HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 26, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

SHIPPING COSTS.

Mr. HALL: A report in today's *News* states that the Australian Citrus Growers Federation has protested to the Commonwealth Minister for Trade (Hon. J. McEwen) about the proposed increases in shipping freights to Britain and the Continent. As the Premier said last week that Cabinet was discussing the proposed freight increases, will he say whether Cabinet has come to any conclusions about the possible effect of the increases on the South Australian industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cabinet forwarded a letter last week to the Prime Minister concerning this matter. As yet, no reply has been received.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 6 when I requested to know who would come within the provisions of section 21 (1) (*e*) of the Citrus Industry Organization Act to enable them to obtain an exemption on the ground of their being producers of a small quantity of citrus fruit?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Any person who carries on the business of producing citrus fruit for sale is subject to the control of the committee. The quantity of citrus grown for sale is not the only determining factor, and every case is treated on its merits. If the name of the person referred to by the honourable member is supplied the case will be investigated.

MODBURY SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my question of July 20 about the connection of sewerage to the Modbury South Primary School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The new Modbury South Primary School will be provided with a sewer connection on the trunk sewer to be constructed along the banks of the Dry Creek in connection with the trunk sewer system for Tea Tree Gully. The work is programmed to commence on this trunk sewer in November, 1966, and it is expected that a sewer connection will be provided to the school by February, 1967.

RESERVOIRS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Following the rains during the weekend and today, can the Minister of Works say how much water is held in metropolitan and northern reservoirs at present, compared with the storages at this time last year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am unable to give figures showing the comparison in respect of the northern reservoirs, but I shall inquire and inform the honourable member. The position with the metropolitan reservoirs is as follows:

Reservoirs.	Present Storage.	Intake for 24 Hours.
Mount Bold . . .	2,402,900,000	277,800,000
Happy Valley . .	1,631,700,000	38,700,000
Clarendon Weir	62,300,000	—1,400,000
Myponga	2,213,400,000	40,600,000
Millbrook	1,131,900,000	74,200,000
Hope Valley . . .	390,600,000	19,700,000
Thorndon Park	103,100,000	nil
Wattle Park . .	2,700,000	—300,000
Warren	344,000,000	28,000,000
South Para . . .	3,967,000,000	17,000,000

At present the total storage in the metropolitan reservoirs is about 7,000,000,000 gallons whereas last year at this time it was 10,000,000,000 gallons, so that the storage is 3,000,000,000 gallons less than it was at this time last year. Off-peak pumping must continue as a safety measure, but I assure the House that the position will be watched and, if necessary, full-time pumping will be commenced. Every precaution will be taken to ensure that an ample supply of water is available to industry during the coming year.

NAPPERBY AND NELSHABY AREA.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a report on water supplies in the Napperby and Nelshaby area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Mr. Speaker, I say in fairness to you that, following representations made by you and growers in the area, Cabinet decided to set up a committee of inquiry, and that committee has recommended that no changes be made to the existing conditions. I strongly urge that no further settlements take place in the area, as it will be clear from the report that the department considers that it is not its function to provide water reticulation for vegetable production. However, I am honour bound to make the report available first to you, Mr. Speaker, and then I shall make it available to the honourable member to use as he sees fit.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 27, according to an announcement made by the Premier, Cabinet decided that a proclamation would be issued bringing into effect the section of the Road Traffic Act providing for the compulsory installation of seat belts. As I understand that as yet the proclamation has not been made, can the Premier explain the reason for the delay, and say when it is likely to be made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall try to ascertain why the proclamation has not been made. The Government has not changed its mind on whether seat belts will be required.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. CLARK: Numerous complaints have been made to me in the past and, I am sure, to other members as well—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask for leave if he wishes to explain the question.

Mr. CLARK: I am sorry, Sir. I ask for leave and for the concurrence of the House. As numerous complaints have been made to me about the delay in hearing civil cases in the Supreme Court, can the Attorney-General say whether the position has improved, and will he outline the present situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I told the House earlier this session that the situation had improved. The present situation is that the civil list as at August 11, 1965, before calling over contained 444 cases. During September, 1965, cases heard in the ordinary way were set down up to the beginning of September, 1964. The average interval between setting down and hearing was, at that time, 13 months. The civil list as at July 15, 1966, which was called over on July 21 last, contained, before calling over, 167 cases. Cases listed for hearing during August were set down up to the middle of April, 1966. The average interval between setting down and hearing will be 4½ months. The civil list is thus approaching what the Master considers to be a desirable situation, when cases set down for trial are listed for hearing about three months later. The Master reports that that situation will certainly exist at some time before the end of the year.

The defended matrimonial list, as at September 30, 1965, contained 126 suits, and those tried during October, 1965, were set down up to mid-August, 1964. The average interval was thus about 15 months. The defended matrimonial list as at July 15, 1966, called over on July 21 last contained 77 suits, and suits listed for hearing in August were set down up to the end of September, 1965. The average interval will be 11½ months. Although the state of that list has improved, it is still unsatisfactory, and it is intended to ask two judges to hear defended suits in September. By the end of the year it is hoped that the delay will be down to eight to nine months. Defended matrimonial matters are less susceptible to settlement than are civil cases, and it may be some time in the latter part of next year before that list is in as good a position as that of the general civil list. The undefended matrimonial list is up to date, and suits are heard usually during the month after the month in which they are set down. The Master adds that from observations made, the situation in this State is markedly better than that in the Eastern States.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: An article appears in this morning's *Advertiser* headed "Super Price Up In N.S.W.". Although I wish to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture, I will not ask it of him as Minister in charge of prices, which I know he is not. Although I am concerned about the possibility of a price increase, I shall ask the Minister about two other matters inherent in the press report. Incidentally, the report states that the price of superphosphate has been increased by $3.10 in New South Wales. The reason for the increase is stated by the companies to be that the price of phosphate rock has been increased by $3.50 a ton, and that of sulphur by $7.75 a ton. The companies have also announced that an off-peak rebate of $1.50 a ton is available in August, September and October. First, with regard to the price of sulphur, for a long time the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie has been a large supplier of sulphuric acid to the superphosphate industry in South Australia, although I am not sure that I am up to date on what proportion of the total requirements of sulphuric acid it supplies. This has an effect on the impact of the increased price of sulphur. Will the Minister make inquiries on this matter as a preliminary to further inquiries into the possibility of a price rise? For instance, could he bring down a report showing the latest figures concerning what part of the total requirements of sulphuric acid is supplied by the B.H.A.S. at Port Pirie to the Port Pirie, Wallaroo and Port Adelaide works? My second question relates to the statement made in the press about the off-peak rebate. The article states:

The rebate will apply to all bulk superphosphate spread under group plan.

I do not know what is the position in New South Wales with regard to the group plan spreading of superphosphate. However, it has come to my knowledge (and I think I am reliably informed) that operators of group spreading arrangements in South Australia receive a priority in delivery, and possibly also in price, as against the ordinary user of superphosphate. Will the Minister inquire whether I am reliably informed? If I am, will he ascertain what is the reason for this preference to certain users of superphosphate over ordinary users who pay just as promptly and lodge their orders at the proper time?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Premier and his department would be aware of the increased price of superphosphate that now applies in the Eastern States. He would also be aware of the control the Prices Commissioner has in this State over the price of superphosphate. In the absence of the Premier, will the Minister of Works ascertain what attitude the Prices Commissioner is taking with regard to superphosphate prices in this State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that the Government is watching the position with much interest, and I shall be happy to ask the Premier (as Minister controlling the Prices Department) to obtain a report.

GLENELG SUNSHINE CLUB.

Mr. HUDSON: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: Last Wednesday the Leader of the Opposition, in asking a question of the Premier, read a letter and presented a petition from members of the Glenelg Sunshine Club. The form of his statements and of the letter from which he quoted implied that remarks I had made on past occasions about the Glenelg Sunshine Club were not accurate in all respects. The Leader of the Opposition said:

There are 41 signatures to the petition, and I am informed that there are about 50 members in the club.

The implication of that remark is that any disharmony in the club relates only to a very small and distinct minority, and that the account I had given of the happenings was therefore inaccurate. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to distinguish between the members of the club and residents of flats run by the club. There are two groups of flats, one group being at Ramsgate Street, where four people live, and the other at Sussex Street, over half a mile away.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is not making a personal explanation of any matter at all: he is starting to debate the question, and I take it he should not be allowed to do that at this stage.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been refused.

Later:

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week the Leader of the Opposition read from a letter which implied that the member for Glenelg was inaccurate in the account he gave to the House about trouble existing within the Glenelg Sunshine Club. Can the member for Glenelg provide me and the House with information that will refute that imputation?

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Glenelg wish to reply?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question because I have further information which I should like to give to the House, and which I am sure the honourable member would like also. The petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition last week, which he said was signed by 41 people (and he added that he had been informed that there were about 50 members in the club), carried an implication that the account I had given of the happenings within the Glenelg Sunshine Club had been inaccurate. A distinction must be made between members of the club and the residents in any of the flats run by the club. There are two groups of flats: one at Ramsgate Street, Glenelg and the other (over half a mile away) at Sussex Street, Glenelg. At Ramsgate Street, four people live, and at Sussex Street, apart from the President of the club and her husband, there are nine residents. I have always understood that the position at Ramsgate Street is satisfactory and that the people there are happy with their current circumstances. However, the position at Sussex Street, where, as I have stated, the President and her husband live, is different. Of the nine people, other than the President and her husband, who live in the Sussex Street flats, only one signed the petition presented to the Premier by the Leader of the Opposition, whereas seven signed the petition I presented to the Chief Secretary earlier this year. I now have signed statements from six of the seven and a further statement from the son of the seventh resident, who is an old lady of

87 now in Northfield Hospital. Of the nine people apart from the President and her husband who live in the Sussex Street flats, five have been refused membership of the club. Although they were previously members when the dispute arose in 1963, their membership was refused. When these facts are considered it is quite clear that the trouble is confined to the flats at Sussex Street and that the position there is a serious one. The position I have taken in relation to this matter is supported by the overwhelming majority of residents at the Sussex Street flats. In the letter quoted by the Leader of the Opposition last week it was stated:

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.

Mr. Speaker, the petition I presented to the Chief Secretary did not refer to life members: it referred to people having life tenancy agreements with the club. Life membership was not in question. What was in question was the disputes that have arisen in relation to these life tenancy agreements. Furthermore, it was denied in the letter that the annual general meeting had not been held. The rules of the club laid out certain procedures for the conduct of annual general meetings. I have a signed statement here which says, amongst other things:

I would also like to state here that at no time since I have been a member of the Sunshine Club have I been given notice of an annual meeting.

The letter that was quoted by the Leader of the Opposition also stated this:

How does Hugh Hudson know of the workings or anything else connected with the club? He is not nor never has been a member, and we doubt if he has ever heard of the club before entering Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, that statement is completely false. I heard of the club and of the doings connected with it back in 1963 some two years prior to my becoming a member of this Parliament, and since I have been a member I have become associated with the residents of the Sussex Street flats who have been having this continual trouble with the club itself. I have a very high opinion of these residents, and the more I get to know them the more I feel that I should support their case, and that I am morally bound to support their case. It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that one of these residents at the Sussex Street flats was elected last year as President of the Glenelg Senior Citizens Club. He is also a vice-president of the Glenelg Pensioners Association, and a member of the State Board of the Old Age and Invalid Pensioners Association of South Australia. I refer to Mr. George Partridge, who is a highly respected member of the community. I have made previous attempts behind the scenes to try to smooth over the happenings within these flats, and on one occasion last year, at the request of Mr. and Mrs. O'Neill, I went to visit Mr. and Mrs. O'Neill and heard their side of the story. They must have forgotten that particular occasion. I should like to quote from one or two of the statements I have here. I will leave out the more serious allegations. Mr. Speaker, this is a statement from the son of the 87-year-old lady:

My mother took up residence in a flat of the Glenelg Sunshine Club in April, 1961, and for the greater part of this time she has been subjected to repeated humiliations and intimidation by both Mr. and Mrs. O'Neill. She is abused and insulted in the street with such remarks as, "There goes the old cow, she ought to be dead long ago." She has been forbidden to talk to or associate with other tenants, and on one occasion when she went to the help of Mrs. Dowling, who had taken ill, she was abused by Mrs. O'Neill and told that she was not to associate with those people . . . For years now my mother has avoided meeting either Mr. or Mrs. O'Neill because of the abuse and unpleasant things that are said to her by them. Some weeks ago she suffered a severe breakdown and is at present in Northfield Hospital. I would say without hesitation that the illness she is now recovering from is in a large measure due to the tension and stress under which she has lived in this flat for which she has paid down a lump sum on taking up residence and for which she has paid regularly the weekly rental agreed upon at the time of her commencing to live there.

Mr. Speaker, there are other matters in these statements which I could refer to and which are more serious than the ones I have just quoted. The main burden, however, of the people who live at the Sussex Street flats run by the Glenelg Sunshine Club can be summarized by the statement given by Mr. and Mrs. Dowling, as follows:

We like the home we have made here very much, and only ask for non-interference in our private life, freedom from threats, continuation of our membership of the Glenelg Sunshine Club, and the honouring of the agreement between us and the club *re* tenancy.

Mr. Speaker, I support completely the position of those members of this club who are residents of the Sussex Street flats, and I hope that their complaints will be rectified soon.

LAND TAX BILL.

Mrs. STEELE: On Thursday last week the Treasurer asked for leave to insert two tables in

Hansard in connection with the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill. One table was the comparative South Australian land taxes of recent years, and the other showed the comparative yield per head of States in the Commonwealth. Only one of these tables, that relating to yields per head, appeared in the *Hansard* pull that was available to members after Thursday. The table showing the comparative South Australian land taxes of recent years is considered by members of the Opposition to be of great importance in the debate which will ensue, and this table did not appear. Also, the Bill was placed on members' files only this morning. Will the Treasurer consider adjourning the debate on this Bill so that members may have an opportunity to study these two tables?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: To the best of my knowledge, last Thursday I gave the Leader of the Opposition a copy of the Bill, which was in print, and a copy of the second reading explanation. I also lent a copy of the second reading explanation to the Deputy Leader, the member for Flinders. To the best of my knowledge, the tables appear in *Hansard.*

Mrs. Steele: There was only one table in the pull: both tables are in *Hansard,* but not in the pull.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not want to inconvenience the Leader in any way, but I had hoped he would be ready to go on this afternoon. However, if he is not ready to go on he can let me know and we will make some other arrangements. I should have thought, after what had been done, that the Opposition would be ready. However, I shall be able to give a better indication later this afternoon.

LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. HURST: Last week I was approached by a constituent of mine concerning his intention to purchase a block of land and a house from a land agent. He paid a deposit for the block on July 15 this year, and his receipt states that it is issued subject to cancellation of the existing contract. He gave me a copy of the contract showing special conditions attached to it. He has since been informed that the property has been sold to another person. It seems from what my constituent has said, and from the wording on the receipt and contract, that the land agent accepted two deposits from different people while trying to sell this property. Will the Attorney-General investigate this matter to see whether any action can be taken against land agents adopting this practice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will give me the details of this transaction I will refer it to the Land Agents Board immediately for investigation.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. COUMBE: It is reported in this morning's *Advertiser* that a New South Wales judge has awarded damages to a Government worker engaged as a maintenance worker on the Sydney Harbour bridge, who on his way home from work played squash and thereby injured his eye severely. The court, holding that this was not a substantial deviation from his normal way home, awarded him substantial damages. Because of the amendments to this section by the Act passed in this House last year, and because Government and other employers are seriously concerned with this matter, will the Attorney-General inquire whether a similar occurrence could be caught and covered by the recent amendments to the Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot promise that the Government can do anything in this area, but I shall consider the case when the report comes to hand and inform the Minister of Labour and Industry of its effect on the amendments passed in this House last year.

BERRI ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. CURREN: An urgent need exists for building blocks in Berri. As I understand that plans for the McDonell and Schrapel subdivisions have been considered, can the Minister of Lands indicate the present position concerning them?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Arrangements are well advanced for the purchase by the South Australian Housing Trust of 28 allotments in the McDonell subdivision. A further 13 allotments for residential purposes (10 facing Mortimer Road and three facing Tipper Street) together with one allotment for church purposes are expected to be gazetted open to application from the general public early in September. Following discussion with the Chairman of the District Council of Berri, it has been agreed to defer the offer of four business sites at this stage, pending more definite information about the practicability of arranging for these sites to be offered and occupied as a shopping centre. A reticulated water service is now available to the 10 allotments facing Mortimer Road, and it is planned to have water mains laid for the remaining allotments by the time they are allotted.

Documents relating to the purchase of the land in the Schrapel subdivision were forwarded to the agent for the vendor on May 31, 1966, but have not yet been returned for settlement. The subdivision survey and the preparation of detail cannot be completed until land purchase is finalized. It is, therefore, not possible to state when land is this locality will be offered for allotment.

MOUNT COMPASS WATER SCHEME.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my recent question about the Mount Compass water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has now forwarded me a report on the proposal to supply water from a bore in the township following the preparation of estimates of cost and revenue. The report states:

The revenue return from the scheme is low and would not cover working expenses. Mount Compass is in a high rainfall area and in view of the present difficulties in obtaining funds for schemes which give reasonable returns, it is not possible to recommend a scheme operated by the department for Mount Compass.

DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the placing of water accounts in letter-boxes?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

Consideration has been given to the method of delivering rate notices by hand. In fact, this method was originally used by the department, but was abandoned in favour of postage. Compared with the methods of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, there are certain practical difficulties which tend to make the proposition less favourable financially. Most consumers of electricity are themselves responsible for payment of accounts, and this means that the persons delivering accounts can work with greater productivity as they do not have to pass many premises without delivering an account. With water rates, however, in many cases the rates are payable by owners and not by the occupant. A more serious difficulty is that whilst the trust has established a continual reading cycle and has an even work load from day to day throughout the year, this department, in order to collect its revenue within each financial year, will have to render accounts quickly in the first few weeks of each quarter. This will require a much larger staff than the present staff of meter readers, to deliver accounts in the required time, after which a percentage of them will be surplus to requirements.

TARNMA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a buffer tank for the Tarnma water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The approved water supply scheme for Tarnma includes the provision of a 30,000-gallon reinforced concrete tank at the end of the main. Following a call for tenders for the construction of the tank, a satisfactory price has been received and I have today given approval for its acceptance. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that the tank is expected to be completed and in operation for the coming summer.

KEPPOCH ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say whether any truth exists in the rumour that the single wire earth return system for the Keppoch No. 2 area is to be delayed for 12 months?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is the first I have heard of such a move.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There's a bit of a whispering campaign going on down there.

Mr. Rodda: That's the first I've heard of that!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall have an inquiry made, and inform the honourable member of the outcome.

OAKLANDS HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week relating to the name of the new high school to be situated on Oaklands Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The name "Oaklands High School" was probably given when the original request was made for a site in this area, as at that time it was suggested that the school should be on the opposite side of Oaklands Road. I have carefully considered the honourable member's two suggestions as alternative names for the school, and have also considered a strong plea from the Postmaster-General's Department that where possible new schools should be named in such a way as to avoid confusion between postal districts. Such confusion can result in late delivery or even non-delivery of important items of mail. The South Australian State Planning Office, which has also been consulted, and the Postmaster-General's Department both agree that geographically the new school would be more appropriately called Glengowrie High School, and I have therefore approved of the school being so named.

ABORIGINAL OFFENCES.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my recent question regarding Aboriginal convictions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A newspaper report last week purported to give information from a police report concerning the number of offences committed by Aborigines in the Far Northern Division No. 17, and that press report was linked with the giving of drinking rights to Aborigines. Unfortunately, the figures quoted related not to offences concerning liquor or arising from the drinking of liquor but to total offences, including many offences having no relationship to liquor at all. The liquor situation has been under investigation for some time now by the research officers of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, and I am able to give members detailed information on this score. Reference was made in the newspaper to the total number of offences committed by Aborigines having increased since they were given full drinking rights, but the only figures published were for total offences and not specifically for drinking offences. Our information has been completed for Port Augusta, Ceduna and Port Victoria, and we have information that is not entirely complete for Oodnadatta, Marree, Leigh Creek and Coober Pedy. However, the information that we have for those areas shows the trends. The two places specifically selected in the newspaper reports were Oodnadatta and Port Augusta. Drinking offences at Oodnadatta in November last year numbered 11; the total offences by Aborigines numbered 26. In December there were 15 drinking offences, and 28 total offences; in January, 13 drinking offences, and 22 total offences; in February, 11 drinking offences, and 22 total offences; in March, seven drinking offences, and 14 total offences; in April, 13 drinking offences, and 16 total offences; in May, 24 drinking offences (the jump there may have been caused by the fact that Oodnadatta's race day is held in that month), and 35 total offences; in June (last month) there were only four drinking offences, and 10 total offences.

I have previously told the House that in the month following the lifting of the drinking restrictions in Port Augusta there had been a considerable increase in drinking offences by Aborigines there, but in the following month the offences had fallen to less than those in the month prior to the lifting of the restrictions. My figures continue from that position. There were 32 drinking offences in July, and the total offences were 42; in August, drinking offences were 31 and total offences, 46; in September, drinking offences, 43, and total offences, 57; in October, drinking offences, 40, and total offences, 78; in November, drinking offences, 32 and total offences, 47; in December, drinking offences, 41, and total offences, 73; in January, drinking offences, 44, and total offences, 57; in February, drinking offences, 24, and total offences, 45; in March, drinking offences, 40, and total offences, 63; in April, drinking offences, 35, and total offences, 52; in May, drinking offences, 25, and total offences, 38; and in June, drinking offences, 24, and total offences, 28 (which is lower than the position immediately before the lifting of the drinking restrictions).

No significant increase in the number of drinking offences has occurred at Port Victoria; indeed, it is significant that many of the fairly small number of convictions reported there are not for offences connected with drinking liquor to excess but are, in fact, for the possession of liquor on a reserve.

Mr. Nankivell: That was an offence before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It will be only a short time before an announcement is made with regard to Government policy on such particular kinds of offence.

Mr. Millhouse: It sounds as though you have now made it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am just whetting the honourable member's appetite as to the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm satisfied!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am glad!

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You should be highly honoured.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although the Leader did not ask me specifically about this, there was last week, at about the same time as his question was asked, a publication in Adelaide of some statements made at a Liberal Party meeting on Eyre Peninsula by a former superintendent of the Koonibba mission, which said some fairly abusive things of me, and said that the situation, in effect, was decidedly disastrous in the Ceduna area, that the lifting of the liquor restrictions had produced a retrogression on the part of Aborigines who had previously been living under satisfactory conditions, that they had returned to living in wurlies, that the number of convictions had fantastically increased, and that people were lapsing into alcoholism.

Mr. Bockelberg: That did not apply so much to Koonibba. It applied to the influx from Coober Pedy and other northern districts some time ago.

The SPEAKER: At times I have to draw the attention of the House to the Standing Orders, and I try to do this as leniently as possible. I am not referring to any particular incident,

but there have been questions asked today that are more in the nature of second reading speeches, whereas a question should include only sufficient information to make it understood. There can be no argument in replies; the question should be replied to, not debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position at the Ceduna police district is that the reports from there show that there were, before the lifting of the drink restrictions, a group of 21 Aborigines locally, all of whom had a significant number of liquor convictions and proved to be hard core drinkers. Apart from these, there are only nine who have a significant number of convictions since the lifting of the drinking restriction. The report of the research officers is that, in fact (as the honourable member for Eyre has said), there have been drinking offences by a number of Aborigines from Yalata Reserve who have drifted into the town after having been engaged in seasonal work in the area. It is intended to take up the suggestion of the mission at Yalata that a canteen be placed at Yalata Reserve which, in the view of those in charge of the mission, will markedly assist in training the people living on Yalata Reserve in an orderly drinking pattern rather than the one that has been involved here. The research officers also point out that the high incidence of liquor convictions amongst those people is reflective of the discriminatory attitude of local residents towards Aborigines. The result is that relief from continual discrimination is obtained from excessive drinking. Regular police patrols of Ceduna beaches result in several arrests being made. Under the proposed Bill to prohibit racial discrimination, the overt forms of rejection by the non-Aboriginal residents might disappear, but past experiences have resulted in some Aborigines becoming alcoholics and they will require specialized treatment. That was the position before the lifting of the drinking restriction. On that score, the welfare officer at Port Lincoln reported that there had been a significant reduction in drinking offences in Port Lincoln and that, although there was a group of hard core drinkers in Port Lincoln, an active body of Alcoholics Anonymous at Port Lincoln was attended by a number of those people and significant results had been shown. Elsewhere through this State, the general pattern has been that no untoward increase in overt offences has been evident as a result of the lifting of the restriction.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I listened with interest to the long report the Minister gave relating to offences attributable to liquor. Has the Minister figures to show whether or not there has been an overall increase in offences, and, if such increase has not been caused entirely by an increase in liquor offences, has it been caused indirectly by the latter increase? If it has not, can he indicate the form of and reasons for these crimes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have any figures with me that can confirm an overall increase in offences in the areas mentioned.

Mr. Nankivell: It was suggested that there was.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but I have not sufficient figures to hand to confirm that there has been an overall increase in the total offences, because I do not have with me the figures prior to July of last year for "other offences" in the Far Northern district; I have only the figures for "total offences". However, officers have been careful in listing the offences connected with drink to take out those that were likely to have resulted in any way from drink, including being drunk, consuming or possessing liquor on a reserve (which is not always necessary, as the honourable member knows) something which involves excessive drinking, being drunk on a reserve, drinking methylated spirits, and driving under the influence of liquor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I also have a question of the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs that arises out of the replies the Minister has given this afternoon on the question of offences committed by Aborigines in certain parts of the State. I was particularly interested in the Minister's comment about Yalata and Koonibba, because Pastor H. H. Temme of the Lutheran Church has expressed to me the views he has put in writing to the Minister about drinking on these reserves and the reasons for asking for a canteen. The Minister knows as well as I that many offences are caused by the consumption of liquor but are not what we term liquor offences or offences concerning liquor. So that members may make up their minds, will the Minister give the itemized details of specific offences, which he has referred to under the two large heads of "Offences concerning liquor" and "General offences"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have a list of offences, taken out by research officers, with respect to the Ceduna Court of Summary Jurisdiction.

Mr. Millhouse: I should like the lot. I know you must have them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would take some time to obtain the figures for all the

courts of summary jurisdiction in this State in which an Aboriginal was convicted.

Mr. Millhouse: I mean in the places to which you have referred.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understood the honourable member was interested in the Yalata and Koonibba areas. If he is not, I shall try to obtain further details. I have the analysed figures for the Ceduna and Port Victoria Courts of Summary Jurisdiction, but if the honourable member wants others he will have to wait until the research officers have completed this section of their project.

Mr. Millhouse: How long do you think that will take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall probably not receive the full figures for another three months.

Mr. Millhouse: You have given an outline today: all I want are the details. I should think the Minister could give today, or get by tomorrow, details of offences which, in his previous answer, he lumped under the headings of "Offences concerning liquor" and "Other offences". Can the Minister give those details now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If that is all the honourable member wants, I think I can get them. I doubt whether I shall have them by tomorrow, but I will have them by next Tuesday.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In this week's *Murray Pioneer* a correspondent has drawn attention to the salinity of the Murray River. He has given some interesting figures about the rise in salt content in the river in shallow water such as that of Lake Bonney. He says that evaporation will increase considerably the salt content of the lake, which ultimately flows into the river. The Minister of Irrigation will be aware that some residents at the top end of the river have refused to use the water for their orchards because they fear the high salt content of the river. I do not know whether the correspondent was an expert, and I seriously doubt his figures. Not being an expert, I ask the Minister whether he will ask his departmental officers, who are experts in this field, to examine the matter and to see whether any truth exists in the correspondent's remarks. If the remarks are not true, will the Minister bring down a report about salinity in the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member did not expect me to reply to the statement made by the correspondent. I have not actually seen the letter to which the honourable member referred, and I am no expert on the question either. However, I believe that officers of my department, together with the engineer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who is attached to the Irrigation Branch, are well versed in the matter and I shall be happy to have them examine it. I shall bring down a report if necessary.

FREELING SCHOOL LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 21 about the purchase of a piece of land adjacent to the Freeling Primary School by the Education Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The piece of land referred to by the honourable member contains about two and three-quarter acres. It was offered to the department in 1961 and, as the school was sited on a small area of two acres, its purchase at a cost of $680 was recommended for recreational purposes. Purchase was completed in November, 1963. To prevent fire hazard, Mr. Kernick, the previous owner, was allowed to use the land for sheep grazing until June, 1964, when the head teacher requested that it be used for school sports. The school has used the land occasionally for recreation since that date.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the Eastwood intersection?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the delay in the installation of traffic lights at the Eastwood intersection is not being caused by any requirement of the Road Traffic Board to install a left-hand turning lane on the north-east corner. No such lane is intended at this time. The previous reply to this question indicates that the matter presently rests with the City of Burnside as it has a financial obligation and a requirement to exercise its powers under the Local Government Act to close the kerb and gutter crossing which is diagonally across the corner of the property. The removal of this crossing is essential for the proper safe operation of the proposed traffic lights.

MOUNT COMPASS SCHOOL YARD.

Mr. McANANEY: A few moments ago the Minister of Works refused an application because there was too much water at Mount Compass. I understand that Mount Compass

has had 17in. of rain this year. An application has been made to pave the yard of the Mount Compass school, and the Public Buildings Department has estimated the cost at $5,500. At present the school is awaiting priority to be given to the work by the Education Department. In view of the condition of the yard, will the Minister of Education inquire into the order of priority and see whether this work can be commenced soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

HAIRDRESSING SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Education aware that some years ago the Education Department purchased a valuable site on Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, and demolished a house property thereon in order to eventually establish a hairdressing trade school? Can the Minister ascertain the plans of his department for constructing such a trade school in that area, and can he indicate when this work is likely to be undertaken?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information.

FREELING SCHOOL TOILETS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on July 13 relating to new toilets at the Freeling Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Plans were prepared by the Public Buildings Department for standard toilet blocks, including the provision of a septic tank system with a filter tank and a 120ft. soakage bore. The estimated cost was $18,980, and in March the scheme was submitted to the Education Department for consideration. It was considered that the expenditure of $18,980 on new toilets at a school with an enrolment of about 100 children was not justified, and the Public Buildings Department was therefore requested to examine the practicability of designing a standard type toilet for medium to small country schools with a view to keeping costs to a minimum. The Director of the Public Buildings Department advises that he should be in a position within a few weeks to submit a revised scheme based on amended drawings for the further consideration of the Education Department.

TOD RIVER MAIN.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Will the Minister of Works bring down a report on progress up to the present of work on the Tod River trunk main, the present area of activity, and the programme for the completion of the work?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have recently seen a docket on this, so there will be no trouble getting the report. I can say that work on a much larger scale will be done very early in the financial year, although the programme will still occupy a period of some years. I will get the details for the honourable member as soon as possible.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Over the weekend I visited the Paringa area and met landowners there who are concerned about the proposed railway line to Chowilla dam. Those landowners have expressed anxiety about what is going to happen to their properties through which the railway will run, whether sandhills will be cut through, whether their properties will be placed back where they were, whether any leases will be entered into between the department and the landowners, and whether the department intends to fence one side or both sides of the railway. They are also concerned about the problem of watering stock if the railway cuts up the properties. The Minister of Works would appreciate that these people have some real headaches over this. They are anxious to co-operate with the department—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not proceed to argue the question.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am not arguing the question, Mr. Speaker: I am pointing out facts for the Minister to answer.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member knows his Standing Orders better than I do.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That is what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker. With great respect, I asked permission to make this statement. I think the Minister would appreciate that this is a problem.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to ask his question.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, Sir. Will the Minister make arrangements for officers of his department to confer either with me or with representatives of these landowners to iron out the very real problems in this area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am happy to have the assurance that the residents of the honourable member's district will co-operate with the department in this very important and major programme. For reasons of which I think the honourable member would be aware, I have anticipated his question and have already made arrangements for the Director and Engineer-in-Chief

elect (Mr. Beaney) to see the honourable member. If the honourable member rings Mr. Beaney, an appointment can be made for him to discuss all these problems. If the honourable member or his constituents want further particulars, I shall be happy to meet them in order that we may work together so that there will be the least possible inconvenience to these landowners and so that the best may be done in the interests of all concerned.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who are the members and officers of the Physiotherapists Board?

2. When was each appointed?

3. Are the members paid? If so, how much?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens, for the Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Members: *vide Government Gazette,* April 28, 1966. Registrar: William Harry Bowering, O.B.E., F.C.A.

2. All board members were last appointed or elected for a period of three years from June 6, 1966. The Registrar was appointed in 1946.

3. Yes. The Chairman receives $150 a year, and other members receive $6.30 for each meeting attended.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1926-1965.

Motion carried.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 21. Page 624.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The recent history of the imposition of land tax in South Australia is a controversial one. Last year there was a move by the Government to increase land tax rates before the operation of a quinquennial re-assessment that came into force after the Bill had been passed by this House. We all know the occurrence to which the Treasurer referred in his second reading explanation, and that, as a result of a conference between the two Houses, last year's Bill was confined to that year. We know, too, that unless this Bill is passed the Government will not receive the additional revenue it requires for this financial year. The Government's haste in introducing the measure is understandable, bearing in mind its present financial position, but I must protest at what I consider to be an alteration to procedure. This Bill seeks to impose significantly increased land tax on South Australian landholders: the Government is asking, I think, for 37 per cent more land tax this year, without explaining to the House how the money is to be spent. The member for Glenelg may snort, but he cannot deny that. The honourable member apparently does not understand the normal procedure when presenting a Budget to the House of outlining the way in which any revenue to be collected will be expended. We are expected to pass this Bill without making any such provision at all.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It's a lottery!

Mr. Freebairn: There's no sunshine in this for the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HALL: The very fact of this omission casts grave doubts on the Bill. It is unreasonable for the Treasurer to expect members to approve substantially increased taxation revenue without our knowing where it is to go.

Mr. Clark: That's silly.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Frome is looking uncomfortable: how will it affect him?

Mr. HALL: If the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) wishes to see a one-sided measure introduced, let him say so.

Mr. Clark: I wasn't referring to you.

Mr. HALL: Very well, I am sorry, and I withdraw that remark. Unfortunately for the honourable member, he sits next to the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) who has been heard to say in the House, "What does it matter if we have a deficit? We are spending the money in the right direction, anyhow."

Mr. McKee: You haven't got the full case.

Mr. HALL: Nevertheless, we do not know how this additional revenue is to be spent. This Bill is possibly the most dressed-up measure ever to come before the House. I think a conscious attempt has been made to sugar-coat its provisions. A few minor concessions emerge from the nine pages of the second reading explanation. The Treasurer used the words

"broadly parallel with the average increase in valuations"; he referred to "averages"; and he used many terms that mean nothing to many property holders in specific areas, whom I shall instance directly, when pointing out how the tax is to be levied in particular areas. The Treasurer said that there would be a minimum of $1,000 to which the tax would apply. It is interesting to note that in 1961 the then Leader of the Opposition moved to exempt all metropolitan house blocks of a valuation up to $5,000. Apparently, that has now been forgotten, although I do not think the Treasurer's reversed attitude impinges greatly on this Bill. The Treasurer said:

The reason why the potential yield has not increased substantially beyond the 60 per cent increase on aggregate valuation through the effects of the progressive rate schedule is that the higher valued properties have not increased so greatly as have the relatively much lower valued properties, such as residential land.

It is pointed out, too, that if last year's rates applied to the increased assessments, there would be a much greater incidence of tax than the incidence created by the application of the present rates. The Government seems to be using the old "bogey man" technique of pretending that it will be extremely bad, by then withdrawing certain intentions, and remaining only "bad". It does much threatening; it removes some of the threats, and then claims how good it is being to the community at large. That old technique will not work with members of the Opposition. It is shown that an increase of 67 per cent would be collected if last year's rates had applied. The Government tried hard last year to institute that rate of tax for five years, the Bill explicitly providing that the rate would apply to the last financial year and to all subsequent financial years. It was only by the efforts of members in another place that the previous Bill's operation was restricted entirely to last year; otherwise, we should have seen (as the Treasurer has said) an increase in taxation this year of 67 per cent. The Treasurer said:

The new rates proposed are simple to understand and simple to apply.

That may be so, yet we find that the trend that occurred last year of altering the important steps in the application of land tax between the variations in rates in the different categories (if approved, they would have been increased by three last year) are this year in go sky-high.

Mr. Coumbe: It's gone up to 19.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and only one reason can exist for doing this: undoubtedly there will be more tax in it. We find that more people are to be caught with the more frequent graduations in rate. The following passage from the Treasurer's second reading explanation is misleading:

On present valuations up to $50,000 the proposed rates will be only 64 per cent of the rates that applied last year. Accordingly, within that range the reduction in rates will be broadly parallel with the average increase in valuations.

That significant statement is the justification for the Bill. The Treasurer also said:

Generally, landholders within this range who have been notified of a less than average increase in valuation will be taxed rather lower than last year whilst those with more than average increases in valuation will pay a rather higher tax.

I object to the lumping of the whole incidence of land tax into an average application when, of course, it is an individual matter. The valuation of agricultural land to the north of the city has risen far more than that for land to the south of the Murray River or in the Upper and Lower South-East. In fact, the figure given for the increase in agricultural land is 45 per cent in valuation. This figure is misleading and many properties used for agriculture have been increased by 100 per cent; I know of many that have had an increase of 70 per cent. When the Government says that of the 200,000 assessments all but 2,000 will pay the same or less, it is endeavouring to separate the voters on this matter. I see no other reason for applying this tax so definitely to the higher taxation ranges. However, despite any possible separation of voting strength on how this tax is applied, it is impossible to separate the interests of the people of the State who, by and large, receive their employment and livelihood through the success of commerce and industry in South Australia.

I wish to give some examples of the incidence of this tax. First, I shall take the case of 500 acres with a present unimproved valuation of $36 an acre. This valuation is common to areas of good agricultural land. In this case, the previous assessment would have been $12,410. The present assessment is $18,000. The effect of this tax is that in the year before last the tax was $41.04; last year, after the imposition of the new rates on the old assessment, the tax was $45.94; and, under the proposed range of taxation, the tax will be $52. Therefore, there has been an increase of $11 within 12 months on a property, the size of which would be on the border line of that

required to earn a living. That was an increase of 45 per cent in valuation. I shall now take the case of a property 50 to 100 miles to the north of Adelaide where the valuation has increased by 80 per cent. Starting with a valuation of $10,000 before the increase in valuation, the initial taxation last year would have been $26.04 and this year it would be $52, an increase of 100 per cent all but for 4 cents. I now instance a property of 1,500 acres with an unimproved value of $22 an acre. I use the lower figure of unimproved value on the proposed valuation because I still want to point out that this is considered as a living unit; it is not a large farm but a farm in the lower rainfall area and big enough only to establish one living unit. On the proposed valuation of $22 an acre it would be liable to taxation of $144. On the valuation existing before last year's alterations, it would have yielded $96.17. Therefore, there is an increase of almost $48, or an increase in taxation of 50 per cent, with an increase in valuation of only 45 per cent. If we take the valuation of $22 to represent an increase of 80 per cent in valuation, we will find that the increase in land tax from the previous year of $65.96 to the new figure of $144 is well over 100 per cent. Also, I have two actual cases of land tax affecting one small and one large industry in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That is outside the city limits?

Mr. HALL: Yes. The small industry has a valuation of $22,150, and under this Bill it will pay taxation of $66.90. As the 1964 figure was $30.85, this represents an increase of well over 100 per cent in that period. I know also of a large industry valued at $125,658 on unimproved value. In 1964-65 this industry paid $727.75 and last year it paid $939.81. Under the Bill, this year it will pay $1,707.16. These are actual figures of industries in the State.

Mr. Coumbe: That figure doubled.

Mr. HALL: It is more than doubled; the increase is from $727 to $1,707. With these cases in mind, I wish to refer to the table headed "Comparative South Australian Land Taxes of Recent Years". That commences with a valuation of $10,000. For the value of $10,000, we go through the exercise of listing the taxation that would be paid in 1964-65, 1965-66 and under the present proposed taxation. In relation to any particular property, this table is entirely and utterly misleading. I believe that it must have been evident to whoever prepared the table that it was deliberately misleading; to give it to the public would be knowingly misleading them.

Mr. Casey: It's a fraud?

Mr. HALL: Yes. The table attempts to take the figure of $10,000 in 1964-65 and use it again in 1965-66 and 1966-67. This is absolutely stupid. It just does not apply. Honourable members know that, where we read $10,000 for 1964-65, on the figures given by the Treasurer in his second reading explanation, if one happens to be a metropolitan house owner and happens to be that mythical average, the figure is $18,500, not $10,000, when the new rate is applied. Again, in the case of the mythical farmers whose rates have gone up only 45 per cent, the figure is $14,500. We must read the suitable categories, not this nonsense that has been put up. No Government member can justify this misleading table.

Mr. Hudson: When we read $14,500, do we read it from the table?

Mr. HALL: Of course, we cannot read it from the table, because 1964-65 is lumped with 1966-67 in the same line, as if those are comparable.

Mr. Hudson: Can't you go down to the other table?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member can interject if he wishes, but this table is misleading and cannot be regarded by the public in any other way. Why should matters be presented to this House in a way in which they cannot be understood by the public? I also refer to the table of interstate comparisons. Apparently, last year the intention in increasing land tax was to equal the other States. This year, we have an excuse for going above other States on a per capita basis in the imposition of land tax. We find to our dismay that we are expected to impose land tax in this State of $7.15 a head, while the tax in Victoria, which is the wealthiest State in the Commonwealth, is $6.13 a head.

Apparently, we are expected to promote the industrialization of our State and to attract industry from other States and overseas by offering the convenience of paying land tax at a rate significantly higher than that operating in Victoria, where industry can be offered many other advantages that we do not have. Then, in our time of recessed credit, we find an even more glaring disparity in comparison with our sister State of Western Australia, which is growing apace, industrializing, and making a dynamic and energetic attempt to win employment. Land tax was levied in Western Australia last year at the rate of $4.15 a head, yet we say we can go $3 a head more!

Then, we have the further insult that the Government gives no guarantee that it will not increase these rates within the next five years. So, we are dealing only with this year now and there is a possibility that, if the Government gets itself further into the mire of financial difficulties, we shall yet deal with other legislation that will put land tax well above what applies in any other State.

We have an increase in valuation not allowed for in an explanatory table attached to the Bill, together with a table showing that we are to become the most highly taxed State in the Commonwealth, a move that is apparently deliberately destroying many advantages, particularly the cost advantage we have held for many years in comparison with other States. We have held down costs appreciably below those in other States, but the Government cannot see the wisdom of that.

The Government believes that it is good business to collect another few million dollars in land tax and lose business to the value of $12,000,000 or $14,000,000 by so doing. However, we do not agree. Our policy has at all times attempted to keep down costs in this State, and that is one advantage that we could offer to industrialists. One of these tables is misleading and the other is dismaying. The Government is destroying our cost advantage and the new assessment, despite the lowering of rates, will mean an increase in taxation overall of 37 per cent. When we disregard the individual case and lump everything under "average", although the rate applicable to many properties goes much higher than the average, we have a dismaying picture.

The matters in this Bill that are considered to be concessions are pale indeed in comparison with the imposition being placed upon us. Local government is to be exempted and there will be minimum rates for charitable purposes. No-one will disagree about the number of the smaller items, but I consider that they have been included as window dressing. There is reference to section 12c, which deals with declared rural use. It is interesting to know how my favourite example is going. I have stated in the House that a landholder at Virginia is hard put by the increase in valuation, and this is one case that has been completely neglected in this legislation or in any Government attitude.

Prior to this assessment, his property of 145 acres was valued at $34,800. In this assessment, it has been valued at $52,380, and two other properties in the Virginia area show a like increase in assessment. However, there is nothing in this Bill or in the land tax legislation proper that will help this person. All this land is valued as horticultural land, although the underground water supplies in the area are giving out. In fact, we expect a Bill to be introduced this year to regulate water use in that area. This example concerns me and brings to mind the fact that any average struck here is false when applied to the many thousands of people whose valuations have increased far in excess of the average given.

Regarding the top rates of taxation that are to be imposed on the highly valued properties, the highest taxable value given is "exceeding $180,000", for which the tax is $3,420 plus 38c for each $10 or part thereof over $180,000. When said quickly, this does not appear to be very much, but it is an annual charge of 3.8 per cent per annum. Just because a property has a value of over $180,000, that does not mean that it is a millionaire's plaything. It may be owned by a company that is just making ends meet or by a reputable business, yet the State Government intends each year to take 3.8 per cent of its capital value. This imposition on industry and commerce is getting out of all proportion. In promoting this tax, the Government has forgotten the basic essential of encouraging industry to establish here and assisting to provide employment for the people of this State. This imposition is socking businesses, both large and small, people engaged in agriculture and city landholders who own average blocks. It is socking the community from start to finish, and it shows that the Government has no regard to the incentives needed for our community to continue to progress. I oppose the Bill, which is one more nail in the coffin of industry, commerce and incentive in this State.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AMENDING FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from July 21, Page 626.)

Clause 4—"Power to inspect land and premises and assessment books."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

After paragraph (*f*) to insert:

; and

(*g*) by inserting after subsection (2) thereof the following subsection:

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this section the Minister or any person acting on an order under the Minister's hand shall not be entitled to enter and inspect any premises under this section unless the owner or occupier has been given reasonable notice of intention to enter the same.

This clause relates to the rights of officers to enter properties to make assessments.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate the Minister's attempt to meet, to some extent, the objections of the Opposition, but this does not go as far as the Opposition wishes. In criminal matters police officers must have a duly authorized warrant before they can enter premises, so it seems that we are more inclined to protect the criminal element than the ordinary householder. The Minister should resist the claims of his officers and restrict the right of entry to cases of real necessity, and I do not believe this is such a case. What is there inside a private house that appreciably affects its value? I do not think inspectors want the right to barge in on people's privacy or that they enjoy doing so. I cannot recall, when I was Minister of Works, seeking an amendment along these lines. I do not think we should accept the amendment, which I believe goes further than necessary. As an amendment to the Minister's amendment, I now move:

In new subsection (3) after "premises" to insert "being a private dwellinghouse and shall not be entitled"; and after "section" second occurring to add "to enter any other premises".

This amendment denies the officers of the department the right of entry into a private dwellinghouse for the purposes of this legislation but it does give them the right to enter any premises other than a private dwellinghouse after they have given due notice to the owner or occupier.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: At this stage there is no justification for the honourable member's amendment, so I ask the Committee not to accept it.

Mr. QUIRKE: I oppose the Minister's amendment and support the amendment of the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson). This clause is designed to give access to private houses where access is at present denied except for special purposes. I agree that right of entry should be given to inspect, for example, deep drainage, which affects the hygiene of the community, but even in that case inspectors should have the right to enter only specific parts of a house. However, this clause gives certain people the right to prowl around every part of a house, including the bedrooms. Why? There may be two outwardly identical houses, but in one a man has installed built-in wardrobes and other fixtures while in the other a man has no built-in fittings and fixtures but has furniture worth between $800 and $1,000. This right of entry, if granted, will enable an assessor to see whether a house has built-in cupboards and other equipment or merely movable furniture. One man is to be penalized by way of increased rates because he has added built-in equipment to his house, while the other man is not. What will the Government gain from intruding into a man's house and inspecting the bedrooms to see what built-in furniture they may contain? By how much would built-in equipment increase the value of a house? Is notice to be given for the purpose of being certain that the householder will be at home when the assessor calls or is it that some bureaucratic mind has magnanimously thought up the idea that there is something in the opposition we are putting forward and at least we should give the householder a chance to tidy up his house before the assessor calls? The sanctity of a man's home should not be breached by these intrusions.

Mr. COUMBE: I support the amendment of the member for Flinders. Speaking as a metropolitan member and as a former member of a council, I say that the right of privacy must be jealously guarded. I know that certain rights exist under the Local Government Act, but what happens in practice is that if alterations are made to a property the council inspector comes along after the work is completed and inspects the outside of the house. I am completely opposed to the right being given an inspector to go inside a person's house. I would not be so opposed to a duly authorized inspector (carrying an authorization card, as is the practice with some other public authorities) going on to the land. If an addition to a house increases the assessed value, the local council immediately informs the Engineering and Water Supply Department so that the department can alter its assessment. Conversely, if the department knows that alterations are being made, it automatically informs the council. It is seldom that there are extensive alterations inside a house that are not apparent outside.

The argument put forward by the Minister regarding built-in furniture is one of the most

specious I have heard. We know that in some Housing Trust houses and in some modern houses a gap is sometimes left in an internal wall and a type of linen press or wardrobe is so built that there is access on both sides. This should not increase the value of such a house one iota; in fact, it may even decrease the value.

Mr. Shannon: It would decrease the value to a subsequent owner who did not like it.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. It could also be argued that it would lessen the value structurally. On the Minister's argument, this built-in furniture becomes a fixture and therefore part of the assessable value, whereas a television set or an expensive divan, because it is not fixed, cannot be part of the value of the house. All I can say is that that is one of the most fatuous arguments I have heard. As the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said, an assessment can be increased if a man spends $200 on built-in furniture. However, if he spends $1,000 by improving his house with furniture, he is not caught under this. I am completely opposed to the Minister's amendment, and I suggest that it be amended to provide for the inspection of an allotment but not the interior of a house.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I support the amendment of the member for Flinders. An Englishman's home is his castle, and that also applies to an Australian home. Before there is any invasion of the privacy of a ratepayer's house, there should be a very cogent reason for it. We know that even where there is suspicion of a criminal offence it is necessary for officers of the law to obtain a warrant to enter private premises, and I submit that, unless the Minister can give a weightier reason for the necessity for this provision, the law should remain as it stands.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Government is being penny pinching in seeking the right to inspect and value built-in furniture, and in any event little revenue would be gained from it when the time involved in making that inspection was taken into account. Better ways exist for the Government to save money than by trying to get a little through seeking the right of entry to private premises. I oppose the entry of outsiders into private homes. If the intimacy of private life is destroyed, the backbone of our liberty is broken.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am amazed at arguments advanced by the Opposition, not so much against my amendment but against the clause. It has been said that this is something new and that we are taking away the rights of the individual. However, section 165 of the Local Government Act provides:

(1) For making and completing any assessment authorized by this Act, or any provision thereof, any valuator and his assistants may, between the hours of 8 in the forenoon and 6 in the afternoon, enter any ratable property within the area.

(2) If admission thereto is denied by the owner or occupier, the valuator may leave at the residence of the person so refusing, a notice in writing of the intention of the valuator to enter and view the property.

(3) After the expiration of three days from the leaving of the notice the valuator may, with or without assistants, use all necessary force to enable him to enter upon the property and to make the assessment.

Section 876 of the same Act provides:

(1) A council shall, for the purposes of this Act, except where otherwise provided, have power by its members or officers to enter at all reasonable hours in the daytime into and upon any building or land within the area for the purpose of executing any work or making any inspection authorized to be executed or made by the council under this Act, without being liable to any legal proceedings on account thereof.

(2) Except as herein otherwise provided, the council shall not make any such entry upon occupied premises, unless with the consent of the occupier, until after the expiration of twenty-four hours' notice for that purpose given to the occupier.

Similar provisions were included in the District Councils Act of 1887 and 1914 and in the Municipal Corporations Act of 1923. Parliament included the right-to-enter powers in the Statute Book as far back as 1887 and, no doubt, it was included to enable a just assessment to be made. Did those in power then include these provisions with a criminal intent, which has almost been suggested here? Did they do it to inconvenience the people, or did they do it in order to make a just assessment? No Opposition speaker has referred to a case where a person has been inconvenienced because of these provisions. Similar provisions were inserted in the Land Tax Act in 1915.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Did the Opposition alter them when in Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, because it then comprised responsible people who had a duty to the State to make a just assessment. Unfortunately, it has become a group of political gangsters with one ulterior motive. By refusing the Government and its officers the right to make a just assessment it is trying to damage the Government. Every State in the Commonwealth has similar provisions in various Acts. New South Wales has had them since 1916; Queensland since 1944, and possibly earlier;

Tasmania since 1950; and New Zealand since 1951. If these provisions were justified (and I submit they were), they were introduced by responsible people. The Opposition has said much about the right of the individual. I believe in that principle, but I acknowledge that the right of the individual must, on occasions, be surrendered to the right of the majority of the people. The only reason for including this provision in the Act is to enable an assessment to be made that is just to the ratepayers and to the department. I should not be surprised if, in a few moments, the Opposition were to move for a provision prohibiting a prospective buyer from entering a dwellinghouse in order to examine it.

Mr. Millhouse: It's silly to say that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I know it is, but I should not be surprised if it happened.

Mr. Millhouse: But it's silly of you to say so.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member knows how far the Opposition will stoop. The only way in which a prospective purchaser can determine the value of a house is by inspecting it inside and out. So that justice may be done, I ask the Committee to carry the amendment as originally moved.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate the Minister's earnestness but, frankly, he has been tilting at a knight that was not in the saddle. We do not suggest that it is not necessary for an assessor to enter premises for, obviously, a farming property cannot be valued otherwise. However, we object to his entering a house, and I do not believe that an assessor desires that right. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON moved:

In new subsection (3) after "any" to insert "private dwellinghouse and shall not be entitled to enter any other".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Over the years, Parliament has often given certain powers for certain purposes and, during my term of office, I introduced legislation to enable inspections to be made where it was absolutely necessary that they be made. In such cases, the proper authorities should have adequate powers. However, I doubt that this provision is necessary. I believe the member for Flinders would agree that over the last 25 years no request was made by the department for this provision. The Minister said that an opportunity had been taken to include this power. Hundreds of amendments that could be made are not made because they are unnecessary or undesirable, and I believe this amendment is unnecessary, and under certain circumstances it could be undesirable.

Times have changed, and today quite often both husbands and wives go out to work and their house is unoccupied during the day. If these people receive a notice that an inspector will call, will they be expected to stay home from work to receive him? All the Minister provides is that reasonable notice shall be given by the department but this will not help householders in the circumstances to which I have referred. As the member for Burra said, inspections could be made simply to see whether a house has a built-in cupboard rather than a conventional cupboard. I believe the clause is completely undesirable, but it is certainly much improved by the amendment. I hope the amendment will be accepted and then we can possibly strike out the clause altogether.

Mr. SHANNON: I support the amendment of the member for Flinders. I do not agree that it is reasonable to include built-in furniture in the assessment of premises when ordinary furniture is not included; quite often conventional furniture is more expensive than built-in furniture. In this way, hot water services, oil heaters and so on could also be included in the assessed value of the premises. We ought to encourage people to provide these comforts in their houses. It is not reasonable to require the department to specify the time when an officer will inspect because a time suitable to one person may not be suitable to another in the same area and officers could be inconvenienced by being required to visit the same area twice.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Those officers are usually reasonable, aren't they?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. Property valuation has always been carried out by external inspection, which enables an officer to ascertain the size and construction of a house.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister engaged in heroics in answering Opposition criticism. However, in other legislation "premises" has always meant the property itself externally and I do not think the Minister can cite a case where an assessor has ever demanded the right to enter a house. The Opposition is endeavouring to preserve privacy for the householder. Our objection is to the use of the word "dwelling". Engineering and Water Supply Department officers must necessarily enter houses in the course of their work and everyone is grateful that they are able to do so. However, we object to giving the right to officers to walk

around a house and see what personal comforts they can value.

Mr. HURST: An assessor must be able to assess value accurately if there is to be proper rating. On the argument advanced by the Opposition, all houses have the same value, regardless of contents. Opposition members will never again be in Government if their policy is to offer an owner only the value of the outside shell when houses are acquired by a Government department.

It is possible to own premises within a building, and this has been acknowledged by insurance companies. If any public servant abused this right, the matter would be raised in Parliament. It is unfair to ask an assessor to make an assessment without inspecting the interior.

Mr. Rodda: You want assessors to enter houses?

Mr. HURST: I am sure no land agent would make an assessment without looking inside a house.

Mr. Langley: Electricity Trust inspectors can enter.

Mr. HURST: That is so, and the Minister's amendment provides that reasonable notice must be given. People who object to an inspection are hiding something. The Opposition is obviously trying to protect wealthy people who have expensive improvements in their houses.

Mr. Quirke: The poor old Labor Party is still back 80 years!

Mr. HURST: I am sure members opposite would not object to inspections being made of the interior of houses if they were to be acquired. I support the Minister's amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Semaphore seems to think that a few extra dollars is more valuable than the privacy of a home. What he said about our trying to protect wealthy people was rubbish: not only wealthy people but parents with children and parents without children object to having their privacy invaded. If people usually agree to allow inspections to be made, why have this provision? Of course people do not object to inspections for the purpose of acquisition, but in that case people are being paid money, not taxed. For health reasons, sewer inspections are necessary, but inspections are not necessary in this legislation or for land tax purposes. If a similar provision exists in the land tax legislation, I shall be prepared to move to delete it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment moved by the member for Flinders, as no valid reason has been given for accepting it. The member for Rocky River said he would move to delete a similar provision from the land tax legislation. I do not doubt that he would, as that would deprive the Government of the opportunity to make correct assessments. A similar provision has been in the Local Government Act for 79 years. The member for Gumeracha said that it was put in that Act for some purpose, but not one member has shown that its purpose was any different from that intended in this Bill. The purpose is clearly stated in the Local Government Act, section 876 of which provides:

> A council shall, for the purposes of this Act, except where otherwise provided, have power by its members or officers to enter at all reasonable hours in the daytime into and upon any building or land within the area for the purpose of executing any work or making any inspection authorized to be executed or made by the council under this Act, without being liable to any legal proceedings on account thereof.

"Any building" includes a house. If this is such an undesirable piece of legislation, all I can say is that members opposite had many opportunities to repeal it, but they did not. They preserved this provision in the consolidating Acts, only so that a just assessment should be made. It has been suggested that public servants will enter people's properties.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is the Minister prepared to declare to me that the assessors want this power to go into a private house? Have they asked for it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not think that is the issue. We are arguing that this power is necessary to make a just assessment. It has not been abused in the past and will not be in future. All we want is that our assessors make a just assessment and that the Government, whatever its complexion may be, be not subject to the possibility of having appeal after appeal upheld against assessments because the inspectors are denied the right to make just assessments. The member for Gumeracha said that I said in my second reading explanation "we take the opportunity". Goodness gracious me—I have heard such a phrase a thousand times in the 17 or 18 years I have been here! Then somebody said that if it had not been open we would not have done it. That is true. The case of two people being at work was raised. There is a provision in the Electricity Trust legislation for its inspectors to enter premises, and they do when they have to in order to read meters that are inside houses. When the occupants are away from

home at work, arrangements are made voluntarily for somebody else to come.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No; the inspectors make an estimate.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No; the householders make arrangements for somebody to see to the inspectors.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No; the inspectors make an estimate.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On odd occasions they make an estimate, but they cannot go on forever doing that. Much play has been made of built-in furniture, but this is only a side issue. Assessments have to be made of the general condition of a house.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: A house may be badly cracked.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, there may be such conditions inside a house not evident from the outside. Therefore, the right of entry must be given. The point in question involves not a few dollars: it is the making of a just assessment. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said the Opposition was trying to protect family life. It is a little late for honourable members opposite to wake up now, after 30-odd years in Government, to protecting family life. They had opportunities to do that, as they know full well.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This power was never in the old Act.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is in many Acts.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It was not in this Act.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the member for Gumeracha has said, this is meeting changing times. We have now a greater variety of houses than we ever had. The member for Rocky River then referred to a section of the community that I did not know existed—parents without children. I have not yet seen these people.

Mr. Quirke: That is not as funny as you think it is. Where is the Minister's sense of humour?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is what the honourable member said. Anyway, I urge the Committee to accept my amendment, which I introduced in an endeavour to meet the Opposition halfway; but that seems not possible. I thought I was acting fairly, and the Government thought it was, too. I ask the Committee to vote in the interests of the State and see that justice is done.

The Committee divided on the Hon. G. G. Pearson's amendment:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens (teller), Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pairs.—Aye.—Mr. Brookman. No.—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens's amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Addition to assessment."

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

To strike out "and"; and after paragraph (*b*) to insert:

; and

(*b*1) by inserting before the word "assessable" where it first occurs in subsection (2) thereof the word "so".

Section 73 (2) of the Waterworks Act would then provide:

If such land or premises were at the commencement of the then current year so assessable under this Act, the owner or occupier thereof shall thereupon be liable to pay and be charged with the whole amount of the water rate for that year; but if they have become so assessable since the commencement of that year, the owner or occupier shall be liable to pay and be charged with only such proportionate part of that year's water rate as to the Commissioner seems just.

If an adjustment is necessary because of an addition, the rate will be applicable only during the period in which the addition has been enjoyed, and it will be reduced accordingly.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It was pointed out in the second reading debate that it would be inequitable to charge a rate for the whole year if the benefit of the improvement had been available to the owner or occupier for only a portion of the year. I accept the assurance that the amendment ties this matter together in the proper way. The only point that arises now is the proportion that the occupier is liable to pay, and this is determined as being the proportion which as to the Commissioner seems just. One could devise a long list of words that would require a mathematical calculation as to when the alterations were completed and when the premises were available to and occupied by the owner. Although I know that some Ministers are more just than others, I think we can let it rest

the way it is. However, I want it on record that I would expect the Minister (and I am sure he would so expect himself, as I would in similar circumstances) to apportion the rate equitably on the basis of the period of occupancy during the year in which the improvement was available for the benefit and enjoyment of the occupier. That seems to me to be the right and proper interpretation of the words "as to the Commissioner seems just". If that is the position, I think it improves the clause in a way that I find acceptable, and I raise no objection to it.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Time of payment of water rates."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

At the commencement of new section 94 to insert "(1)"; and to add the following subsection:

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any owner or occupier of land or premises from paying his water rates and minimum charges for water by measure under agreement in full in advance upon receipt of a notice for any quarterly amount that is due and payable.

This will allow ratepayers to pay rates in one lump sum or to take advantage of the quarterly instalment plan. I am sure that country ratepayers will prefer to pay in a lump sum and, no doubt, many metropolitan ratepayers will wish to do the same. This amendment will not interfere with the computer's operation. Implicit in this amendment is the requirement that the department will render an account showing not only the quarterly instalments but the full amount payable for the year. If accounts are not rendered in this way problems may arise.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I accept this amendment.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Omissions in assessment may be corrected."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS moved:

To strike out "and"; and after paragraph (*b*) to insert:

; and

(*c*) by inserting before the word "assessable" where it first occurs in subsection (3) thereof the word "so".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15—"Power to inspect land and premises and assessment books."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS moved:

To strike out "and"; and after paragraph (*f*) to insert:

; and

(*g*) by inserting after subsection (2) thereof the following subsection:

(3) Notwithstanding anything in this section the Minister or any person acting on an order under the Minister's hand shall not be entitled to enter and inspect any premises under this section unless the owner or occupier has been given reasonable notice of intention to enter the same.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Power to make rates payable quarterly."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON moved:

At commencement of new section 18 to insert (1); and to add the following new subsection:

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any owner or occupier of land or premises from paying sewerage rates in full in advance upon receipt of a notice for any quarterly amount that is due and payable.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.53 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

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 21. Page 628.)

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I support the motion of the member for Alexandra, and believe that a Select Committee to inquire into and report on all matters affecting Aboriginal reserves is long overdue. In a previous debate, I said that many problems associated with Aboriginal reserves had yet to be overcome. As up until now many of those problems have not been solved, a Select Committee may well be the answer. My knowledge of Aboriginal life and Aboriginal reserves is probably confined to closely settled areas such as Point Pearce, Point McLeay, and Koonibba; I have never visited the North-West of the State and know nothing about the

reserves there. However, I claim to know something about what has been happening at Point Pearce for about 40 years. During that time I have been privileged to be associated with the social and religious welfare and the work of the people there. I have also been associated with officers of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs stationed at Point Pearce to manage and supervise various sections of life on the reserve. I do not believe that an Aboriginal lands trust will do much for the Aboriginal. In fact, I believe it is a means of "passing the buck" for, in effect, we are saying that we have not been able to do much for the Aboriginal and that we therefore desire now to pass the responsibility to him and to let him see what he can do for himself.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is quite untrue, of course, and quite unjustified. You know the welfare programme has gone ahead perfectly well and that the Government has no intention of lessening it.

Mr. FERGUSON: That may be so.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Well, what are you talking about?

Mr. FERGUSON: The member for Alexandra said:

The Lands Department is the most experienced authority on settling people on the land; its legislation is designed to allow it, and there is no reason why the Aboriginal people should not be settled on the land under the Crown Lands Act if that was desired.

There is no reason why the Aboriginal should not be settled on the land if he is ready for it. Indeed, I believe that the Minister admitted that the Aboriginal was not ready to be settled on the land when, in his second reading explanation, he said:

. . . the Government of South Australia determined that it would ensure title in the existing land to the Aboriginal people . . .

He then qualified that statement by saying that this could be done, provided they could manage these lands themselves. Why did the Minister qualify that statement. I believe that if he were quite sure that Aborigines were ready to take over the management and working of reserves no need would have existed for him to say they could do so, provided they were capable. I think only one Aboriginal has been settled outside Point Pearce on agricultural land, namely, Tim Hughes, a military medallist of the Second World War, who was settled on such land not because of an appointment made by the department but because of the war service land settlement scheme. Having worked for some years under that scheme, he qualified to select a block which, in fact, he received, along with other returned men. Tim Hughes did not learn to be proficient at agricultural practices through Point Pearce; he became proficient because of tuition received while working land under the war service land settlement scheme.

Agricultural practices at Point Pearce are totally different from those in the South-East. The chief agricultural practice at Point Pearce is growing cereals and keeping some cattle and sheep, whereas Tim Hughes's war service land settlement property at Reidy Creek in the South-East carries stock, including dairy cattle. It is not cereal-growing land. The member for Alexandra said:

We are dealing basically with a race of people who are nomadic by nature and who have never been agriculturally inclined in any sense.

The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) then interjected and said:

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

That is not correct, and I think if the member for Port Pirie had any knowledge of agricultural practices at Point Pearce or Point McLeay he would not have said that.

Mr. McKee: I said that you would know they could do it, if they had the opportunity.

Mr. FERGUSON: I have the *Hansard* pull here, and the honourable member said:

And they have never had the opportunity to be.

That is not correct.

Mr. McKee: I was referring to the majority of them.

Mr. FERGUSON: Point Pearce mission was established in 1868, and I believe that for the past century agricultural pursuits have been followed there. Some of the early residents would have helped to bring the land into production from its virgin state. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) spoke about establishing these people on the land and teaching them to drive a tractor. The member for Port Pirie interjected, saying, "You've got to make a start". Many Aborigines in the inner reserves of South Australia made that start many years ago. For as long as I can remember residents of Point Pearce have been encouraged to participate in agricultural practices on the reserve, and certain residents have been encouraged to engage in share farming on that reserve.

Mr. McKee: That has been successful, too.

Mr. FERGUSON: I shall now give some instances of where the share farming has been practised. The member for Port Pirie says that this share farming has been successful; I do not contradict him, for in some respects it has

been carried out satisfactorily. For many years past the policy of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs has been to select four men from Point Pearce to work a portion of land under a share farming system. I understand that the four share farmers selected use the machinery provided by the reserve. Those selected to work on the share system each take 20 per cent. In latter years, some of the residents of Point Pearce have been given the opportunity to engage in what is called a half-share system. This was made possible partly by the department, and experienced agriculturists (men interested in the residents of the reserve and men who assisted with their knowledge of agricultural practices and provided financial help) contributed to the system. I know that at least one resident of the reserve has share farmed on this basis for four or five years. During that time he share-farmed a portion of the land quite successfully from an agricultural point of view; at a conservative estimate, he grossed about $40,000 during this term. However, today he share farms on the half-share system no longer. Apart from having farmed the land well, he is no further forward today than he was when he started share farming.

Mr. Nankivell: To what would you attribute that?

Mr. FERGUSON: To his management of his financial affairs. Another case is that of four men who, after being selected to work land on the Point Pearce reserve, completed their year's work and, after paying all their outstanding accounts, paying for their "bombs" and so on, had $2,000 each left. They were anxious (and an officer of the reserve was also anxious) that they should be able to share farm on the half-share basis in the same way as the other person to whom I referred. An officer of the department took these four men to see a gentleman outside the reserve, whom he considered would be able to give them practical advice. The former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs will bear me out when I say that after the officer had spent all night discussing the proposition to place these men on half-share farming the last thing he asked was, "Where is this money?" They told him it was in the bank at Port Victoria. He asked them whether they were quite sure that the proposition worked out was what they wanted, and they said that it was. This man underook to interview the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, who said, "I think you have something; I will give the matter further consideration and see whether we can arrange something for these men on a half-share basis in the same way as we arranged it for the other man". The man who had shown interest in the residents of Point Pearce, who had been keen to see them established on a half-share basis and who would have supported them, heard nothing more of them; they had disappeared. No more was heard of the money because, apparently, that had disappeared, too. I have related these experiences because I believe it does not make any difference whether an Aboriginal Lands Trust is established to look after the reserves or whether these residents are set up in agricultural practices.

Mr. Shannon: From what generation would those people from Point Pearce have come?

Mr. FERGUSON: I should say they would be second generation. I point out that whichever way the system is worked the progress will be no greater. I suggest that, in order to be a successful farmer, one has to do more than grow a 40-bushel crop. Most men, whether they are proficient or not, can sometimes grow such a crop. However, management and organizational ability are required and, if the Minister is so sure that the residents of the reserves are ready to take over, as this Bill suggests, he should have given these people the opportunity to prove their proficiency in agricultural practices, which are carried on at most of the inner reserves. The various departments of the farms have to be managed. If the residents are ready to take over the management, they ought to be able to control the departments already established on reserves.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They have taken over the store at Point Pearce, and it is running very well.

Mr. FERGUSON: They may have done that, but running the store is not working the land. The Minister knows as well as I and most other people that they are not ready to manage the various farm departments.

Mr. McKee: Have you any idea when they will be ready?

Mr. FERGUSON: They have had an opportunity, as I shall establish. Some residents have discussed with me taking over the management of certain farm departments and I have told them that I consider that they are not ready to do so. There was a piggery at Point Pearce at one time, but it ceased to function because the residents were not able to manage it. There was also a dairy at that reserve at one time but it is not there today, because those in charge of it could not manage it to the extent necessary, having regard to hygiene and other matters. The health inspector found

that the regulations were not being observed and that, therefore, the dairy could not continue to operate.

These are reasons why I consider that the residents are not ready to take over the management of these reserves. In most occupations in life one cannot put off until tomorrow what can be done today, and that principle applies particularly to agricultural practices. If a farmer who is working the land with his tractor in preparation for sowing a crop sees a shoal of fish in the gulf, he cannot leave and go fishing, because three or four inches of rain may fall in the meantime and he may not be able to get on the land when he returns. The weeds would be growing while the man was fishing and he would not be giving necessary attention to the preparation of his land. However, one of the characteristics of the Aboriginal is that, if he does not want to do something today, tomorrow will do.

We have not been told what will take place when this Aboriginal Lands Trust is set up. I do not think the Minister is sure that the residents are ready to take such responsibilities. Does he intend to set up a training centre on one of the reserves so that the residents may receive special training in agricultural practices?

Mr. McKee: Why didn't your Government do it? It could have done it years ago.

Mr. FERGUSON: If the Aborigines are to be successful, they must have training.

Mr. Shannon: Surely the four that you told us about had some training?

Mr. FERGUSON: Not only did they have training from the department but they had the benefit of the practical knowledge and assistance of men who had worked outside the reserves. *Hansard* records that, when the member for Flinders was speaking, I said that Point Pearce reserve comprised 40,000 acres. That is not so: the correct figure is 14,000 acres. Much of this land is not arable and I consider that, if that reserve is cut up into farms, eight to 10 farms at the most could be provided. The population of the reserve is 306 and if about 20 residents are to work these farms, what is to happen to the rest of the population?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How many residents at Point Pearce are engaged directly in farm work now?

Mr. FERGUSON: By setting up the Aboriginal Lands Trust, it is intended to set the people up in agricultural practices.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is your own construction. You are going into cloud cuckoo land. We have specifically denied that we have any such intention. We said that in the House last year.

Mr. FERGUSON: The member for Unley spoke about education of the Aboriginal people, which I consider one of the most important matters for Aborigines. However, this Bill will do nothing to improve the education of those on the reserves. That is because the responsibility for their education rests with the Education Department. If we can encourage these people to understand that education is an important aspect of their lives, many of the troubles regarding Aboriginal reserves will be overcome. This will be particularly so if they are given a technical education. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the member for Alexandra. If it is given effect to, it will bring great benefit to the Aboriginal people.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): In rising to support this Bill, I do not wish to have anything to do with the motion moved by the member for Alexandra; nor do I consider it of such importance that I should even mention it. I listened attentively to the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) and the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson). I enjoyed their speeches because, being ex-Cabinet Ministers, they knew all about these reserves. I think that in their own hearts they realize that this Bill is a good move for the Aborigines.

Like the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson), I have not visited the reserves further north (and, in particular, the north-west reserves) so I shall confine my remarks to the places about which I perhaps know something. The only other reserve I visited whilst up north with the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) was the Amoonguna settlement. I was interested in the work done there. They are faced with a totally different problem in the Far North from that facing the south of the State. I listened attentively to the member for Yorke Peninsula. I know he is a practical and successful farmer, which could be attributed to the fact that he lives in some of the best grain-growing land on Yorke Peninsula. He is fortunate to live within that line of rainfall that assists any farmer to become a good farmer. Nevertheless, one needs business acumen and an aptitude for farm management to make farming a success.

Mr. Quirke: A good farmer is a good farmer anywhere.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly; that is the point I want to make. I do not take away any credit from the member for Yorke Peninsula, because

I have known him for most of my life. I know he is a practical and good farmer with a vast knowledge of the problems facing the Aborigines in his area. I was pleased to hear the honourable member say that, if Point Pearce was cut up into sections, it could accommodate eight to 10 families. He has shifted a little since the member for Flinders was speaking—

Mr. Ferguson: No.

Mr. HUGHES: I say "Yes", because, when the member for Flinders referred to Point Pearce, he turned to the member for Yorke Peninsula for guidance about the acreage and the number of Aborigines that Point Pearce could accommodate. His answer was that it was approximately 14,000 acres and could accommodate, at the most, four families.

Mr. Ferguson: I said "eight".

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member did not say "eight". Although I did not read the report of the speech, I heard him say "three or four".

Mr. Ferguson: I said "eight".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I made an estimate, but the honourable member did not agree with me. I did not hear what he said, but I was in error. I hope honourable members will forgive me for that misinterpretation.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought the honourable member said "four".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I said "three or four", and turned around and the honourable member made some comment I did not catch.

Mr. HUGHES: I apologize to the honourable member if I am wrong. He referred to the acreage as being approximately 14,000 and he said it could accommodate four families.

Mr. Ferguson: No; I said "eight".

Mr. HUGHES: Tonight he has doubled it; he has thought it over. I was shocked at the reply that he gave the member for Flinders, because I know the country as well as the member for Yorke Peninsula does, and I thought it would have accommodated eight to 10 families. I was shocked when the reply came that it could accommodate only four. It is no good the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) trying to substantiate it. What the honourable member has said is in *Hansard* and, if I have made a mistake in catching what he referred to, then I apologize. I am prepared to do that.

Mr. Heaslip: The honourable member said "eight" tonight.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that but, when the member for Flinders was speaking and he looked to the honourable member for guidance, the honourable member said "four families".

Mr. Ferguson: I said "eight".

Mr. HUGHES: If I am wrong I am prepared to apologize to the honourable member. It has been pointed out to me that the honourable member said "40,000 acres". That is what is in *Hansard*. Am I wrong, am I to be corrected? I understood it was 14,000 acres. I do not want to enter into any argument, because it is only the provocation of honourable members opposite that I was wrong in my statement that brought this on. It is stated plainly here in *Hansard* that the member for Yorke Peninsula said "40,000 acres". I am prepared to say that the honourable member said "14,000", but that is not the point I am making here and now. The honourable member said:

> 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 it is not recorded in *Hansard*, the member for Yorke Peninsula said "four families". Apparently *Hansard* did not catch it. I do not want to enter into any argument about it. This arose only from interjections to the effect that I was wrong. I went a little further with it, so perhapse we can leave it there, because apparently this could be a mistake on the part of *Hansard*. It is an easy mistake to make when recording "40,000" or "14,000". I was pleased to hear the member for Yorke Peninsula tonight say "eight to 10 families", because when the member for Flinders was speaking the honourable member referred to it as "four families". I think I have made my point. One of the members of the Opposition made a slight mistake, and apparently Opposition members do not like these mistakes. However, I do not see anything wrong with that, for anyone can make a mistake. I suppose the honourable member, after having gone into it further, worked out the acreage there and how many families it could accommodate, and he then said it could accommodate eight or 10 families.

This country of ours was founded on Christian principles, and it was fully intended that those principles would be applied to the natives of this country. In fact, an instruction was issued to that effect to the Resident Commissioner at that time. I have a particular reason for referring to the explanation given by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in introducing

this Bill, for the Minister detailed the instructions given to the Resident Commissioner as follows:

His Majesty's Government, having appointed an officer whose special duty it will be to protect the interests of the Aborigines, the commissioners consider it unnecessary to do more than give you a few general instructions as to the manner in which they are desirous that your own proceedings, with regard to the native inhabitants, should be regulated. You will see that no lands, which the natives may possess in occupation or enjoyment, be offered for sale until previously ceded by the native to yourself. You will furnish the Protector of the Aborigines with evidence of the faithful fulfilment of the bargains or treaties which you may effect with the Aborigines for the cession of lands; and you will take care that the Aborigines are not disturbed in the enjoyment of the lands over which they may possess proprietary rights, and of which they are not disposed to make a voluntary transfer. On the cession of lands, you will make arrangements for supplying the Aboriginal proprietors of such lands not only with food but with shelter, and with moral and religious instruction.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the House that despite this instruction by the commissioners in London to the Resident Commissioner here regarding providing the Aborigines with food and shelter, not much was done in that respect. I have here a book, *A Study of Assimilation*, by Fay Gale which refers to the rations distributed in 1860 and which indicates that the authorities at that time were not very generous. The book contains a table setting out the number of issues made in each Aboriginal depot during a certain period and the total cost and average per capita cost of such issue. It lists the various stations supplied (for a period of six months unless otherwise specified), the number of natives to whom issues were made, the total cost of rations issued, and the average cost of rations for each native.

For Chowilla for the six months ended June 30, 1860, there were 247 natives, total cost £30 15s. 0d., for an average cost of each native of 2s. 6½d.; at Venus Bay for the same period, 510 natives, total cost £67 14s., or 2s. 7¾d. each native; Overland Corner, for the same period, 1,067 natives, total cost £75 17s., or 1s. 5d. a head; Blanchetown, 196 natives, total cost £29 16s. 6d., at an average of 3s. 0½d.; Mount Serle, 2,224 natives, total cost £29 19s. 8d., average cost 3d.; Port Lincoln, 643 natives, total cost £41 12s. 3d., or 1s. 3½d. average; Robe Town, 1,173 natives, total cost £14 10s. 5d., or 2¾d. average; Wellington, 3,876 natives, total cost £66 10s. 10d., or an average of 4d.; Goolwa, 1,371 natives, total cost £82 5s. 7d., or 1s. 2½d. average; Point McLeay, 886 natives, total cost £39 7s 9d., or a 10½d. average; Mount Remarkable (to March 31, 1860, only), 1,836 natives, total cost £72 10s. 5d., or 9½d. average; Franklin Harbour (to March 31, 1860, only), 118 natives, total cost £8 4s. 6d., or an average of 1s. 4¾d. This gives a total of 14,147 natives; a total cost of rations issued, £559 3s. 11d.; and a general average for the natives at all the stations of about 9½d. That was for a period of six months!

Members will see, therefore, that despite the instructions issued at that time regarding the feeding of these people, the authorities at that time were not very generous. I want to refer again to the Minister's speech and continue with his quotation of the instruction given to the Resident Commissioner. The instruction proceeds as follows:

With this view, you will cause weather-proof sheds to be erected for their use and you will direct that the Aborigines be supplied with food and clothing in exchange for an equivalent in labour. The means for effecting these objects will be left for your arrangement with the Protector of the Aborigines; but you will bear in mind the necessity for a strict regard to economy. One means by which extensive benefits may probably be conferred on the Aborigines at a small cost will be to afford them gratuitous medical assistance and relief. If such an arrangement should appear to you desirable, you will apply to the Governor to give the necessary instructions to the colonial surgeon.

The Minister then said:

Some two years after the founding of the province, the Secretary of the South Australian Association observed in a report to England: "No legal provision by way of purchase of land on their behalf or in any other mode has yet been made, nor do I think with proper care it is at all necessary."

That confirms that the instruction had just been ignored on that occasion. Apparently the report that was sent to England was a misleading one, because it appears that the commissioners in England were of the opinion that everything was going well out here in South Australia, whereas that was not so. If ever there had been a beginning, that report heralded the end of the application of Christian principles to the Aborigines by the authorities of the land. Today, a genuine attempt is being made to do something that has been talked about for over 100 years. Every member should vote for this Bill. Although it is 100 years late, it is not too late to make amends for the un-Christian attitude adopted by the authorities in this country many years ago. Let us do unto others as we would have others do

unto us. I congratulate the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs on reintroducing the Bill. I heard his second reading explanation, and I have since studied it in *Hansard*. I regret that personalities have entered into this debate, because I know that the Minister genuinely desires to improve conditions for Aborigines and to make amends for the wrong done their forefathers many years ago.

The previous Minister (Hon. G. G. Pearson) also made a sincere attempt to improve the relationship between the Aborigines and the whites. I believe he was anxious to find out how best a relatively small population of mixed bloods, no longer able to participate in the life of their indigenous forebears, could find a place in the general community that would give satisfaction to themselves and be beneficial and acceptable to the larger community. The present Minister wants to go a step further and set up an Aboriginal Lands Trust to provide for those still on reserves, and to provide an opportunity for those who have left reserves but who desire to return to the land. In his second reading explanation, the Minister made it abundantly clear that only a small proportion of those Aborigines who seek urban existence want to take up land. However, the Bill provides for this to be done if necessary.

The action of the previous Government in granting oil exploration leases to certain mining companies without the knowledge of the Aboriginal Affairs Board was an insult to the board. Originally, it was intended by this Government to provide some compensation for the wrong committed by white people in not providing, many years ago, suitable land for Aborigines. The Labor Government wanted to give pre-eminent mineral rights over Aboriginal reserves to the Aborigines but, because of a shrewd move by the previous Government in having the reserves incorporated in other leases, the present Government could not proceed with its original intention. However, the Labor Government has done the next best thing by providing that, in the event of a mineral discovery, all royalties will be paid to the trust board. I should think that every honourable member would agree that if proper attention had been given in the early days of Australia to providing suitable large areas as reserves for Aborigines to roam and to provide for themselves, authorities today would not be faced with the problems they are endeavouring to solve.

Yesterday morning, one of my constituents from Moonta asked to see me because he did not want to state his wishes on the telephone. I was somewhat taken aback when he called during the afternoon and told me that for some time he had been concerned about Aborigines. He said that he had been delving into the Aborigines' history, and had become worried about the injustices done to them by white people. After listening to this man for a short time, I was firmly convinced that he was genuine and that he had read much about this problem, as he dealt extensively with the treatment meted out to the Aborigines since the white man had taken over their land. During our conversation he said that he was anxious to know the contents of this Bill and, in my humble way, I tried to explain it to him. As a result, he asked me whether I could arrange for him to meet the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs because, as he said, this was the most practical plan for helping Aborigines that he had heard of, and he was anxious to meet the Minister to discuss the problems with him. My father, who is 94 years old and who is still living, had considerable experience with Aborigines when he was a young man. He talks to me now (and his mind is still active) of the Aboriginal camps that were in the sandhills near the north beach at Wallaroo and of another camp a few miles north of Wallaroo.

It seems that the Aborigines who occupied those camps must have come to those areas after 1868, as that was the time when the Government allocated land for the Aboriginal Point Pearce Mission Station. I have already quoted from *A Study of Assimilation* by Fay Gale. It was prepared as a thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Geography at the University of Adelaide in 1960. Its contents are interesting and I recommend the book to all members. It deals with race mixture, a universal problem; population trends in South Australia; the roots of the problem; between two worlds; missions and reserves; Government policy and organization; the role of education; the role of employment; the roles of health and housing; social barriers to assimilation; regional variations; and finally, what of the future? The writer, in dealing with the roots of the problem, takes three periods, the first, from 1836 to 1857; the second, from 1857 to 1911; and the third, from 1911 to 1937. The first period deals with assimilation, the second with missions for a dying race, and the third with a policy of segregation. I shall not refer to all periods, but the author makes some interesting observations about the third period. At page 104 of her book she states:

The third period from 1911 to 1937 deals with the policy of segregation. No allowance was made for the Aborigines in the Commonwealth Constitution, 1901, because it was felt that they were rapidly dying out.

From what I have read, I believe that to be true of that time. I add that a number of people at that time hoped that this prophecy would prove accurate and that this race would die out. The book continues:

By 1910, however, informed opinion was convinced that for the mixed bloods, at least, this was not true. "While the number of full-blood Aborigines is certainly decreasing, the evidence clearly shows that the Aboriginal half-castes are on the increase." Throughout Australia there was a wave of feeling that something should be done for these people. In many States Acts were passed dealing solely with people of Aboriginal descent. In South Australia this surge of interest culminated in the Aborigines Act, 1911. This Act ushered in a new era of protection and segregation. Assimilation attempted in the first 20 years had failed. The second period when the Aborigines were practically ignored had achieved little. The race had not died out. Thus, a strong humanitarian move to protect these people arose. Following the same waves of administration undertaken in other States and parts of the world, 1911 saw the beginning of a period of attempted segregation in South Australia.

This was similar to the reservation period up to 1871 in the United States of America. The 1911 Act made the Chief Protector the legal guardian of all Aborigines and half-castes under the age of 16 years. It also gave them the power to move any Aboriginal or half-caste to a reserve and force him to stay there. Health and education were taken into consideration. The Act was protective in every aspect. It tried to curb relationships between white and Aboriginal women. A clause was inserted stating that an alleged white father should pay towards the upkeep of his half-caste child. One interesting provision in the Act, although never carried out, was a land settlement scheme for these people.

Therefore, as far back as that time, a suggestion similar to the provisions of the Bill was made, and we have had to wait until a Labor Government was elected before a Minister of Aboriginal Affairs was prepared to go the whole way towards implementing such a scheme.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not think that is quite right, because the Aborigines Act specially provided for land settlement of Aborigines, and was revised in 1962. It is not fair for the honourable member to make that statement.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe that previous Governments have not done enough and that the introduction of an Aboriginal lands trust will give a greater incentive to Aborigines to become self-supporting. The book continues:

An "Aboriginal Department" was to be established under the direction of a Cabinet Minister. As yet, 1960, no special Minister has been appointed and the Minister of Public Works has carried this responsibility.

We all know that the member for Flinders was the Minister to whom the book refers as the Minister of Public Works. I have already paid a tribute to the honourable member for his attempts whilst administering the Aborigines Department. However, I believe that, whereas the honourable member was attempting to do his best for the Aborigines, he perhaps was not receiving sufficient co-operation. By instituting an Aboriginal lands trust, the present Minister is attempting to make the Aboriginal more self-supporting. The book continues:

The strong desire to protect these people did not end with the Act, and in 1913 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into "the whole question of the South Australian Aborigines". It is interesting that the Royal Commission, 1913-15, should express a desire to train and assimilate part-Aborigines when the whole emphasis of the Act, 1911, and the actual results of the Commission were directed towards segregation. "The problem of dealing with the Aboriginal population is not the same problem that it was in the early history of the State."

(I am reading now from the report of the Royal Commission on Aborigines of 1913 and the minutes of evidence.)

There is no doubt that in the early days and for many years afterwards it was necessary for the Government to protect the native inhabitants, but, with the gradual disappearance of the full-bloods, the mingling of black and white races, and the great increase in the number of half-castes and quadroons, the problem is now one of assisting and training the native so that he may become a useful member of the community, dependent not upon charity but upon his own efforts." It is apparent that the Commissioners saw the need to train and settle part-Aborigines in the community but there was no qualified personnel available to do this work and public opinion favoured segregation. However, some of the recommendations of the Commission were quite far-reaching. The various missions were hampered by a heavy financial burden.

In 1913 the Commission investigated the stations of Point McLeay and Point Pearce and suggested that they be taken over by the Government. This was carried out and the Aborigines Department took control of these in 1914. During 1914-15 the Commission visited and studied the only other two missions in the State at that time, namely, Koonibba and Killalpininna. Here, too, the same recommendation was put forward that the Government should control them. However, this was not carried out. No doubt the war and the strong desire of the two branches of the

Lutheran Church to keep their stations influenced the lack of action in this direction. When reading the evidence of the Commission, at times it is difficult to realize that it is a discussion of the situation in 1913-15 and not of the present day, as in some directions so little seems to have taken place in the intervening 45 years. For instance, the following quotation from the 1913 report is almost identical with comments heard at Point Pearce today, both from staff and native residents:

> That it be a recommendation to the board that the system of share farming at Point Pearce be gradually abolished in so far as the outsider is concerned, and that arrangements be made whereby the most deserving Aborigines and half-castes be given such work.

It is gratifying to note that even many years ago a Royal Commission had recommended that white people should not intrude and reap the reward of the reserves, but that more endeavours should be made to consider the people who justly owned the land, who were entitled to be there, but who were being denied that right, in order to accommodate the white people. The book continues:

Thus, in spite of quite positive suggestions by the Royal Commission, this period, 1911-1939, saw a tight policy of segregation. There was a false opinion that this would overcome the problems of drink and immorality. Today, some authorities believe that segregation actually increases these two evils. The words of the Premier of South Australia, when introducing the 1911 Act, show how strongly favoured was this policy of segregation.

It is interesting to see what the Premier of that time said:

It was becoming more and more urgently necessary, for their own sakes, that legal power should be given to keep them away from the towns, and where and when such was found expedient—again for their own benefit—to require them to live in certain localities and on special reservations. On reservations there would be safeguards which would keep them away from the bad influences which now followed their being scattered throughout the country and townships.

The Premier at that time made it well known that there were evil-doers in the various communities with whom he did not want Aborigines to mix. Certain people referred to Aborigines as heathen natives. However, the Premier of that time tried to herd these people on to reserves to keep them away from the immorality rife in the community. I wonder whether those who referred to the Aborigines as heathen natives should not have referred instead to white people in this way. The Premier of that time concluded his statement by once again drawing the attention of the House to the immorality prevalent in certain parts of the State. He said:

For one thing, they would be prevented to a great extent from getting intoxicating drinks, and from the gross immorality which was now prevalent in certain parts of the State.

He was afraid for Aborigines to mix with this type of people. Therefore, it must have been thought by some that these people had high principles and should not be contaminated by the white man. Some of Fay Gale's work supports what my father has told me concerning the Aborigines that once lived in the Wallaroo district. Referring to the setting up of a mission station on Yorke Peninsula, she said:

Native people are usually attracted in some way by white settlement, and South Australia was no exception in the way native camps grew up on the edge of developing townships. This was indeed true of the mining towns of Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina. Here local residents, enthused with missionary zeal, formed a committee in 1867 to set up a mission for these people under the superintendency of the Reverend Julius Kuhn. At first it was a wandering mission following the Aborigines as they moved camp from Moonta to Wallaroo Bay and then inland to Kadina during the winter.

To the committee as well as Mr. Kuhn, it was disturbing to find the mission being constantly scattered by seemingly aimless migration, which was considered evidence of base ingratitude and selfishness on the part of the Aborigines. Thus with a complete lack of comprehension of the compulsions which drive a food gathering people, who rapidly exhaust the food supplies in any place they live in, the committee appealed to the Government for a grant of land to establish a permanent mission. In 1868 they were allocated six hundred acres situated on the western coast of Yorke Peninsula.

In this way the Government had given back to the original owners of the soil on the Peninsula a square mile of almost uncultivable land of all the millions of acres which this thriving and prosperous colony occupies. Apparently at a later date further grants of land were made to Point Pearce (after the original grant of 600 acres) making in all 13,591 acres.

Referring to the Point Pearce and Point McLeay missions, *A Study of Assimilation* states:

Point Pearce, opened in 1868, like Port McLeay was commenced not by any one church, but by a group of philanthropic people. Situated on the western coast of Yorke Peninsula it, too, has sections of poor country, sand dune and saline flats. However, much more of this reserve is good farming land than that at Point McLeay which has large sandy stretches. At Point Pearce, wheat and barley are grown under the direction of a farm overseer, and sheep and pigs raised under the guidance of a stock overseer.

The member for Yorke Peninsula stated that pigs were no longer raised at the mission. However, this thesis was written in 1960. It continues:

Both employ part-Aboriginal men, and at Point Pearce, four (who must give way to another four after one year) share farms. Although provision is made for only four part-Aboriginal share farmers, a section is granted to white share farmers. This is contrary to the recommendations of the 1913-15 Royal Commission, which stated explicitly that reserved land should be used for the part-Aboriginal residents rather than farmed by white men, yet the practice still continues.

It is interesting to see that the Royal Commission at that time recommended that the part-Aboriginal residents should get the benefit of the land in preference to white men. I maintain that this was correct because the reserves were never set up for white men to reap the reward. Surely the previous Governments could have taken some action whereby more part-Aborigines could have been settled on the station and taught the agricultural way of life so that they could have reaped the benefits that went to the white people.

The Lutheran Church, which was the first to introduce missionary work amongst the Aborigines, has sustained its interest in this matter right up to the present time. The work of this church is highly appreciated by anyone who has an interest in Aborigines. In her book, Fay Gale states that just 100 years ago the Lutheran Church returned to work in the northern part of South Australia. It was not received kindly by the Aborigines, as open hostility was shown towards the white missionaries, who had to retreat in 1867. They retreated and, after that, appealed for police protection. This comment was made by the then Police Commissioner of Adelaide:

> The nature of the mission raises the question as to whether the public of South Australia are called upon to find especial police protection to persons who go forth unsolcited into the wilderness to carry out a design of converting the heathen native to the religion of the civilized European.

Apparently, this Police Commissioner was a convert of Governor Gawler, who had previously shown a complete lack of understanding of the Aborigines. The Commissioner referred to the Aborigines as heathen natives and to the whites as civilized Europeans. I just wonder how civilized were the authorities who had been entrusted with the responsibility of seeing that the rights of the Aborigines were not disturbed. That is why I referred earlier to the remarks of certain people who termed the Aborigines "heathen natives". I think they fell far short of what was expected of people who held such highly responsible positions at that time. It was well established that, before full rights were granted to people of Aboriginal blood, white men made much money by selling cheap wines to these people. A flagon of wine that retailed for 80c to $1 was sold to Aborigines for $6, and I understand that in one area white men were demanding as much as $10 a flagon and that in many areas white men were bartering wine in return for Aboriginal women. This was nothing new, because as long ago as 1837 groups of white men living on Kangaroo Island had only native women living with them. History reveals that there was a popular doctrine and practice among the white men on the island that, if a black woman could be decoyed away, stolen, bought, or openly robbed, it was perfectly right to do so. Yet, a Police Commissioner at about the same time referred to the heathen natives and the civilized whites. That is why I query to whom they should have been referring when they were talking about heathens. I commend the Bill to the House and congratulate the Minister on being brave enough to introduce it so that it may become a great asset to the Aboriginal people of South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I rise to address myself to the amendment, having listened to the arguments advanced at considerable length by members on both sides. This has obviously become an extremely emotional issue and that has, in a sense, clouded the issue. In fact, many Government speakers, instead of supporting the Bill, have adopted an emotional attitude to its objects.

I have examined the Minister's explanation carefully. He goes to considerable length to outline the history behind this action and the reasons for introducing the legislation. He goes right back to the beginning of settlement and sets out the instructions that were issued in order to provide compensation to the native peoples for taking their lands from them. It has been said that something should have been done and that land should have been reserved to these people other than what they now have.

I point out, however, that it would have been difficult indeed to do this, because the Minister knows as well as I that the history of these people was that they lived as nomadic tribes, had recognized tribal areas, hunted quietly over those areas, and moved around them in cycles. Therefore, there was no fixed place in respect of which one could have said, "Here is where you belong. Your land shall be reserved to you." One would have been obliged to reserve virtually the whole of the State to these people in making such a provision.

Only recently, when certain areas in the North were being inspected, a native travelling with an officer of the department was asked, "Is this your land? Is this good land?" This went on until the Aboriginal, completely exasperated, said "It is all good land. It is all our land." I think that explains much of the concept behind this thinking, that the Aboriginal people believe that this land is theirs.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And it was theirs.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It was theirs, but how does one make the provision for them that has been suggested?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You don't think they should have even a small portion.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I said that it would be hard to reserve big areas and provide the Aborigines with the wherewithal to live under the system of tribal life they have followed. The Minister who is interjecting knows as well as I that there are ethical and religious problems associated with the land as far as the Aborigines are concerned, in that they look upon the earth as their mother, from which they derive nourishment. It is natural that they would be upset if their land were taken away from them.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: All primitive men think that, don't they?

Mr. NANKIVELL: And some less primitive men, perhaps, but that is aside from the basis of the argument.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is the very basis of the argument.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The very basis of the argument is that I am not saying that these people should not be given rights to land. I am not saying that they should not have land. I am saying that it was very difficult in those early stages to say what lands they should have to live on without being supported, as it was directed that they should be. I do not deny that they were pushed around and pushed into some rough spots. They came to look upon it as their right to be compensated in the form of sustenance. I am satisfied that it has been passed from generation to generation that the only way they could be compensated for their loss of rights to land was for them to be given hand-outs by the people who had deprived them of those rights.

Mr. Heaslip: Were we kind in doing that? I think we were doing them an injustice and a harm.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This is exactly the point: in the sense that they were deprived of their means of getting sustenance until they could develop ways of life that would enable them to live in harmony with us. As I pointed out earlier, this has become an extremely emotional issue with the Aboriginal people. In some ways, it has become exaggerated until it has become something that cannot be remedied until the introduction of legislation of this nature. That is the thinking of many people in this regard.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that the experience of the officers?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand it to be the experience of thinking officers and people associated with them. I have accepted the Minister's offer of discussing this matter with his officers, and I know that this has been their thinking.

The Bill sets out to protect the minority rights of these people. They may not be considered rights. It is said that the lands they are occupying belong not to them but to the Crown. The Minister has said they can be taken away from them, and they firmly believe that this is so. I have looked at the Acts referred to, including the Crown Lands Act, which, although it can be construed as stating that this land can be taken away from them, provides that the powers that the Governor has in this respect are the same as those that he has over any land he can dedicate for a particular purpose. By proclamation, those powers can be taken away, but does the Minister know that the Act states:

> A statement setting forth the reasons for any such resumption shall be laid before Parliament within 30 days after the proclamation, if Parliament is then sitting, and if Parliament is not then sitting, then within 30 days after the next sitting of Parliament.

I have tried to find out what would happen if Parliament disagreed with the Governor's proclamation, but I have not so far got an answer to that, except that I consider that, if the matter was an issue, it would be debated to such an extent in this House that some action would have to be taken to remedy the situation. Although it appears on the surface that there is no protection under this Act, there is in fact the protection given by Parliament. If Parliament is responsible in this matter, as it should be, it will see that no injustice is done in these circumstances.

The only other powers provided are those under the Aboriginal Affairs Act. It could be said that, by gradually contracting the boundaries of these reserves, they could be reduced to nothing. Again, the Minister in

charge of this Bill is not likely to suggest that the Governor should, by proclamation, do this thing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'm not.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not think that any other responsible Minister would, either. I am sure the Minister's predecessor would not have and his successors would not.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, but what has happened in Western Australia?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I know that these things have happened in other States but I venture to say, without looking at their Acts, that they do not give the same protection as that given under the two Acts I have just mentioned. Despite these protective powers, it is still felt that, unless these lands are vested in the people themselves, they can be taken away from them. Although this is possible, it is most unlikely it will ever happen.

It is also said that handing over land to these people will give them status in the community. I think there is ground to believe that this is so, that if this is a real thing with these people it may in some way readjust their thinking about these lands. It is said that they would be unsuccessful in many of the ventures they undertook and were directed in. It may well be that this is the result of an attitude of mind that "these things are not ours; they are only handed out to us." The responsibility resulting from the action fostered by this Bill could in some measure lead to their recovering not only their dignity but also some interest in doing something with this land. So there may be considerable merit in this Bill in redressing a grievance (which, again, is something that seems to be a purpose of this legislation) suffered 130 years ago. This Bill might achieve what the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to as "restoring to them the dignity of human rights".

These people, we must remember, do not do things as we do them: they enjoy a communal way of life. One criticism made about people of Aboriginal blood who occupy houses in some towns is that they bring all their friends along to the house. I know it is their almost inherent desire to share whatever they have, because this is part and parcel of their nature. So it may well be the fact that, while certain people enjoy the use of these lands, the rest of the Aboriginal people will be satisfied with such action being taken, but I point out that no direct provision is made to assist all the Aboriginal people under this legislation. This Bill sets out, purely and simply, to establish a lands trust, and the powers accruing to the trust are to be used for the purpose of acquiring more land and assisting in the developing and working of it by finance being provided to either groups or individuals. But there are at least 6,100 Aborigines in this State, and there may be 1,000 or so more. Perhaps the survey being undertaken will establish the correct numbers.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It may be more than that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Probably, but the figures I have are accepted as authentic at present. They show that there are between 6,100 and 6,200 people of Aboriginal blood in South Australia. The figure provided by the Minister in his second reading explanation shows that about 2,370 of those live on reserves. Therefore, more than half the Aboriginal people of this State would never stand to benefit directly from this legislation, from land being vested in an Aboriginal lands trust. But it may well be that because of their attitude towards things they will feel satisfied, particularly as this has become a real and emotional issue with them. As previous speakers have pointed out, this problem of settling Aborigines on the land should be solved by means other than those set out in this Bill. I accept the fact that there is a limit of 160 acres in the Crown Lands Act. I do not know why, but this acreage seems to be perpetuated in the Northern Territory legislation. Why 160 acres?

Mr. Rodda: It may result from the quarter section in America.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. I do not know sufficient about that to be able to agree with or contradict it but provision is made under the Crown Lands Act, section 5 (*c*) of which provides:

. . . lease to any Aboriginal native, or the descendant of any Aboriginal native, any Crown lands . . .

I admit it states "160 acres". An issue has been made of this, but it is like any other Bill. I am satisfied that provision could be made to define some area to be acceptable as a reasonable living area. I am still waiting to have a "living area" defined, but it is one of those ephemeral things no-one seems able to grasp. I am sure provision could be made under that Act to cover this issue. Also, section 22 of the Aboriginal Affairs Act, as pointed out by the member for Flinders, gives the Minister power to assist. In fact, the assistance the Minister

could grant under that Act is far wider than that which could be provided under the terms of the present Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He is not proposing to dispose of that power, either.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I realize that. At the same time, there are powers here that the Minister could use, but no-one has yet attempted to use those powers.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not quite right.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister can explain later just where he has attempted to use that power. Clause 6 of this Bill, under Part II, deals with the membership of the trust. I think the matter is left very wide and perhaps (I do not wish to be suspicious) extremely free of any direction, because it says:

. . . . . the Governor may whenever he thinks it fit so to do . . .

That is pretty wide. It does not mean that the Governor has to make an appointment: he merely does so if he thinks fit so to do. One could say, if one had a suspicious mind, that there would be this trust set up in which this land is to be vested and that it might consist of only the chairman and two other members. I do not mean to imply that this is what the Minister would do, but provision is made and he is always so terribly worried about what other people (including his successors) might do. I think he has left this extremely wide, and I do not understand exactly why. The clause also provides that the Governor may appoint additional members not exceeding nine upon the recommendation of Aborigines Reserve Councils. As I understand it, he may do that only if those people elect to come under the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

I have asked the Minister for more detailed information concerning Point McLeay, in which I would have a real concern and interest. I do not think I am flattering myself by saying that, Mr. Speaker. In his reply the Minister said that the people at Point McLeay did not wish Point McLeay to become an open village for five years, and I say that perhaps they do not wish to come under the Aboriginal Lands Trust for five years. This is subject to their having discussions with members of the council or the trust board that is appointed. It need not necessarily mean that they will not come under the lands trust in less time than the five years that they are thinking in terms of at present. Point McLeay, one of the older reserves, consists of two parts: Block K, which has 3,000 acres and is waterless, and the other section, which has 2,700 acres on which all of the people and the staff of the reserve reside.

In speaking to this legislation last year I pointed out that attempts had been made to settle selected families on Block K, but unfortunately, because of isolation, I presume, more than anything else, they did not choose to stay there. The rest of the lands, as the Minister knows, are not in a very happy condition. Having inspected them in company with the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and the Minister of Agriculture about 18 months ago, I know that everybody was concerned at that time about the condition of these lands. On inquiring the other day to see whether the manpower position was any better now than it was then, I was told that it fluctuated from day to day between one and 15 able-bodied men, and nobody knows just what it will be on any one day. Most of the people who reside there are engaged in some other occupation, either trapping or share-farming—mostly share-farming the wool off somebody's sheep, I suggest, because some very good shearers have come from Point McLeay and some still reside there. It would seem to me that although it could well be estimated that this reserve could keep, by developing its agricultural potential through irrigation, perhaps eight families and no more—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Would you think as many as that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I said "no more", and I think that eight families would be stretching it; but after listening to what the member for Wallaroo said about our being so cautious and under-estimating things, I was being a little more optimistic. Perhaps I can be forgiven for that. The point is, of course, that this reserve is one where the department is having considerable difficulties. I know that one matter discussed during that tour of Point McLeay was the fact that it might be practicable to allow leases to be established and taken out on this land by adjacent landowners in order that the land might be developed and put into better order. I put this idea forward last year, and I suggested that the land should be leased to someone who in using it would develop and improve it, to which the Minister replied that that would have to be a condition of the lease.

I think I can construe from that that some thought has been given to the possibility that this land may be leased and not necessarily leased to people of Aboriginal blood. I think this is relevant to this situation. It has been considered that land might be leased to people other than those of Aboriginal blood in order

that the land might be put into satisfactory condition for the ultimate occupation by persons of Aboriginal blood. However, I suggest that if the Government and the Minister were to attempt to do this in their own right it would meet with a storm of protest, and that this would be impracticable and virtually impossible for this Government (with its attitude towards this matter) and the Minister, particularly, to do in their own right. I suggest that this could be done through this Bill, Mr. Speaker. If these people themselves elect that this should be done, that is perfectly proper and there can be no criticism of the Government or the Minister as a consequence.

As I pointed out, the trust is a loosely appointed council, and much power could be placed in the hands of a few people. This could be a way of getting around a situation that the Government would find embarrassing if it had to execute these powers itself.

Mr. Ferguson: Wouldn't that be a reason why the Government could not do it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It cannot do it because of its attitude and the public feeling in this matter. I am not suggesting that it should not be done, but it would be embarrassing for the Government to do it. This may be a good idea for the time being, and the Minister may agree.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is right.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It could not be done with Aboriginal reserves without the full concurrence of the Aborigines.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I cannot do it unless they do it for themselves. It is not for me or the Government to do it.

Mr. Heaslip: That is right.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the meantime, the trust has to be set up and financed. The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) suggested that perhaps 7,000 acres of unoccupied Crown land could be disposed of, if necessary, under these arrangements. I have considered the list given to me by the Minister and I cannot imagine anyone wanting to buy most of the land in my district that is on this list. Who would want to buy Goat Island or other spots in the Coorong? Many parts of the Bonney Reserve have a Coorong frontage, and would be of little value. It may seem to be a way for money to be obtained to float the trust, but it is unlikely that much money will come from this source. It is more likely to come from land used on a leasehold basis. This money, whether accruing from leasing land to Aborigines, from the sale of land, or from mineral or petroleum rights (royalties will accrue if successful prospecting is done under this legislation), can be used only to purchase land and to develop and improve properties, as set out in clause 17. If the Government intends to do something for the general welfare of these people, even though they may accept that there will be some compensation or redress should the land be transferred, some provision should be made if wealth is derived from such mineral leases that this money should be available for the general welfare of all Aborigines. However, that is not provided for in the Bill, which states that whatever wealth accrues to the trust will be devoted to the acquisition and development of land and the assistance to people in projects associated with the land.

Mr. Hughes: Lands cost much money.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It has been established that we have reserves that we cannot satisfactorily work until we have people trained and equipped to farm them. We have not reached the stage where there is any urgency to acquire new land for this purpose. If the problem were urgent, money would have to be provided from the Minister's department, and settlement would have to be arranged under terms of section 22 of the Aboriginal Affairs Act. Ultimately, if the project develops, as we wishfully think it will, some land will be available on which to settle these people, if they want to be farmers. However, I do not believe they do. These people are artisans with skills, and most of them will be more interested in devoting their energies elsewhere than to farming. Their agricultural habits, if any, have come from the fusion of European blood. It is not native to them to be agriculturists. We know they are hunters. As the member for Flinders said, although they are not naturally horsemen they are agile and adapt themselves to stock work and are competent stockmen when trained. However, I do not know where to obtain all the land required to settle them if they all want to be farmers, as they are in the same position as anyone else. The Minister of Lands knows what pressure is on him to obtain land.

These people will develop skills in other directions, as they have the ability. I have noticed their development at the Meningie Area School, where they compete successfully with others on a common basis. The intellectual level of Aborigines is not substandard. One girl is in the Intermediate class at Bordertown and will continue and sit for her Leaving examination. All these people need is encouragement. It is unfortunate that the Act does not

provide that money derived from mineral discoveries (and that is the principal source of wealth for the lands trust, as it will not obtain much finance for properties on the reserves), should be available to benefit all Aborigines.

Mr. McKee: The member for Alexandra said money might embarrass them.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Port Pirie said a few things that he would not like me to quote. However, I do not wish to enter into a discussion with him. The Bill has been introduced as an emotional issue. It may help to solve some problems, but it has shortcomings, some of which I have tried to point out. No doubt future speakers will refer to other problems arising from the introduction of the Bill. At present, there seems to be a slight misunderstanding amongst the Aborigines about what the Bill will do for them. Apparently, some on reserves think that this is a big handout and that they will get a farm of their own. In these circumstances, it is most important that we satisfy ourselves that everyone concerned with this legislation knows what it entails. Therefore, I support the amendment moved by the member for Alexandra.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the Bill and oppose the amendment, but I shall not re-hash all that has been said. I do not intend to deal with any personal matters that may have been raised in the House in the last few days. Australians have earned for themselves a poor record for their attitude towards this continent's original inhabitants. The Minister in his wisdom, having taken a particular interest in Aboriginal welfare, has, through his investigations with officers concerned in the administration of Aboriginal affairs, endeavoured to correct some of the anomalies that have existed in this country for the last 130 years. Early in the colony of South Australia an attempt was made under the Wakefield scheme to give to our Aborigines some recognition in regard to lands that were being sold, but after about 20 years the endeavours ceased, and for the 100-odd years up until recently no substantial assistance was given to Aborigines.

Those who have read any of South Australia's early history (and I doubt whether the Opposition will admit this) will readily agree that most of the problems associated with the Aboriginal people have been conveniently forgotten. Indeed, the thought of the Aboriginal having any rights in respect of land is anathema to certain sections of the community. In their own interests, the Aborigines should be given some responsibility in the conduct of their affairs, something that the Minister is endeavouring to recognize in introducing the Bill. The setting up of a lands trust is not and never was intended (as has been implied by certain members of the Opposition) to give every Aboriginal, whether a full-blood or half-caste, say, an acre of land to farm. The trust is to be established to try to ensure that, if certain minerals are discovered on reserves under departmental control, some of the assets will in some way eventually be returned to the Aboriginal, thus compensating him for some of the white people's shortcomings.

This legislation will be the forerunner to much legislation concerning Aboriginal people in this country. I regret that the Opposition has seen fit to doubt the intelligence of Aborigines. There are many eminent and well-educated Aborigines in Australia. Given the opportunity, Aboriginal children can reach standards in education similar to those attained by Europeans. Indeed, that is evident throughout the world where natives are given a chance. New Zealand Maori policy has progressed most noticeably under the leadership of Maori and part-Maori officers and politicians, such as Sir Apirana Ngata (a former Minister of Maori Affairs), Mr. T. T. Ropiha (a former head of the Department of Maori Affairs), and Sir James Carroll (a former Acting Prime Minister of New Zealand for periods between 1909 and 1911). It was found by giving them responsibility that Maori people developed talents that may not otherwise have been evident.

Mr. McKee: Were they full-blooded Maoris?

Mr. BURDON: Yes. Maoris today, as everybody should know, are represented in the New Zealand Parliament, the result of a treaty which came into force after a battle with New Zealand's white people many years ago and which secured for the Maoris certain rights and privileges. Aborigines in this country in the early days were mowed down by guns and given poisoned water and food. They were often considered to be a hindrance to the white man solely because they raided his sheep for the sustenance of which they had been originally deprived by the white man. Aborigines were driven into the far corners of the country. The United States of America's Bureau of Indian Affairs is today staffed by as many Indians and part-Indians as whites, which clearly shows that that country believes that the best way to treat its natives is to give them responsibilities. I firmly believe that, if we are to progress in this State, this measure

will be a step in the right direction. I have just been given certain information by a member of the Opposition (the member for Light), who asks me to "get stuck into the Opposition". Having received that invitation, I shall certainly do so, because I believe the Opposition has been hypocritical in this debate. If the honourable member has any contribution to make to this debate, and he can show he is interested in the welfare of Aborigines, he should get up and say more than his colleagues have done today.

Mr. McKee: Or ever whilst they were in Government!

Mr. BURDON: We have heard nothing constructive.

Mr. McKee: "It won't work; it's impossible; it's crook!"

Mr. BURDON: Opposition members have done nothing but criticize the Bill. Why don't they get up and say something constructive so that the people of South Australia can see where they stand? The people realize (and they realize it more each day) that members opposite have nothing to contribute to this Parliament and no constructive suggestions to make. If the light of Light wants something from this side of the House then let him contribute something constructive to the debate. I am not concerned with the little note he brought over here. If he wants to bring over more notes let him do so; I will reply to him and, I hope, shed a little light on his problems.

The Bill is designed to give something to those we have robbed and plundered throughout the history of this country. We have adopted a paternal attitude to Aborigines over the years: now let us do something constructive. Opposition members have said Aborigines make good stock men, which work they do for low wages. If they make good stock men, carry out certain functions on stations in the outback and adapt themselves to those conditions, then they can adapt themselves to other conditions. Let us see whether we can repair some of the past damage done to these people. In our schools it has been seen that Aboriginal children can learn and absorb what they learn. Unfortunately, in this State, when an Aboriginal girl or boy gets the Intermediate or Leaving certificate in the same class as a white boy or girl, even if the Aboriginal child has more scholastic ability, he or she will not get a job ahead of a white child. That is one of the tragedies of this country. If given assistance, in technical fields particularly, Aborigines are capable of taking their place alongside white men, who came and settled in their land and drove them to the far corners of the country.

I do not intend to delay the passage of the Bill. However, as a weekend newspaper stated, the Minister should receive kudos for introducing this Bill. A certain Opposition member said that the Minister was out to break records but I can regard that only as a cynical remark. I regret that personalities should enter into a debate such as this. It has been said that this has become an emotional and hysterical debate and has not been discussed in a rational manner. However, the object of the Bill is rational and will give back to the Aboriginal people something that they have been denied. If it were left to the Opposition they would possibly receive in the next few years the same treatment that they have received over the last 130 years. What place can an Aboriginal take in the Australian community? How can he be fitted in to fufil a role to the satisfaction of himself and his neighbours? He should be given some responsibility. I understand that this is now the practice of officers under the control of the Minister and wherever possible full-blood and part-Aborigines are given some degree of responsibility. I believe this is the way in which some sense of belonging and pride can be instilled into these people; thus they will have some confidence in themselves. For too long they have been denied opportunities.

I was amazed at the tenor of the remarks that emanated from Opposition members during the debate. It is plain to me that a certain section of the community believes that land should not be alienated to Aborigines. That attitude is completely wrong because the land was originally taken from them and some effort must be made on their behalf. The Government is now making an effort to give these people an opportunity in the years ahead. I find it hard to imagine that anybody could read into this Bill some of the things read into it by Opposition members. It is completely ridiculous for them to say an attempt will be made for all Aborigines to be set up on farms as a result of the Bill, because that was never intended and would never be possible. Such a statement is a complete distortion of the truth.

Mr. Hughes: The Minister made that plain.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, and it should be plain to anybody who reads the Bill. I have much pleasure in supporting this legislation.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I wish to comment on the motion moved by the member for Alexandra, because I believe that the speeches made earlier in the debate by Opposition members showed clearly the insincerity behind this motion. Their speeches revealed what they thought about this motion. It was never intended by Opposition members that there should be a proper examination of this matter by the appointment of a Select Committee; the motion was moved purely to side-track the issue. I want to substantiate what I am saying in this regard. The members of the Opposition who spoke earlier went to much trouble in suggesting that my colleague, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, was concerned with getting Aborigines on farms as agriculturists. In fact, they drew a picture of an Aboriginal being a nomadic person who could not possibly be an agriculturist. They tried to write down the capacity of the Aboriginal to change his ways in any shape or form but they admitted that, despite the fact that he was a nomadic person, he could operate a piece of modern machinery. How inconsistent can they be!

As I listened to their story about how these nomads could not possibly change their ways and be agriculturists, I was reminded of the Roman general who, during the occupation of Britain, wrote to Rome and said, "The natives here are so stupid that they could never develop into anything." That is just what the members of the Opposition were saying about the Australian Aborigines. Of course, my colleague made it perfectly plain that this Bill was never introduced for the purpose of turning nomads into agriculturists. He said:

> Let us make it clear that only a small proportion of those Aborigines who seek urban existence ever want to take up land.

The only well-reasoned speech from the Opposition came from the member for Albert. At least, he had a reasoned approach. He got down to the root of the matter when he said that there was something in this Bill, because it got down to the point of the emotional feelings of the Aboriginal in so far as his love of land was concerned. Of course, every man has the love of land, because he knows that this is the very basis of his existence. I am reminded of these well-known lines:

> Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> "This is my own, my native land".

Just as the people of Great Britain think of Great Britain as their native land, so the Australian native thinks of this country as his native land and, if he could feel that he owned something of it, no matter how small a portion, it would at least give him some consolation after the long period during which he has suffered at the hands of the so-called Christian people (and I say so-called Christian people) who have had control of this country for so long.

I am amazed that we stand here and have the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of our daily session, yet we have people getting up and wishing to deny the Aborigines the ownership of any land in the land of their birth, their own land. I wonder how many members of the Opposition ever put themselves in the place of these people, who are human beings the same as we are. Unfortunately, we see in all debates of this sort the superiority of our race coming out and an arrogance toward any person not of our own particular colour.

The members opposite dealt with this purely from their own points of view. They said that, if a man wants a piece of land, he must want to be a farmer. Why should he want it so that he can be a farmer? Members opposite think this is the only use to which land can be put: if a man cannot grow 40 bushels an acre on it, then he should not have a piece of land; if he cannot do that with it, he has no right to it. They say there cannot be any other use for it. This is the argument that they have been advancing.

We have only heard one speech (and that is the one to which I have referred) from members of the Opposition that had any rational approach. The Opposition has said that these people should not have land unless they can become agriculturists and at the same time have said that they cannot possibly become agriculturists. Therefore, the motion to set up a Select Committee to examine this question is sheer bunk. Opposition members, having said that the Aborigines could not possibly be agriculturists, know that their argument for a Select Committee is sheer nonsense. That is why their action in moving this motion is one of complete insincerity.

When members of the Opposition started off, as two of them did, by imputing improper motives to my colleague for having introduced this legislation, I thought that was one of the lousiest things we have heard in this House. Nowadays, they seem to spend their time imputing ulterior motives and trying to sow suspicion in the minds of the people about the personal ideals and principles of the members of the Government, but that is not having the

sort of effect outside that they imagine. Their attitude to this measure is on all fours with the attitude that has been exemplified since we became a Government. I am not at all surprised, but I say that this motion is nothing but one of insincerity as far as the Opposition is concerned.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 27, at 2 p.m.