking in an Act. I am of the opinion that the trust will not be overworked. There are not many Aborigines with an aptitude for farm management. I have had administrative experience of some of them. In their natural state they never attempted to grow anything. When the Chaldean empire was young, they were old. When we arrived here, they were in exactly the same condition as they were in when the Chaldean empire was young—and that was thousands of years ago. They were nomads, pure and simple.

They never learned to store food; they never attempted to store food. Such a thing was entirely foreign to their method of living. If they killed a kangaroo they gorged themselves until everything was gone, for fear that what they might leave would go bad and they would not be able to eat it the next day; or for fear that wild dogs would get it and they would be deprived of it. They never learned to plant anything in the way of grain foods. The best they could do was to pick the stuff that grows in the creeks in the north—it is called Nardoo.

Mr. Clark: They planted yams.

Mr. QUIRKE: They never planted yams. They never planted anything but dug up roots called yams.

Mrs. Steele: And lily seed.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. This country did not present the opportunities for them to squat down in bunches, because the climate was such that they had to be forever on the move. People liken them to the Maoris in New Zealand, but we cannot, not for a long time. The Maoris are Polynesians from the islands in the Pacific, and for all the time their race was there it was necessary, because they were squatting on small islands, for them to produce food, and they carried that power with them to New Zealand, where the indigenous natives did not produce their own food. They were like our Aborigines. This was probably 18,000 years or more ago; it is lost in the dim mists of antiquity as to when they arrived here. The Maori is a recent arrival. Our natives came probably when there was a land bridge from the islands north of Australia to the mainland of Australia. They came, and that was probably at the time of the ice age; but, when the ice receded and the oceans rose, Tasmania was separated from the mainland and northern Australia was separated from the

islands. This caused two things to happen. First, it completely isolated our indigenous population, our Aborigines; and, secondly, it preserved forever on this mainland the marsupial animals that were the common life of the time, because they were here long before the coming of the predator mammals in the form of the big cats, which wiped out the innocent and inoffensive marsupials.

Long before the black man was here, the kangaroo was here. It is interesting to note that the black man has been here for a long time, because in Lake Callabonna we can dig up the remains of complete skeletons of those giant marsupials, giant wombats. They are like putty, and is hard to dig them out. Then there are the fire sites of the Aborigines. We can dig down to things buried by generation after generation of lighting fires and we can find the giant fire-scorched bones of those great animals, thus clearly proving that the Aborigines were here when those animals were here, animals that disappeared between 8,000 and 10,000 years ago.

My point is that in the Aboriginal we have a person who never learned to store food, as the Polynesians found they had to. The Melanesians acted in the same way. The Australian Aboriginal had a vast continent to trot over. He was a nomad, and still is. There will not be many Aborigines who will sit down on a farm, but those who do will need a tremendous amount of direction. Look at the services that today are provided by the Agriculture Department for people who have been born and bred on the land and have the advantage of all the latest information about production from the soil; yet we are going to put these Aborigines on the land. They will need close handling. The method to be used should not be speedy. This is an extremely slow operation. I am not opposed to this move because I think it will do harm; I do not think it will. Neither do I think it will do much good. There is ample scope under the present Crown Lands Act to provide lands for these people.

The one advantage that I see in this legislation is that it will provide a buffer between the man of Aboriginal blood and the white man. If we put good Aborigines on the board they can speak and act for the Aboriginal and the Aboriginal will probably have a degree of confidence in the white man. That is the one valuable thing that I see in this legislation. But I am sure no good will come from putting these people on the land in great numbers.

What shall we do? We can teach the Aboriginal to ride stock; we can give him a horse and he will become part of it. We can give him a tractor and train him to drive it and he will do that job well, too, and will love doing it. He can be trained to look after that tractor, and he will not neglect it. Although he needs a bit of oversight, he can do that sort of work. Indeed, that is the type of work that he is gifted for, and that he can do prior to being put on the land. There are many stages in that story. I make a plea for the North-West Reserve, consisting of an area of, I think, 17,000,000 acres. It would make a few station properties, although not many.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There is no water there for a great part of it.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is so. It is the one area in the whole of that central country in Australia that remains as near as can be to the original condition of that country, for we have massacred the rest of it. The few nomadic natives who remain on it should be left there, and we should see that they do not starve. They are not likely to do that while they have that country to run over. We must never put sheep or cattle on that country: it should be left alone, for it is one of the most precious bits of our first heritage that is left. The people that come after us will bless those who have preserved for posterity country in its indigenous, prime and primitive condition, for that is necessary.

I look to the Minister of Lands for support in this matter. I am certain that if the two of us stood side by side as a pair of leaders no-one could get any of that land. I have already had that fight. An irrevocable loss would be incurred by destroying that country. The Aboriginal is not a man that is going to cherish the plant life grown on it, and he is not a man who is going to look after the fauna and flora on it. He wants good tucker for himself and good tucker for his beast, because good tucker for the beast makes good tucker for him. I do not want that to happen to that North-West Reserve: I want that preserved as it is now, and just as large as it is now. This business of making small reserves is a hopeless way of preserving them for posterity: we must have them large. The rubbish we introduced into this country in the way of weeds seems to flourish here as it does not flourish in the country of its origin; it goes into this country, and if we have a small area of land that we want to preserve it is not long before it is destroyed by the rubbish that

we have brought in, against which the indigenous flora has no protection, because it grows rampantly.

In Clare there is a 15-acre area of red cored stringy bark, the last surviving relic of its race in South Australia. A little of this vegetation remains against the Victorian border, a little in New South Wales, and a little on the side of the river in Victoria. That is the remnant of what was possibly a complete forest that covered the land from those hills of Clare right across the country to Victoria hundreds of thousands of years ago, and it is still there. The Commissioners of the Wild Life Reserves knew it was there, and we got 15 acres of it. I knew what they knew, that 15 acres would not persist with the country around it being treated with superphosphate. I know it is right and proper that the people who have land there want to make a living from it. However, when we apply superphosphate the weeds grow and invade this vegetation, thus unbalancing the fertility of the soil for that stringy bark tree which naturally grows on a soil of low fertility, and then away goes the thing that we are trying to preserve. The reaction to that was that the Government of which I was a Minister agreed that we should preserve that little bit of what was left of this vast forest. The only way to preserve this is to buy the country around it. Today, instead of 15 acres we have 750 acres around it, and I think the Minister will know that it is not complete and that one side of it still needs protecting.

We have the other magnificent reserve that will be in the Mount Remarkable area. People will recognize later on the wisdom and the foresight of the people of this time who preserved those things for them. There was a time when people were cutting the beautiful sugar gums off that country. We did not know how to stop them at first, but when we would not buy their sleepers they soon stopped cutting those gums, with the result that those trees are still there for all people to see. When we go to no end of trouble like that to preserve the fauna and flora inside of this country, let us see that nothing is done by us to destroy that precious bit of country, the last remaining bit of its type on the continent. It is there as near as possible in its original state, except for the unmitigated curse of the rabbit that got in. The rabbits ring-bark those trees and kill them. I do not know where the man is who introduced the rabbit and the fox to this country, but I know where I hope he is.

The native knows these things, for that was the life that he lived and that was the country that he inhabited. He knew it, and he read it like we would read an open book. That is his life, and he does not want to sit down in one place and go through the chores of working agricultural properties. I doubt whether we would get many to do that. We will get some who will be successful, but not many. The Aborigines can be put there without this Bill. Although I think the Bill is fairly useless for the purpose for which it is designed, I consider that for the one purpose I have mentioned it has a value, and because of that I do not mind it. However, I want to see that it is not a medium (and there is no guarantee in the Bill that it is not a medium) for taking those reserves and putting cattle and sheep on them where the good Lord never intended cattle and sheep to go. That little woolly animal is a devastating little beast, with beautifully designed cutting hooves; what he does not eat he chops up. If he is on the side of a hill he walks up it at a grade of under one in 10, and that makes a beautiful furrow to run water down. The erosion that he can cause in that way has to be seen to be believed. Indeed, one would think a surveyor had made those gullies, whereas originally they were a pad for sheep going up the hill. I do not like that little beast on reserve country where we are trying to preserve fauna and flora. He has very great uses and he is most valuable to this country, but like everything else that is valuable he can be dangerous and bad medicine in places that we want to preserve.

It is the same with cattle. We can tell when we are in cattle country by the plants that are like umbrellas: as far as the cattle can reach them they have eaten them. In the native country that has not had cattle, that cover goes right down to the ground and provides cover for the little fauna such as little desert rats and other things that run around. When we put cattle in they clean the vegetation off as far as they can reach. They destroy the cover of the little marsupials, and we must guard at all costs to see that they persist. As the Duke of Edinburgh said, when we destroy something like that it is like destroying an old master because we can never replace it. If we destroy and utterly eliminate these marsupials we cannot bring them back. Let us preserve our reserves by buying land for the Aborigines if we can afford it, but do not think we can make a job of it by giving them some of the reserves they were parked on because they are not suitable except for grazing on large

areas, and the larger the area the fewer people may be put on it. I am not a carping critic. You, Mr. Speaker are aware of my views. This Bill will not achieve much, but neither will it do much harm if properly administered. Its value is that a start is made in this way by lifting the dignity of the man by making his representative act as a "go-between" the overlording white man and his own subservient self. We have to get him out of that attitude, but we have to go a long way before we can make a farmer of him, although he might make a good tractor driver.

Mr. McKee: You have to make a start.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but this Bill is not needed to do that.

Mr. McKee: They don't go for this white man agreement much.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, and that is why the "go-between" makes the agreement.

Mr. McKee: It's on paper, and that's important.

Mr. QUIRKE: He may not be able to read it anyway.

Mr. Rodda: What percentage can read?

Mr. QUIRKE: I agree with this idea to some extent, but I am not going to go into raptures about it.

Mr. Langley: I'm sorry.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is the first time that the member has been sorry. With those few remarks I leave the Bill to the mercy of the House.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): In supporting the Bill, I forgive the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) anything he said that I did not agree with, because of what he said in the last few sentences about raising the dignity of man. The honourable member means it. Although he criticizes the Bill I know he is anxious to see something done for Aborigines in Australia, and in South Australia in particular. However, I wish I could say the same about the speech of the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman). When I listened to the honourable member, my thoughts went back to a comment that he made in the House last year, in a debate on the drought-stricken North, I think. On page 735 of *Hansard*, he said:

If anyone takes the trouble to look through *Hansard* at statements I have made since I have been a member of this House they will not find one personal criticism I have made of anyone.

That used to be 100 per cent true. In the old days, before the honourable member was a Minister, he and I (and others, of course) often clashed in friendly animosity, and I never

heard anything personal from him; I regret that that is not the case today. I have not heard so many personal remarks directed at a person as were made by the honourable member last night and directed at the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I trust the House will forgive me if I quote some of those unquote-worthy remarks to make my point. The first one (and this must have been noticeable to every member), was completely out of the blue. The Minister was sitting in front of me as harmless as a dove, when the honourable member, who was making a speech said, "The Minister is looking his usual uninspired self." To the honourable member for Alexandra perhaps this seemed so.

Mr. Quirke: I have said worse things about you.

Mr. CLARK: I am sure the honourable member has, but I expect it from the honourable member, and he may expect it from me. To the member for Alexandra the Minister may look uninspired.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Don't you think that I had some provocation?

Mr. CLARK: I could see none at all, unless it was the contents of the second reading explanation, and I doubt that. I admit that when the Minister was charged with sitting there in his usual uninspired state, with his reasonably quick tongue, he said that the honourable member's speech had no inspiration. That was a matter of opinion and I did not think it had much inspiration either. Shortly after this, the member for Alexandra said something that was not out of the blue, but was prepared. He repeated it, with slight variations, three or four times. He said:

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

That statement is completely biased. We know what a responsible position the Minister has and, with great respect, even with his virtues and faults, that is not a just thing to say. The member for Unley (Mr. Langley), with his strongly developed sporting instincts, interjected and said, "That is a bit personal, isn't it?" The member for Alexandra, apparently fancying the remark he had made, repeated it with a slight variation, and said, "I believe the Minister is trying to establish a name for himself as a record breaker in this respect." Does the member for Alexandra mean that?

Mr. Rodda: Are you wielding a waddy or a boomerang?

Mr. CLARK: I am speaking, as well as my virus-affected throat will allow, about a few comments of the honourable member. I sat quietly and tried to work out the reason for these obviously personal remarks, and the only conclusion to which I could come was that it was the old green-eyed monster, envy. It seemed to me that this was the answer. I found it hard to believe, but could not find any other answer. Apparently, this envy has submerged miles below the surface, the usual logical thinking of which the member for Alexandra is capable. He was a good Minister, and at one time I thought he might be the heir-apparent. Possibly he may have thought so himself.

Mr. Jennings: Not enough hair!

Mr. CLARK: But what happened? The member for Alexandra is not the only sinner in this respect (if it is a sin, of course).

Mr. McKee: He wouldn't be isolated.

Mr. CLARK: No, but at least other honourable member's remarks may be excused, whereas no excuse can be made in this case; the honourable member was simply debating a straightforward, if rather large, Bill. I do not know the reason behind his animosity; I shall have to leave that to the House.

Mr. Quirke: To which Bill is the honourable member addressing himself?

Mr. CLARK: The one the member for Alexandra was debating when he made the remarks to which I am referring in discussing the same Bill! The honourable member said that the Minister insisted on absolute courtesy when speaking, but occasionally "did his block". I think I can agree with that; but almost straight out of the blue, again, when the Minister was doing his best to help the honourable member, the latter revealed his dislike for interjections. That, of course, is his business but, despite the Minister's attempt to help the member for Alexandra, the honourable member said, "I think the Minister is behaving stupidly."

Mr. Jennings: If the Minister was trying to help the honourable member he was probably acting stupidly!

Mr. CLARK: The Minister said, "I think you are behaving ignorantly," and I am inclined to agree with that. I cannot see why a perfectly harmless informative interjection designed to help should goad the honourable member into making a rather discourteous remark, unless it was purely because the remark came from that particular Minister. Then, the members for Port Pirie and Unley were bold enough to interject (forgetting that

the honourable member did not like interjections), and were chided for interrupting. Towards the end of his speech the member for Alexandra said, "The real truth is that the Minister is trying to break records." The next we shall hear is that he is better than the man who recently ran the mile in such a short time. The honourable member also said, "He is trying to break records by being the first in Australia to make this lands trust a success." Finally (and he had every right to say this, although it is a matter of opinion) he said, "This is an emotional and banner-waving Bill." If we study the Bill, however, I think we shall find that it is completely unemotional, and I can find no evidence in it of banner waving.

Mr. Quirke: It lacks not only emotion, you know.

Mr. CLARK: I should have been happy to excuse the member for Alexandra for making personal remarks that he does not normally make (at least he says he does not)—

Mr. McKee: He is in an unfamiliar position, now.

Mr. CLARK: I have heard the honourable member make out an excellent case when speaking to a Bill, and I think when he reconsiders his remarks he will realize that he had much information but did not do much with it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you like to answer a few questions?

Mr. CLARK: Not at the moment.

Mr. Curren: He doesn't like interjections!

Mr. CLARK: I think the member for Alexandra will forgive me if I take a leaf out of his book and say, "We shall perhaps have a talk about it later."

Mr. Nankivell: What's in the Bill?

Mr. CLARK: The member for Alexandra told us earlier that he would not have moved the motion for a Select Committee if the Government had not wished to proceed with the Bill yesterday, and if he could have moved the motion today but, frankly, I do not get the point.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That remark related to the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. CLARK: I can see that my knowledge of the procedure of the House is lacking again; I really missed the point, but I see it now. We were told all sorts of odd things by the honourable member, and I hope I am not distorting what he said.

Mr. McKee: He's an odd chap!

Mr. CLARK: He seemed to say that no need existed for an Aboriginal trust because

our Aborigines were not and never had been war-like, as had American Indians, for example. The argument seemed to me to be that, because Aborigines had submitted fairly readily to whites (much more readily than had the American redskins), they did not need a trust, but I think that is nonsense.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I hope you acknowledge that you are doing the interpreting?

Mr. CLARK: I listened carefully yesterday and read the speech again today.

Mr. Jennings: You're a glutton for punishment!

Mr. CLARK: That may be so, but when seeking knowledge one sometimes has to suffer.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you ready to answer those questions now?

Mr. CLARK: Not at the moment. Later, the honourable member said, "The underlying message is that we have filched land from the Aboriginal people." Frankly, is that not because of our ancestors' actions? Then, we were given a story (that I thought was pointless) of a young man who was interviewed somewhere in the U.S.A. about our Aborigines, in regard to a radio broadcast or something of that nature. The only point I seemed to make of it was that apparently we should not improve the lot of our Aborigines because it might be heard of overseas, perhaps in America. I am proud of what we are trying to do, as is the Minister and everybody on this side, and I should be only too happy if, say, the United States heard about our efforts. The honourable member wished to know the answers to questions which he detailed and which members can study. However, I believe the answers to all his questions are contained in the second reading explanation, and that, if they are not, the Minister will be only too happy to try to give the honourable member the information he desires when he again speaks to the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you mind telling me how the North-West Reserve will be used?

Mr. CLARK: Will the honourable member allow me to make my speech, without his interjecting? I am sure the Minister, who has considerably more knowledge about this matter than I, will answer all the questions raised without resorting to any banner waving. Indeed, I shall be disappointed if any banner waving occurs on this occasion. I am certain that the Minister, who has this whole matter at heart, will be absolutely delighted to answer the questions and to do anything he can to make the Bill workable. I appeal to everybody,

particularly to the member for Alexandra who, I know, seeks information, to listen carefully to the answers and to forget about any personal feelings towards the Minister. Fortunately, I have a good memory and am able to remember something that the present Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said about 14 or 15 years ago, when he was just the member for Norwood (and only just, because it was not an easy district to win). He said:

While we maintain Aborigines as second-class citizens, we shall not assimilate them into our community, and they are entitled to that as of a right.

I do not think there was any flag waving about that or that the Minister was then thinking about breaking records. He had a genuine desire to advance the welfare of Aborigines, as all members have, and he has carried on that desire. Now, with the complete support of every member of this side (and I trust that we shall have the support of every member on the other side eventually), he is anxious to do something for the Aborigines, but he has no desire to break records. If the member for Alexandra does want to gnash his teeth, I suggest that he read the report in today's *Australian* by Douglas Brass about the Hon. D. A. Dunstan. To put it colloquially, I think that report would slay the honourable member! I support the Bill and oppose the unnecessary amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I think members know that I have, for many years, taken much interest in Aboriginal affairs in this State. It was necessary for me to take an interest, quite apart from my natural desire to do so. I approach this legislation with a feeling that we all desire to do something tangible and practical for the welfare of our indigenous people and that this desire is shared by many people throughout of State, who are enthusiastic in greater or lesser degree for various reasons.

I consider that those active in Aboriginal welfare can be divided into three groups. First, some people are sincerely practical, logical and cautious in their approach to an extremely vexed problem. These people not only know the problem but also try to find a solution and, in the hands of people in this group, the welfare of Aborigines is most capably held. Then, idealists approach the subject on a stop and go basis, becoming enthusiastic for a short time but not bringing their enthusiasm into the realm of practical application. Nevertheless, they mean well and think something ought to be done. We often hear it said that

something ought to be done and mostly we hear, "The Government ought to do something."

Another group feels some moral obligation in the matter, and that is their predominant motivating characteristic. They consider that we have a duty to our indigenous people because we have taken something of great value from them rather light-heartedly without having attempted to make up to them in value or by association with them for what we have taken.

I should like to comment on the remarks made by the member for Gawler regarding my colleague, the member for Alexandra. I say in fun that, when he talks about the possibility of the member for Alexandra being the heir-apparent, he and the member for Alexandra are well advised not to talk about heirs-apparent, because there is not much hair apparent on either of them!

The member for Gawler's speech was almost entirely devoted to a rather spirited defence of his Minister. No-one could blame him for that, but it is interesting that he found it necessary to defend his Minister. That suggested to me that he recognized that there was some weakness in the Minister's makeup, that the Minister was pre-disposed to be something of a window-dresser. It was interesting to me that the member spent almost the whole of his time trying to convince us that such was not the case.

There is an old phrase, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." I think that applies aptly to the member for Gawler because, if the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs were not inclined to advertise himself and his doings, why is it that, on every occasion when it is possible to do so, he draws the attention of the public, through the press, to the fact that he is the first in Australia to do this or that? Why was it that, when he completely removed the liquor restrictions in respect of Aborigines, he caused a feature to be made in his press announcement that this was the first State in Australia to do this?

Admittedly, he was correct in fact. However, I point out to the member for Gawler that the Minister saw fit to make a particular feature of the fact that he was the instigator of his move. I have rather mixed feelings about the wisdom of that move. I have been away for six months and this change has been in operation during that time. Since I have come back I have re-assessed the effect of some of these things and am somewhat disturbed at the results that are flowing from this

rather precipitate move. However, there will probably be opportunity to discuss that matter more fully in another debate. I think that, in his haste to draw attention and notoriety to himself about what he has been doing and intends to do in this rather complex field of Aboriginal administration, he threw caution to the winds and went for honour and glory rather than a cautious approach. Why was it that, when he introduced this measure (and I think he mentioned this in his explanation) he again took care to ensure that he announced in the press that he was the first Minister in the Commonwealth to introduce this sort of legislation for Aborigines? That may be correct, but why make such a personal song and dance about it? I believe the member for Alexandra was perfectly justified in the circumstances in drawing attention to this fact. I say advisedly and with all the force I can muster that the administration of Aboriginal affairs in South Australia and throughout the Commonwealth, and of similar matters throughout the world, should not be a subject on which to base political kudos or personal notoriety. It is far bigger and of much greater import than that. We are dealing with people, and this is not an occasion for vainglory or self-advancement.

The member for Gawler said the Bill had the full support of members on his side of the House. In tonight's *News* appears a reference to two members of the Commonwealth Labor Party being disciplined because they dared, out of their own experience and knowledge, to criticize some part of the policy or doings of their Party. Therefore, heaven help a member of the Labor Party in this House if he does not support the legislation introduced. I do not consider the solidarity amongst members of the Government Party on this Bill is a recommendation. There might have been a majority of one or two in the Party in favour of it, and once the Party decided that the Bill should be introduced, every member of that Party was obliged to support it.

The Bill leaves me with grave doubts and, possibly, some misunderstandings as to just what the Minister intends to do. For that reason, I entirely support the amendment. In legislation of this type, one should not set out merely to say something in words. Rather, one should set out to do something practical and of real benefit to people. Therefore, a measure such as this should certainly not be misleading, as it could then raise false hopes. Such a measure should be really worthwhile.

I asked myself: does this Bill comply with these requirements? I doubt very much that it does. It seems to me that it does nothing to advance the welfare of the Aboriginal people. It sounds good: it sounds as if we are, with the stroke of a pen, righting a deep and long-established wrong. It sounds as if we are attempting to repay a debt, which is assumed to be a just one (although I shall have some comment to make on that aspect later). This is the kind of legislation that probably appeals to many people who feel a small or a substantial moral obligation to put right what they believe is a long-standing wrong.

The Bill also arises from measures taken in North America, particularly with regard to compensation paid by the Administration in the United States in respect to tribal lands which American Indians occupied over a long period and which they inhabited not as nomads but as a fixed population in a given area. Honourable members will appreciate that, in making that comment, I draw a distinction between circumstances in North America and those in Australia. I do not intend to go into details, because the members for Alexandra and Burra have already referred to the matter and I do not want to labour the point. In his second reading explanation, the Minister traced the history of land settlement in South Australia from the advent of the white population in the early 1800's and referred to the way it was expected they would handle the land situation. I believe that possibly no real criticism can be directed at the founders of the State for the way they handled this matter. As the proposals set out on that occasion were completely unworkable, naturally they fell to the ground when an attempt was made to apply them practically. Before the white man came this country had, apart from marsupials, no domestic or edible animals or indigenous cereals, fruits, or garden flowers. All these things were brought here by white people from overseas and we are still bringing things from overseas. I know that the Aborigines were pushed back as the frontiers of civilization advanced, but it was not all on the debit side. The Aborigines were quick to take advantage of the benefits civilization brought here. The white man brought many comforts, benefits, hopes and helps to the Aborigines. Of course, the proposal to reserve certain lands for them broke down because it was impossible effectively to reserve small portions of any land grant for this purpose. Even had this proposal been carried out it would have resulted only in small batches of land being

reserved here, there and everywhere, which would have had no practical value and application.

We cannot set the clock back or undo the past, so we must look to the future. I suppose that the Minister believes he is looking to the future in this Bill. However, if he pins his hopes on what the Bill is likely to do, he and all the people for whom he presumes to act in this matter and for whom it is his duty to act will be gravely disappointed. Let us take the Bill at its face value, assuming that we really do know something of what it means. In fact, I do not think we know what it means, and I will need to know more about it before I am prepared to support it. As I do not want any misapprehension about my attitude to this matter, I refer to my reputation in Aboriginal affairs administration, which I think will stand me in some stead. I believe it is generally understood that I am genuinely in sympathy with Aboriginal welfare and that, during my term of office, I did my best and achieved something practical, at any rate, towards the advancement and welfare of Aborigines. I affirm that I am in sympathy with any genuine, proper and practical move to improve their lot and to enable them to fit into this community on the basis of either integration or assimilation, which I believe is the end product of integration—in this particular case, anyway, taking into account the physiological aspects and the relationships existing between the two races of people. I believe that assimilation is the ultimate result and a happy solution to these problems.

So I do not approach this Bill with any bias against the Aboriginal people. On the contrary, I approach it cautiously, because I do not want people's hopes to be raised or people to be affected by a false expectation that something will occur that will not occur; but, so far as I can see at this moment without further inquiry, I cannot perceive that any good will come of this legislation. However, let us take it at its face value and see what it looks like. At present, according to the Minister's second reading explanation, there are a number of small reserves, both occupied and unoccupied, as listed on page 474 of this year's *Hansard*, totalling about 7,000 acres. Of the 26 listed in *Hansard*, six only are occupied and 20 are not. I suspect it is the Minister's purpose when he hands over these small pieces of land to the trust that the trust should realize on them. At present the trust has no money and I do not think the Government has much, either; so, in order to get

some capital to set about its development schemes, the trust must have some money to use and I suggest it will probably offer these 26 reserves, or most of them, to the adjoining landholders or throw them open to application in the usual way, to realize upon them in order to get some money with which to establish itself. So these reserves will disappear from the list of reserves, for what they are worth. I have heard that there is strong opposition, and indeed some resentment, in the area where some of these reserves are situated against the possibility of their being disposed of, but I will leave that to the member for the district to discuss more fully.

I believe that that is what the Minister has in mind that the trust will probably do. It is provided that the Minister may pay to the trust by way of grant or by way of loan, or both, such sums as he thinks proper. The Minister in his second reading explanation said:

In due course further areas, useful for Aborigines, could be acquired and title provided to the Aboriginal people. The Government, therefore, proposes to ensure land rights to Aborigines in this State, but to go further, and, as a matter of specific compensation to the Aboriginal people, to ensure to them control of mineral rights in any lands held as Aboriginal lands beyond those given to other citizens.

I suggest the Minister is proposing that the trust shall have the right to buy additional lands for development purposes and for the settlement of Aboriginal families thereon. I draw attention to the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962, because the provision to enable the board to acquire land to sell to Aboriginal families and to establish them thereon and to establish them in business already exists in the 1962 Act, section 21 of which states:

The Minister may, on the recommendation of the board and the Surveyor-General, allot to any Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood, any Crown lands available for settlement, or may, on such recommendation as aforesaid, purchase land for occupation by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood, and allot the same, and any such allotment shall be upon such terms and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by regulation. What need have we for a repetition of this provision in another Bill? It is set out completely in the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962. I had some hand in the framing of that legislation. This provision was inserted deliberately for the very purpose for which the Minister now proposes to ask the House to agree to this legislation.

Why are we proposing to take away from the board the power that this section gives

it to settle Aborigines on land, and give that power to a trust? Is this a vote of no confidence in the Aboriginal Affairs Board? I do not know, but this power exists already and I want to know whether the present Minister has any intention of using it for the purpose for which it was designed. If not, why is he proposing to duplicate this provision in other legislation? Then section 22 goes a little further in this matter of assistance.

Mr. Bockelberg: It is a very pertinent section.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Section 22 states (and this, again, is a section that I specifically had inserted in this Act):

The board may, subject to the approval of the Minister, provide special assistance, either financial or otherwise, on such terms as it thinks fit, to an Aboriginal or a person of Aboriginal blood to assist him to establish himself in primary, mechanical or business pursuits.

Mr. Nankivell: That is a wider sphere.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a very much wider sphere. Why do we want other legislation? This section is very much wider than just being a matter of providing land: it is to "provide special assistance, either financial or otherwise, on such terms as the board thinks fit, to an Aboriginal or a person of Aboriginal blood, to assist him to establish himself in primary, mechanical or business pursuits". Those words were carefully chosen. The natural aptitudes of Aboriginal people, as I have discovered them, are to work in rural occupations. Incidentally, it is a mistake to assume that the Aboriginal is a natural horseman, because he is not. He has aptitudes as a horseman. He learns quickly to ride a horse, but there were no horses here before the white man came. However, the Aboriginal has a natural aptitude in that direction. He has a natural aptitude, too, for the handling of stock. He is a good sheep and cattle man when he is taught how to do these things—but he has to be taught. The Act provides for "primary, mechanical or business pursuits". As the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) pointed out, many Aboriginal people are good with things mechanical. They do not necessarily understand what goes on inside a distributor or how a coil boosts the primary to the secondary voltage but, given a mechanical device to operate and to care for, they usually do it very well.

In the area represented by the honourable member for Eyre we have had several examples of these aptitudes, because in the township of

Ceduna there were two or three such Aborigines, one of whom was the proprietor of a most successful garage. We thought we should therefore encourage people to go into this sort of business if they had the capacity and if they proved themselves to be capable, so we enlarged this section to provide assistance for that sort of thing. We also widened it by including the term "business pursuits", which was a very wide term and which would enable the board to give financial assistance or advice, or both, to any person who had the aptitude to go into business on his own. I wonder just what more this Bill the Minister has brought before us can do in respect of that particular matter than can the Aboriginal Affairs Act. In addition, there is under the Crown Lands Act certain special provisions which one of my colleagues will deal with when he speaks. This Act contains a provision which would enable this assistance to be given.

Those are some of the things I want to know before I lend my support to this Bill. It certainly appears on the face of it that we are duplicating provisions that already exist. With very great respect to the lands trust to be set up, I do not know who the personnel of the trust will be. I do not suggest that they will not be capable people, because I believe there are and that there could be found very capable people of Aboriginal blood to act on such a trust. However, they will of necessity, of course, lack experience in this sort of administration. I suggest that the powers and functions of this trust when it is set up will be greater than those of the Aboriginal Affairs Board. In fact, it will become almost completely unfettered in the things that it can do. The trust will have the right to buy and sell large tracts of land, and it can sell, I imagine, the North-West Reserve if it decides to do so. It will certainly have wider powers than has the present Aboriginal Affairs Board.

Mr. McKee: It would need to, wouldn't it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know. I wish the honourable member would inform himself before he makes a remark of that sort, because the Aboriginal Affairs Board has very wide powers, as I have already mentioned. Indeed, that board, with the Minister acting in consort with it, can do almost anything regarding Aboriginal affairs.

Mr. McKee: They have not done it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know exactly what the powers of the trust will be, and I think we ought to know these things. I do not think it is proper for this Parliament to delegate to any group of people powers

which are greater than those possessed by the Minister or those vested in the statutory board set up to assist the Minister in his administration of a department. I think that is quite wrong. It has been suggested that perhaps the Minister will exercise a very strong influence over the trust. However, I do not know whether he can. If he tries to do so, he might get rather a rude shock, because he might find that the Aboriginal Lands Trust, having been given these powers, will perhaps say to the Minister, "We will look after our affairs; you look after yours." It is proposed to give extremely wide powers to the trust.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is all subject to the Minister's approval.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

It is proposed to transfer all unoccupied reserve lands in the State and all occupied reserve lands not supervised either by the Government or by a mission when the residents of those lands indicate that they wish the lands to be held by the trust.

Well, I suppose that to some extent it might be possible to determine the wishes of those people. However, I think that they may express a view which the Minister will be probably obliged to accept as being a well-informed view but which in actual fact cannot possibly be a well-informed view. For example, when I last visited Yalata (admittedly that was about 18 months to two years ago) I saw people living in a camp outside the Yalata mission. They were semi-nomadic, and they lived for the most part in fairly close proximity to the mission because they got so much assistance from it and their children were attending the mission school; but they were closely associated with the people of Granite Downs, and frequently they made walkabout trips to and from that particularly important tribal ceremonial area.

Intelligent as they may be in self-preservation, intelligent as they may be in understanding the signs of Nature, I doubt very much whether they are sufficiently educated to understand what is meant when they are asked whether or not they want the Yalata mission, for example, to be transferred to an Aboriginal Lands Trust. I would suggest that they would agree because it would be represented to them that this was a great thing for the Aborigines, but whether they would understand it I do not know, and I doubt very much whether, with the best will in the world, the Minister or the officers of the department would get a really intelligent and well-informed view

from such people as to what their wishes were regarding this matter.

If we go farther north to Granite Downs or Everard Park or up to Ernabella or across the way to Musgrave Park or out from there into the western end of the cattle country towards the Western Australian border, we find that the farther we go the more acute the problem becomes. Only the other day I heard that the Minister was causing a survey to be made and a census of Aboriginal people throughout the State. I believe it was the Director of the Aboriginal Affairs Department who made the comment that it would take some years to make a proper census and return of the people who lived in those areas, and I agree with him, because I have been up and down and across that area on three occasions and I believe I can say that I know the country and the problem involved in discovering and listing the Aboriginal people there. Indeed, there is an area north of Maralinga on the Western Australian border in which we believe there are tribal natives with whom white men have not yet succeeded in making contact. Strong evidence of their existence was seen from the air, such as their camp fires at night, and their footmarks were seen in the loose countryside, but the white man has not succeeded in making contact with them. How are we, in an area as vast as the North-West of this State, going to get from those Aborigines an intelligent and informed view about the surrendering of their lands to an Aboriginal Lands Trust? I ask that in all sincerity. I do not believe we can get an intelligent view and, therefore, I do not believe that these people should be committed to something when they do not and cannot understand (through no fault of theirs) just what is being done.

We get down now to the rather crucial situation as to just what can be achieved when this trust is set up, if it is set up. The primary purpose of such a trust is to assist in the development of lands and to settle Aboriginal families on the land. As the member for Burra pointed out, we can exclude the North-West Reserve from the possibility of settlement. When we established the out-stations on Musgrave Park we prospected around the foothills of the ranges to the west, and found useful spots where some stock water could be obtained at reasonably shallow depths, but away from the foothills the country is waterless possibly for 250 miles to the south. The natives live on the water they get from the desert kurrajong, which contains water in the roots, and they cut it up and drain it into a vessel. That is their water supply.

A vast area south of the southern boundary of the Aboriginal reserve has not been applied for as pastoral lease because no water is underneath it. It is beautiful country with every species of mulga and many valuable fodder trees in their virgin state, but nothing is underneath it and it cannot be used for running cattle. I suggest to the Minister that he reconsider the possibility of adding to the North-West Reserve much of this country to the south of it, and which is contiguous to it. I suggested to Cabinet that this be done, and the proposal was referred to the Pastoral Board which, when we left office, was to look at it again before it was transferred to Aboriginal reserves. I have heard nothing more of it, but perhaps the Minister could consider this proposition. It has some value as a reserve and may as well be used for that purpose, as it has no other use. It cannot be occupied on a living-area basis, except for the small areas adjacent to the foothills of the ranges where water is available in small quantities.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You don't take the view that the Aboriginal cannot be a good cattle man because he was once a nomad?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I do not.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is what we heard from other members on your side of the House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have had experience of Aborigines, but perhaps I may be too optimistic.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I agree with what you did.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I may be over-optimistic, but I did not suggest we could make a good cattle man out of a nomadic Aboriginal in 24 hours by putting him on a horse and giving him cattle to look after.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I was not suggesting that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is a great fallacy and should be emphasized by me, the Minister and his colleague.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The honourable member knows me well enough to know that I would not entertain such a thought, and my colleague does not think so, either.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We are not joining issue on this matter. I believe there is a possibility for selected Aborigines to make good, but their number will be few compared with the total population. The greatest problem is the inherent nomadic characteristic that takes some generations to control. It will never be eliminated because it is so much a part of them, and will take time to control.

The total land available in this State that is dedicated as Aboriginal reserves would not provide a living for more than 50 families: I suggest 25 would be nearer the mark. The people at Koonibba came to me in a deputation and asked that the mission be allocated to them so that they could manage it as a communal farm. I suggested they were under a misapprehension because, however well they managed it, it could not provide a living, without departmental assistance, for more than about four families. They were shocked at my analysis; they thought there was some magic in creating a communal farm out of Koonibba and disputed my contention about this, until I had discussed the matter with them at some length. Point Pearce has a good area of land. I have forgotten the total acreage—

Mr. Ferguson: 40,000!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Much of it is rough country towards the island, and I suggest that only three or four families at the most could settle there. Although the area at Point McLeay is limited, it has perhaps a higher potential an acre than the other land I have mentioned, but the number of people it could successfully support would be strictly limited. Gerard probably has the highest potential of any lands dedicated for reserves; it contains a valuable irrigation area, and the Minister could develop and settle families on each part of it tomorrow, if he wished, for he has the control of it.

I hope I have established that a sound reason for the amendment exists. Why do we have this Bill? What will it do for Aboriginal people in this State that existing legislation does not enable the Minister and the board to do? How will it function beneficially? Will its passage arouse unjustified hopes in the Aborigines? That is a real fear in my mind: doing something that will arouse lively expectations which are not eventually realized will do grievous harm. I believe this legislation will be a flop for the Aborigines.

Mr. McKee: Do you believe that, or would you like it to be so? How do you know it will be a flop?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is my view.

Mr. McKee: I think it is only your view.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I know it is not the honourable member's. He dare not have such a view; if he entertained any doubts, he dare not express them.

Mr. Coumbe: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member expressed them he would get what I notice the Commonwealth members are getting in today's *News*.

Mr. Ryan: You were going pretty well up to then but you have crashed now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The member for Port Pirie knows that would happen. I have a genuine doubt, and my approach to the matter is also genuine. If any real good can come out of this measure I shall probably change my mind. However, I wish to know more about it and, in fact, the Minister in his second reading explanation said that officers of the department and other people would be only too willing to supply information about the matter to inquirers. Let us have an inquiry and obtain some information.

Mr. Shannon: Other people may be able to supply some information, too.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have some questions of members of the board that I would not venture to raise at present.

Mr. Lawn: But "Mrs. Whippy" objects to the cost of too many inquiries!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There need not be any cost.

Mr. McKee: There need be no more inquiries; there have been plenty.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member for Flinders.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, Mr. Speaker, because I was not talking at the time. There are inquiries and inquiries, and I do not intend that thousands of dollars shall be spent on this investigation, nor has my colleague suggested that. An inquiry by a Select Committee would cost little, and the member who interjected knows that.

I intended to discuss other aspects of the Bill, but I now conclude by saying to the Minister, whatever happens to this Bill and to the amendment moved by the member for Alexandra, "Hands off the North-West Reserve." I say that definitely and sincerely. If he sets up a trust that has power to dispose of, or settle cattle or sheep on, that reserve, he will do a great dis-service to the Aboriginal people of the State.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 21, at 2 p.m.