

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 9, 1966.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, 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.

QUESTIONS

FRUIT EXPORTS.

Mr. HALL: This morning's *Advertiser* contains an article relating to remarks made by a representative of the London fruit market about the difficulty in selling Australian fruit on that market. One of the main reasons given for the difficulty was the increasing supply of South African fruit to the London market at a lower price. Secondly, it was stated that the British Seamen's Union strike had created an impression among the public that fruit would cost more. The other opinion given was that the position would have been even worse had it not been for the drought in Australia. As this matter directly affects many South Australian producers, will the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain what is the position now and what the immediate future holds for these export industries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I read the article referred to by the Leader, and heard last evening an Australian Broadcasting Commission news report on the matter. I think that the Chairman of the Apple and Pear Board said that this matter could present some difficulty next season. I have already communicated with the department, which no doubt is investigating the matter now. I shall be happy to bring down the report requested by the honourable member.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. CURREN: Late last year, I accompanied a deputation of representatives of the Upper Murray War Service Land Settlement Association to the Minister of Repatriation. During the course of its submissions the association requested that a Royal Commission investigate all aspects of war service land settlement in the Upper Murray regions. As I understand that the request was referred to

the Commonwealth Government for its consideration, has the Minister a statement regarding the outcome of that request?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Undoubtedly the member for Ridley will also be interested in this matter. As the member for Chaffey knows, last Friday I visited Berri where I discussed this matter with war service settlers. I told them that, although the submission for a Royal Commission on the war service land settlement scheme in the irrigated areas had been considered by State Cabinet and referred to the Commonwealth Government, it had been rejected and no Royal Commission would be appointed. Both the State and Commonwealth Governments agreed that the inquiries conducted into the industry generally by the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee, by the Royal Commission on the Grapegrowing Industry and by a horticultural inquiry committee in the Loxton area, had sufficiently covered aspects of the industry to make unnecessary any further inquiry, particularly as far reaching as that which a Royal Commission would provide. In their submission for a Royal Commission, the settlers also referred to departmental policy on finance. However, it was considered that the introduction of a budgetary system of control and, possibly, a more liberal attitude regarding finance would in the main meet the needs of settlers in the area. For these reasons, the Royal Commission was not appointed. From my discussion with the settlers last Friday I gained the impression that they were prepared to accept this, particularly as the drainage assistance period for the whole scheme had been extended to 1972. Therefore, those people on war service blocks in the irrigated areas will now have an opportunity to prove that there is a necessity to have drainage installed and it will then be paid for instead of their having to bear the cost themselves because the drainage assistance period had concluded.

Mr. Quirke: Does that apply to those who have already paid it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, because this will be repaid to them. Although we had the year 1972 in mind, it may be necessary to extend it even further after that period. However, up to that period at least they will be assisted in this regard, and this will involve about \$750,000, of which the Commonwealth Government will provide two-thirds over that period, the remaining one-third being paid for by the State. In the light of the information I was able to give them, they were, to my mind,

satisfied that efforts had been made as a result of their submission, and I think they agreed with me generally that there was no need at this stage for the Royal Commission they had requested.

Mr. QUIRKE: The relief to be given in regard to Loxton drainage is good news indeed. Everybody must know that many mistakes were made at Loxton, consequent on which certain debts were built up by settlers. Those debts cannot justly be attributed to the settlers' own mismanagement, as many of them arose from factors outside their control. Can the Minister of Repatriation say whether representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government for it to accept (as it has accepted in the case of the drainage problem which, again, was outside the settlers' control) some liability for the debts that have arisen whilst settlers and departmental officers have been (and still are) worrying about the correct plantings for particular Loxton areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is probably better aware of the requirements in this regard than I. He would know that we must make representations to the Commonwealth Government on this matter concerning any write-off involved. When this matter was discussed last Friday with settlers, I pointed out that it was a matter of individual application rather than of general application because, as the honourable member would know, problems may vary. I take it that he was referring particularly to Loxton, and to what are called the "fruit salad" blocks. I know that some difficulties have been created, but I repeat that the settlers were told on Friday that it was a matter of individual application, and that if they were affected and believed they had a case, they should apply to the department which, in turn, would refer the matter to the Commonwealth Government. If hardship to individual settlers has been caused, I certainly hope the matter can be rectified in that way.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Repatriation further information about the increase in living allowance for Loxton soldier settlers from \$1,600, to make it more in line with the allowance received by King Island settlers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When replying to this question previously, I said that the matter had been referred to the Commonwealth Government, with particular emphasis on the recent increase in the basic wage. As yet, I have had no reply, but I will send a reminder to see whether the matter cannot be expedited.

PENOLA ABORIGINES.

Mr. RODDA: An article in the *Sunday Mail* at the weekend dealing with Aborigines in the South-East highlights the fact that itinerant Aborigines are spreading fear in the timber-milling towns, and it goes on to elaborate on this aspect. Yesterday, at Penola, I met the Aborigines and saw for myself the situation there. Those Aborigines who have been in the town for nine years have been assimilated, and they are accepted as good and reputable citizens. I refer to the Graham family, who I think have made approaches to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. Those people told me how hurt they were by this article. I also went to the homes of other Aboriginal families. Obviously, there are problems there that will need the attention of the Minister's department, for these itinerant Aborigines are embarrassing not only the Grahams but other families. I think the wives of these families in two instances are putting up a brave fight against the drink problem. There is a feeling abroad amongst the residents of the South-Eastern towns that the police have been instructed to "lay off" in this matter, and I should like to hear the Minister's comment on this. The Penola council considered this matter for some time at its last meeting and I understand that it has approached the Minister. I consider that this matter requires careful consideration. Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs comment on the Aboriginal situation in the South-East generally?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not had a full report concerning the matters canvassed in the article in the weekend newspaper, so at this stage I do not think I am competent to comment on the whole situation at Penola. I certainly have had no reports from elsewhere in the South-East that would indicate anything of the problem mentioned in the article. Before the article was published I had had a letter from the Penola council asking that an investigation be held because of a problem arising from itinerant Aborigines who were not residents of the district, and I have seen to it that welfare officers visit Penola to investigate the situation thoroughly. No instruction has been given to the police to "go light" on Aborigines. The standing instruction to the Police Force (except in a few cases in the North where tribal laws come into the matter; but that is not so of itinerant Aborigines in the southern part of the State) is that Aborigines should be treated the same as anyone else, as they are expected and

required to have the same responsibility to the community as have other people. Where people have complained about itinerant Aborigines' conduct, the Government's attitude is that it would be obliged if those people complained to the police so that the necessary action could be taken if the law was transgressed. The article referred to suggested that the department had to spend thousands of dollars in repairing Aboriginal houses in Penola as a result of depredations by Aboriginal tenants. We have had two bills for repairs to houses occupied by Aborigines in Penola, but in neither case did they arise from depredations by Aboriginal tenants: the bills were for normal repairs; one large sum was paid for underpinning, which was required because of a subsidence in the area and which was in no way the fault of the tenant.

BLACK FOREST BUILDING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands received a reply from the Minister of Transport to my question about the removal of the building at the junction of the Goodwood Road and the Glenelg tramline?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Transport has received a report from the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust indicating that trust officers have inspected the building at the corner of Goodwood Road and the Glenelg tramline, and it has been decided to remove the building. The building is at present under lease in terms of which three months' notice of termination is required. The necessary notice has been given, and the building will be demolished after the expiration of the term of the notice.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about calling tenders for the new Glengowrie High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The programme for the preparation of tender documents for the above project is based on funds being available in the financial year 1967-68 for the erection of the school. Tender documents will be completed as soon as possible, but in view of the Loan funds allocated for school buildings during 1966-67, it is most unlikely that funds will be available for the calling of tenders before the latter half of this financial year.

SOUTH ROAD TRAFFIC.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Lands a report from the Minister

of Roads about the traffic danger on South Road at the Morphett Vale Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague the Minister of Roads states that he has had several discussions with the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board about protecting school-children crossing the South Road to attend the Morphett Vale Primary School. As a result of these discussions, arrangements will be made for two advanced warning signs of special design to be placed on the South Road at the approaches to the existing "school" signs near the Morphett Vale school. At present the Highways Department is carrying out roadworks adjacent to the school, and there may be temporary difficulty in positioning the signs. However, the Police Department will be asked to keep this section of road under observation.

GAS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It has come to my notice that the Canadian Treasurer (Mr. Mitchell Sharp) has arranged through the Canadian Bank to lend Jamaica \$1,625,000 (Canadian) free of interest over a long period of years. As the State Government is involved in building a gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, the details of such a loan free of interest would be worth investigating. Will the Treasurer inquire of the Canadian Treasurer how the loan to Jamaica was negotiated and whether it would be possible for the Commonwealth Reserve Bank to negotiate a similar loan for the construction of the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already made representations to the Commonwealth Government for the provision of money for the construction of the pipeline referred to. I have been informed by that Government that I must present more evidence and I am still awaiting that evidence. As soon as I have it, I will present it to the Commonwealth Government with a view to financing the construction of this pipeline. It would be presumptuous of me if I asked the Canadian Minister why he did certain things for another country. In the interests of all concerned, it is not my intention to go beyond the action I have already taken with the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier say how many drilling rigs are at present proving the Moomba field?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot answer the question now, but I will inquire and bring down a reply tomorrow.

OPAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the last few months much alarm has been expressed (as well as some discontent) over the action of the Government in bringing opal under the provisions of the Gold Buyers' Act, and I understand that this provision has applied since March 1. I presume that all members have received a copy of the letter from the Gemmological Association of Australia (from Mr. Kavanagh, the President of the South Australian Branch) to the effect that the present arrangements are virtually killing the opal industry in South Australia. As I read in the paper yesterday morning that Cabinet was reconsidering this matter, will the Premier indicate whether, in fact, it has been reconsidered and, if it has been, what decision the Government has arrived at?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the first instance this Government accepted certain advice concerning placing opal under the Gold Buyers' Act, and that was done because of certain activities in the opal business. In addition, police protection has been provided in the area and Cabinet has determined that certain other necessary proclamations will be made for the lifting of the decision that we were originally advised to make.

SWIMMING POOLS.

Mr. COUMBE: On July 21 I asked the Premier a question regarding the establishment of a swimming pool in the north park lands between Prospect and North Adelaide, and the Premier then indicated that he would inform me when a conference had been held. A news flash today indicated that a conference had been held. Can the Premier indicate the outcome of that conference?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A conference was held in my office this morning comprising the original councils involved in this matter, in addition to the Enfield council. After the Lord Mayor, who has been very interested in this matter, outlined the situation, I told the councils concerned that I would, by correspondence, disclose to them the full discussion that took place this morning. I expressed the hope that the matter would receive their favourable consideration, so that the project could proceed. I think the work is not intended to be commenced until early in the 1967-68 financial year, because of the Adelaide City Council's present obligations. The sum of \$78,000 is estimated to be the difference between the total subscriptions including the Government's share of one-third, and it is expected that \$10,000 worth of soil can be

provided by the Adelaide City Council. In view of the suggested commencement date, I do not expect the various councils to consider the matter immediately, but I hope that at the appropriate time they will be able to further help construct a swimming pool in the north park lands in the interests not only of Adelaide but of South Australia generally.

Mr. BROOMHILL: During the last 12 months the Henley swimming pool has suffered considerable storm damage, as a result of which the Government recently helped the Henley and Grange council effect repairs. As I understand that since then the Henley and Grange council has requested further Government financial assistance towards the maintenance of the pool, can the Premier provide information about this request?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe about \$2,200 was made available for this purpose earlier this year. I understand a further sum of \$800, to complete what would normally be a \$3,000 project, will be made available through the Tourist Bureau for this purpose.

TEA TREE GULLY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 2 about the acquisition of land by the Education Department to extend the present restricted Tea Tree Gully Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Cabinet approval was given for the purchase of almost two acres to extend the present restricted Tea Tree Gully Primary School site of 2½ acres. Negotiations were opened with the owner, but he asked for a figure considerably in excess of the Land Board's valuation. Approval was therefore given to acquire the land in accordance with the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, and the matter is now with the Crown Solicitor, who is negotiating with the owner. The Crown Solicitor is not in a position to advise when settlement is likely to be reached.

MURRAY RIVER.

Mr. HUGHES: The *Advertiser* of August 5 contains an article headed, "River Murray Water Cuts", which states:

Sydney, August 4: For the second year in succession water restrictions will be imposed in the Murray Valley and will take effect in N.S.W., Victoria and S.A. Details of the restrictions have yet to be worked out. News of the restrictions, which were decided on this week by the River Murray Commission, follows hard on a N.S.W. Conservation Department announcement of drastic water restrictions on the River Murrumbidgee. The commission, consisting of commissioners representing the

Commonwealth, N.S.W., Victoria and S.A., controls the use of the River Murray storage waters in the Hume Reservoir, near Albury, and Lake Victoria, which is just over the N.S.W. border from Victoria and S.A.

Under the River Murray Agreement, these waters are apportioned in the proportion of five to N.S.W., five to Victoria and three to S.A. Executive officers of the commission, which has its headquarters in Melbourne, last month prepared a report on the water storage position. The commissioners decided this week that because of the low storage levels shown in the report, restrictions would be imposed on water usage in the Murray Valley. The commission will decide this month how much water will be available to each State and it will then be up to State conservation authorities to work out details of restrictions. This is only the second occasion in the commission's history that restrictions have been decided on.

Can the Minister of Works say whether the restrictions imposed by the commission will affect the quantity of water coming into South Australia, to the extent of restricting the reticulated water supplies in this State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member's question largely relates to irrigation, I believe the Minister of Irrigation may have relevant information on this matter when he answers another question tomorrow. It is not expected that restrictions will be necessary, although the metropolitan reservoirs are at present holding slightly less than they were holding at this time last year. A similar position exists also in relation to the Tod River and Barossa water districts, and it is unlikely that water restrictions from reticulated systems will be necessary. I point out that all possible steps are being taken to ensure that industry and commerce generally function to their fullest capacity, unhampered by water restrictions.

Mr. McANANEY: During the summer, the lake levels were low, making it difficult to irrigate. However, since then the levels have been fairly high; in fact, had there been a substantial north wind I believe the water would have blown over the barrages into the sea and thus been lost. As the water storages are still low upstream, can the Minister of Works say why the lake levels are so high now, whereas water was not available to keep the lakes at a reasonable level in the summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to have investigations made and supply the honourable member with a reply.

INFLAMMABLE CLOTHING.

Mrs. STEELE: Since my question of last week about children's clothes made from

inflammable material, I have received a letter from the Medical Superintendent of the Adelaide Children's Hospital stating the number of children out of the last 100 admitted to the hospital with burns of any kind who have had their clothing set alight as a result of contact with gas or kerosene heaters, electrical appliances and open fires. An article in the *Australian* of Saturday last stated that the Tasmanian Minister of Health had said that his Government was to approach the Commonwealth Government to see whether this matter could be dealt with at a Commonwealth level. The article also stated that the Minister was appealing to other States to make a similar approach so that legislation might be initiated to control the making of clothes from such materials. Apparently, Tasmania and Victoria are making this approach. It was pointed out that in Great Britain, where there was a ban on such materials, the number of children affected was much lower than in Australia where there is no ban on the use of this type of material. Will the Premier take up with the Commonwealth Government the need to initiate uniform legislation on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have received the following report of the Secretary for Labour and Industry:

To my knowledge there is no legislation in Australia on this subject. The Textile Products Description Act does, however, require those textile products to which the Act applies to be labelled with a description of the materials used in such product. There is a similar Act in each of the other States and the Commonwealth Commerce (Imports) Regulations make similar requirements. This was achieved by a series of conferences between Ministers and departmental officials of Commonwealth and State Governments a number of years ago. There would be no point in one State passing a law to control the inflammable content of clothing, unless similar action was taken by all of the other States and the Commonwealth. After discussing the matter with the Minister of Labour and Industry, I am inquiring to ascertain whether any similar action is contemplated in any of the other Australian States and will also raise the matter at the next conference of the heads of the Commonwealth and State Labour Departments. I assure the honourable member that I will do everything possible to speed up consideration of the matter by both the Commonwealth and State Governments in the interests of those concerned.

PETERBOROUGH DRAIN.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of last week regarding a drain across the main road at Peterborough?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads states that the installation of the culvert to replace the spoon drain at this location is being considered by the department and is expected to be carried out soon.

FORESTS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In the absence of the Minister of Forests, can the Minister of Lands answer the following questions: First, what councils have taken advantage of section 4 of the Local Government (Forestry Reserves) Act, 1944, to establish and manage a forest under a local government forestry reserve? Secondly, what acreages have been established in forests by such councils, respectively? Thirdly, what advances have been made to such councils respectively, pursuant to section 5 of the Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member.

INTERSTATE WARRANT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Since last Thursday there has been much press publicity about the arrest of Mrs. Gowley, a constituent of mine living at Meningie. I understand that the arrest was made on a warrant issued in New South Wales. As I would expect that this matter would have been reviewed in South Australia before authority had been given to execute the warrant, can the Attorney-General say who gave the authority and, also, can he state the reasons behind the issuing of such an authority under the circumstances involved?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not necessary for authority to be given; the warrant was issued under the Service and Execution of Process Act. In consequence, it validly runs here, but it is necessary to get a committal under the warrant to a specific institution. This was why the lady in question was brought before justices. However, I am raising the question of the execution of this warrant with Mr. Maddison, the Minister of Justice in New South Wales, who has been investigating this case. Happily, before that had to be resolved administratively, Mr. Jury telephoned me on Saturday morning and I directed him to the appropriate place where his assistance was most welcome.

SHIPPING.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week about reported proposals to establish a joint shipping line between Australia and Japan and about whether ships might be built for this line?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I communicated with Sir Ian McLennan of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited on this matter, and I have now received from him the following reply:

Thank you for your letter of August 2 telling me of the question the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly asked concerning shipbuilding in South Australia, which question arose from a paragraph in the press stating that our company was negotiating with Japanese interests to establish a jointly owned shipping line. While it is correct to say that our company has been having discussions with various Japanese organizations concerning the possibility of using Australian manned ships to carry goods from Australia to Japan, I think it is overstating the case somewhat to say that these discussions have envisaged a jointly owned shipping line. We have had discussions with various interests and the proposals generally have envisaged the shipment of coal to Japan from New South Wales or Queensland ports and then on the return voyage picking up Yampi ore for Newcastle or Port Kembla. In our discussions we have always kept in mind the Australian shipbuilding industry and the desirability of introducing some Australian-built tonnage into this service. However, I think it would be somewhat over-optimistic at this stage to envisage that our discussions would result in greatly increased industrial activity in South Australia in the way of shipbuilding. As mentioned above, we are keeping this aspect well in mind.

MAIN NORTH ROAD.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Lands ascertain what plans the Minister of Roads has for the re-routing of the Main North Road at Tarlee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

BRIGHTON ROAD.

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago an agreement was reached between the Brighton council and the Highways Department in relation to the widening of Brighton Road between Dunrobin and Stopford Roads. Will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Roads a report indicating when this work will be commenced and when it is likely to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

BOTTLE DEPOSITS.

Mrs. STEELE: Much publicity has been given in the newspapers in recent days to the introduction of non-deposit disposable bottles, which incidentally, I understand, contain less but cost more. A particular problem associated with these bottles which is giving much concern in the community is that their introduction increases the broken glass hazard which was (I think we are all very much aware) big

enough before this new development. It was naively claimed by a spokesman for the trade concerned that the public using the new bottles would do the right thing and place them in garbage receptacles when empty. The Road Safety Council receives \$21,500, made up of grants from both the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, which is a fairly modest amount to be used in publicizing hazards to the safety of the public, and the need to combat this new development, I suggest, will be an embarrassing one for it with such limited funds. Can the Premier say whether there is authority to control the introduction of such bottles, and whether action could be taken to investigate whether in the interests of public safety the use of these bottles might be discouraged?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know of no particular control, unless it could be controlled by the Prices Department, involving a deposit on the bottle itself.

Mrs. Steele: These are non-deposit bottles.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: That is all very well, but I think the honourable member would agree that there are other bottles that carry a deposit but because of their larger size there is a free deposit (as I think it would be defined), with no charge on the bottle but with an all-inclusive price. My personal view is that it is not going to work in the interests of anybody. I think we are concerned mostly with the purchase of soft drinks. People often wish to purchase these drinks from chain stores, which do not want to be bothered with the exchange of bottles. I am not prepared to suggest that the small shopkeeper should have to receive empty bottles and give back deposits to people with whom he is not trading, just because chain stores do not have sufficient time to make the exchanges. This was best illustrated through the question of the purchase of vinegar, when the chain stores would not accept the return of empty bottles. I believe there is another approach to this matter. I refer to the proposition to introduce a plastic type of bottle which would be non-returnable and from which there would not be the same danger as there would be from broken glass. I should like to know what the campaign from the industry itself is to be, and what the public's reaction to it will be if people are expected to pay an extra 1c or 2c on a bottle on the condition that it is returned. The position appears to be that people are purchasing from the larger chain stores and expecting to get a return of deposits from the smaller shopkeeper, and that is

another problem that has to be overcome. I am prepared to take the matter up with the Prices Commissioner and ascertain what he considers would be a solution to this problem.

ANSTEY HILL ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of August 3 requesting that an inspection be made of the inadequate fencing bordering the steep Anstey Hill Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the fencing on the edges of roads in the Adelaide Hills is normally erected by landowners to prevent stock straying, etc., and is not owned by the department. This type of fence, although it has a psychological effect of giving an impression of safety to a motorist, is of little or no value in protecting an out-of-control vehicle. The only type of fence to adequately check a vehicle is the spring steel guard rail which has already been erected in many locations. The high cost of this guard rail, about \$10,000 a mile for one side of the road, precludes it being used in all locations where its use may perhaps be desirable. At present, the erection of a guard rail is being progressively carried out at the most hazardous locations, and another inspection will be made of the Anstey Hill Road to determine whether the erection of a further length is justified.

MITCHAM CROSSING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have often spoken about the danger at Wattlebury Road railway crossing at Mitcham, and have suggested that a more effective safety measure should be adopted than the wig-wag system that is installed at present. Yesterday morning, I was a passenger in a train that collided with a motor car at this crossing. The car almost crossed the crossing in front of the train but the back corner of the car was clipped by the first carriage of the train as it came to the crossing. Afterwards, the explanation being bandied about was that the sun blinded the driver and he did not see either the wig-wag signal or the train. It does not matter whether that is a correct explanation or not: another accident has occurred at this crossing where other accidents have occurred in the past. A subway would be relatively expensive, but it would be the ideal solution. If this cannot be built, at least boom gates should be installed. Will the Premier consult with the Minister of Transport about the safety of this crossing?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but the wig-wag signals have been installed for many years and, I understand, have been most effective. Apparently people driving motor cars are more concerned with their destination than they are in looking where they are going. They know the crossing is there and should take care. A subway would be impracticable because of the shortage of land in the area. However, I will inquire about the possible construction of a subway or the installation of a boom gate, but, no doubt, people will still want to race through this crossing, human nature being what it is. If people are in a hurry, whatever is provided at this crossing will not satisfy everyone.

GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: It has been brought to my notice by several growers of wine grapes in my district that rumours are being circulated of the possibility of a challenge by a proprietary winemaker of the orders made last March fixing a minimum price to be paid for wine grapes. It was suggested that growers would be required to sign a contract to cover sales over many years. Will the Attorney-General comment on whether it is legally possible to require growers to sign long-term contracts to avoid future price-fixing orders under the Prices Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should think that any winemaker who was attempting to obtain contracts for the purchase by him of wine grapes in the future at a price less than that fixed under the prices order would be facing a considerable risk of prosecution. On the face of it, I cannot see any means of contracting out of the legislation. I have heard that there has been a move to put people on long-term contracts for less than the fixed price, but if clear evidence of this comes to the knowledge of the Government I shall immediately advise a prosecution.

PSYCHOLOGY BRANCH.

Mr. COUMBE: In an article that appeared in the July journal of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, it was suggested there was a shortage of psychology services in the schools in this State. The article suggested that the number of psychologists employed by the Education Department was the lowest per pupil in the Commonwealth. It further suggested that, whilst a high standard of officer was maintained, because of this shortage the future guidance and health of students in our schools might suffer. Will the Minister

of Education comment on this article, and will he obtain a report about the facts? If the facts are accurate, what action will be taken to solve the problem?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I saw the article and I would not challenge the conclusions or the statements in it. No doubt we have fewer psychologists in the Psychology Branch of the Education Department than we should have. There may be a sufficient number of psychologists in the State, but the Psychology Branch of the department is understaffed. Obviously, this position has been inherited from the previous Government. The only way we can remedy the position is to receive more funds in order to expand the Psychology Branch. We are unable to do this at present.

PENNESHAW PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Last August I visited Penneshaw and, in company with the Minister of Education, inspected the Penneshaw Primary School. At that time the condition of the lavatories of both the school residence and the school were discussed and the Minister said he would take the matter up with the Public Buildings Department. Since then, there has been much correspondence, but apparently no conclusion has been arrived at, nor has there been news of further development. Although I realize that two departments are involved, a year has elapsed since the matter was last raised. Can the Minister give me a reply at this stage, or will he examine the matter and let me know within a few days?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report and see whether anything can be done soon.

TRANSCONTINENTAL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question, arising from an article appearing in the current issue of that excellent newspaper *Railways of Australia*, relates to an article headed "Tenders to be Called for New Trains". Part of the articles states:

Tenders will be called for new trains for the Transcontinental standard gauge railway line between Sydney and Perth scheduled for completion late in 1968. The new expresses will incorporate many of the luxury features of Southern Aurora and will be jointly owned by the four systems over whose networks they will operate—New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia and the Commonwealth Railways. The train consists will be made up of two twinette and one roomette car for first class passengers, a first class lounge car, dining car, three second class sleeping cars, cafeteria-club car, dormitory crew car, power van, and a

combined luggage and mail van. Each train will carry 150 passengers and crew of 20, the latter accommodated in the dormitory car.

As this new train will travel over South Australian railway tracks, can the Premier say whether the Islington Railway Workshops will tender for a contract of this size?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I see no reason why the Islington workshops should not tender either for the whole or part of the contract. I do not know whether tenders have been called for at present, but I assure the honourable member that I would be most disappointed if the Railways Department did not tender for the contract, particularly in view of the splendid record of the department in connection with other rolling stock it has constructed for the Commonwealth Railways.

TAX REIMBURSEMENT.

Mr. McANANEY: The recent basic wage increase will increase the State's liability by about \$5,000,000 and from whatever amount is involved the Commonwealth Government will collect income tax this year whilst the State will not receive any reimbursement until next year. I have been informed that, prior to last year when the new taxation formula was determined, the Commonwealth Government made an offer to the States in an endeavour to bring the formula more up to date so that the States would be reimbursed sooner. I have been informed that the Premiers refused that offer. Will the Treasurer say whether my information is correct and, if it is, why the States refused the offer?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As a result of discussions held, three types of proposal were submitted and the then Prime Minister (Sir Robert Menzies) submitted another proposition concerning tax reimbursements which was accepted and on which a formula was laid down. I believe that the formula, which was to the advantage of the States, has been adopted. I will not go into detail, but I assure members that the absolute maximum that could be obtained was obtained. The formula, which has existed for two years, will continue for a further three years. I intimate to the House that I have already corresponded with the Prime Minister (Mr. Holt) asking that certain other financial assistance be given because of the increase in the basic wage.

PINES.

Mr. RODDA: On July 28 I asked a question of the Minister of Lands regarding the sale of pine trees from the Woods and Forests

Department's nursery, and I understand that he now has a reply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report is as follows:

The price quoted by the department for two-year-old Aleppo pines is in no case higher than that charged by established nurserymen in the metropolitan area. This particular species has proved difficult to establish in the field, unless it is grown in special containers, thus adding to the cost. The five cent price quoted by Mr. Rodda's constituent applies only to commercial species capable of being grown open rooted in nursery beds. This is not the case with the Aleppo pine. It is surprising to hear that identical plants could have been obtained so much cheaper and, if this is so, there may have been some special reason unknown to me at present.

SANDY CREEK SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 3 I asked the Minister of Education whether the department had disposed of the old school, schoolhouse and site at Sandy Creek. Has he a reply to that question?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has been requested to dispose of the old Sandy Creek school building residence and site. The timber classroom will be transferred elsewhere.

BARLEY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On August 4 I asked the Premier whether Cabinet had considered guaranteeing railway freights to enable the Barley Board to increase the first advance payment on barley. Has he a reply to my question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Auditor-General was asked to investigate this matter and his inquiries and report reveal difficulties in the proposal: so much so, that those difficulties may involve another State, and perhaps more than one. The difficulties will be further investigated and a decision finally made by Cabinet. As soon as a decision has been made, I will report progress.

QUARRY BLASTING.

Mr. HALL: I understand that the Minister of Lands has a reply from the Minister of Mines concerning quarry blasting at Para Hills.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Mines reports that the Mines Department is not aware of any specific damage having been caused by quarry blasting to houses in the Para Hills area, and investigations have shown damage to be most unlikely. Over the past six months there have been three specific

complaints made to the Mines Department about blasting in this area, two of which were found to be related to blasts not connected with quarries in any way. The third arose from a firing that was, in fact, a safety measure in a quarry, for the purpose of making a section of shattered ground safe for the quarry men. It was a small shot that made a loud noise, but no damage could possibly have been caused.

These complaints were in line with findings in the recent two-month survey in this area, when one-half of the noises reported were not due to quarry blasting. Some of these were not due to blasting at all, while others were the result of blasting in operations not under the control of the Mines Department. In order to minimize the noise nuisance the quarrying company has been subjected to restrictions by the department with regard to blasting, and it has modified its blasting practices. It is co-operating with the department in its efforts to reduce noise, and to keep ground vibration to a level where there is no possibility of damage to houses.

WESTBOURNE PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the erection of a new lavatory block and shelter shed facilities at the Westbourne Park Primary School. By a letter to me, dated December 20, the Minister of Education said that the matter had been referred to the Director of the Public Buildings Department and that it was expected that tenders would be called at the end of January, 1966—about six months ago. I have been informed by the Secretary of the school committee that absolutely nothing has happened, to the committee's knowledge, about this matter. I have been asked to take it up again with the Minister and to couple with the original request for a new lavatory block a request for special facilities for adolescent girls to be incorporated in the block. Will the Minister ascertain the reason for the delay and let the House have it, and also turn it to good account by considering having incorporated in the lavatory block when it is built the special facilities I have mentioned?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to examine the reasons for the delay, to have the matter expedited, and also to give attention to the other part of the request.

LANGHORNE CREEK BORES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Mines a reply to my question about water at Langhorne Creek?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Mines reports that further progress in hydrological investigations of the Milang district was delayed, pending clarification of the staff and financial position of the department in the new financial year. The drilling of four 200-300ft. bore holes is planned for the coming months. These will be to determine the stratigraphic thickness of the aquifers at a number of localities, and pump tests will be carried out to obtain figures on the aquifer characteristics, that is, maximum draw-off capacity and safe yield, as well as the water quality. These bores will be used for long-term observations of water level behaviour.

LYNDOCH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On March 31 last the Minister of Education informed me that provision of an additional 2in. of loam over the oval area at the Lyndoch Primary School, as requested by me following representations from the school committee, was considered unwarranted. He further stated that the topsoil originally in the area had been regraded under a recent earthworks contract, and was at a depth of 4in. over the completed oval; that this soil previously produced a good lush growth of vegetation, and that with the planting of grasses, cultivation and watering, a good grassed area should again be provided. On May 23 the school committee asked the Senior Soils Officer of the Agriculture Department, Nuriootpa, to inspect the area. That inspection was made and a report submitted, part of which states:

Because of this rather extensive earthmoving, the deep, infertile subsoil has been exposed, and then used to build up the lower area. Not only is this subsoil infertile but it also has extremely poor physical structure. It is most unsuitable for plant growth, and it will be some years before it improves. Because of this, any turf planted will have to rely on the top 2in. of soil for most of its water and food requirements. This will create serious problems of establishment and maintenance. Very frequent watering will be necessary to keep the turf alive and growing. Consequently I recommend that at least another 2 or 3in. of topsoil should be spread over the area before it is sown.

Because of the report submitted, will the Minister re-open this matter with a view to having 2in. of loam supplied for the oval as originally requested?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to re-examine the matter.

EMERGENCY HOUSEKEEPER SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question relates to the Emergency Housekeeper Service which the

Minister of Social Welfare runs under the Department of Social Welfare, and which I have personally appreciated in the past. I understand that the weekly charge for the service of a live-in housekeeper has now risen to \$35, which is high and beyond the reach of many people who need the services of a housekeeper for the reasons for which the service was set up. I also understand that, probably because of this, the demand for the services of the eight housekeepers has recently fallen off considerably. As this is an excellent service to a family when a mother is incapacitated, either because she is in hospital or for some other reason, it would be a great pity if it were not availed of as widely as possible. I know that some relief from payment, in whole or in part, can be given but that is subject to a fairly stringent means test. As only small sums in total are involved (I think about \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year) will the Minister re-examine the question of the charges made for this service, so that it can be more widely used by those who need it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly have the matter examined. We have tried to see whether we could not obtain Commonwealth assistance for the voluntary housekeeping service run by Meals on Wheels, and are currently negotiating with the Commonwealth Government to see whether the finances of that particular service meet the Commonwealth's requirements. The Emergency Housekeeper Service run by the department has not been as fully availed of as it might have been previously, not so much because people do not want it but because it is difficult to recruit enough qualified housekeepers to the service.

Mr. Millhouse: You've got plenty now, and they're not being fully used.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall have an investigation made, as that certainly has not been so far reported to me. I shall tell the honourable member when I have a report from the department.

CHEESE.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about cheese shipments?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following instruction from the Australian Dairy Produce Board, Melbourne, the board's local representatives arranged for 145 tons of export rindless cheese to be road freighted, under refrigeration, from cold stores in the Adelaide Hills, to alongside a ship at Port Melbourne, Victoria.

Japanese buyers had requested cheese as soon as possible and South Australia was the only State that could supply the cheese at such short notice. The ship was at Port Melbourne, Victoria. The Japanese market is considered a priority market and one that is developing to the advantage of dairy farmers both in South Australia and in other States in Australia. The South Australian dairy industry has contracted to supply nearly 4,000 tons of cheese to the Japanese market during the present cheese season. It is expected that, as the season progresses and quantities in store accumulate, shipping from Port Adelaide to Japan and other oversea markets will take place in the normal way. The incident referred to by the honourable member is a case where the Australian Dairy Produce Board acted promptly so that the marketing commitment could be met, and so that we could preserve the favourable position Australia has won against severe competition from other exporting countries as far as the export of cheese to Japan is concerned.

POLICE ACTION.

Mr. McANANEY: As much publicity has recently been given to the Beaumont case, can the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether the police are taking the prognostications of Gerard Croiset seriously and carrying out searches?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot answer the question today but I will seek information on the matter. However, if the honourable member desires to discuss the matter with me privately he will probably be able to tell me his opinions, which I shall be pleased to hear.

HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many houses were completed by the South Australian Housing Trust in the financial year 1965-66?

2. How many of these were low-deposit rental-purchase houses?

3. How many trust houses for sale were unsold as at July 31, 1966?

4. How many of these were rental-purchase houses?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. 3,250.

2. 742.

3. 370.

4. 125.

A total of 603 houses were completed for sale during June and July of this year, and of this number 310 were completed in July. The

normal output of sale houses is about 220 houses a month; the sudden upsurge of production was caused by large areas of houses suddenly becoming available because of water and sewer connections. In addition to the sewer connections, 145 miles of sewer mains was laid during the last financial year. The numbers concerned were temporarily beyond the capacity of the trust to handle because of the outstanding mileage of mains for water and sewers and the great number of connections concerned.

HILLS FREEWAY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. On what date or dates in April, 1966, was the Measday Hill special traffic survey in connection with the hills freeway carried out?

2. Is it proposed to carry out any further survey in this area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are:

1. The Measday Hill special traffic survey was carried out on April 29, 1966.

2. It is not intended to carry out further traffic surveys in this area.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 4. Page 884.)

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I do not intend to oppose the Bill. Superannuation is almost universal whether for Government or private enterprise employees. Various systems are used but, for the Public Service, the Government contributes about 70 per cent and public servants 30 per cent towards the scheme. This is an attractive scheme that could almost be classed as a scheme of semi-compulsory savings, for these people contribute during their period of employment eventually having, with the contribution of the Government, sufficient on which to retire. The Bill provides that male public servants who previously retired at 65 years of age may now retire at 60 years, and that female public servants who previously retired at 60 years may now retire at 55 years.

It is interesting to contemplate to what extent the earlier retirement age will be availed of. Public servants retiring at 60 will have many years of useful service ahead of them. I do not think anyone can say whether public servants will elect to retire at 60 or continue

to work until they are 65, because there are many aspects for and against the earlier retirement. Public servants now often receive promotion and salary increases between the ages of 60 and 65, thus enabling them to retire on a higher pension.

Mr. Clark: They will have to decide when they will retire.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but it is open to doubt whether most will retire at 60 or 65. Most public servants retiring at 65 then take up employment in private enterprise, and they are worth employing. These people have had a lifetime of experience, and for five or 10 years they can be usefully employed with great advantage to themselves and also to employers because of that experience. If those people retire at 60 they will have a further five years in which they will want to do something. I consider that a man is far too young at 60 to do nothing, because I am sure he will die earlier if he does not do something. Those people who retire at 60 will want some form of employment.

Mr. Ryan: Do you say that a man who retires at 60 will die if he has nothing to do?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think a man who retires at 60 will be bored if he does not engage in some other form of employment. All men are happier when they are doing something, and they will live longer than they would if they were doing nothing. What is to happen to all the people who take the opportunity to retire at 60?

Mr. Broomhill: Are you suggesting that they will all retire at 60?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know. All I know is that these people can elect to retire at that age if they wish to do so.

Mr. Casey: Do you realize that people in the United States of America retire at 60?

Mr. HEASLIP: Unemployment is much greater there than it is here, and I consider it is not good to have so many unemployed people. I think people are much happier when they are being productive.

Mr. Casey: This Bill will not prevent them from carrying on, will it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am just coming to that point. If all these people decide to retire at 60 we will have them coming up for employment, and if we do not at that stage have full employment those people will not be able to get jobs.

Mr. Clark: Surely you cannot consider a man on superannuation as being unemployed.

Mr. HEASLIP: I would say that he is unemployed. Even if he has enough to live

on, if he is not working he is unemployed and he is not doing anything productive. If men of 60 are capable of working but are not able to do anything, it is a waste of manpower.

Mr. Casey: Do you think such men would retire in those circumstances?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know.

Mr. Casey: Under this Bill, a person has the option.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. If all these people decide to retire at 60, these comparatively young men will be unable to get something to occupy themselves. Many people today work for two or three days a week and for the rest of the time they play bowls or tend their gardens. I should hate to see all these people being unemployed five years earlier than they are today, and this could easily come about. These people would be bored with themselves because they had nothing to do, yet people of that age are still able to work and to render worthwhile service to the community.

Mr. McKee: It could have the opposite effect.

Mr. HEASLIP: I cannot see that happening. I do not know from where the demand for this provision came. However, if the public servants themselves have requested it, it must mean that many of them want to retire at 60.

Mr. Clark: They want the right to be able to do so.

Mr. HEASLIP: If they want that right, no doubt they will take advantage of it.

Mr. Clark: There may be reasons why a man needs to retire.

Mr. HEASLIP: That is so. I know that in private enterprise people can retire in special circumstances and still get their superannuation, even though they may not have reached the age of 65. I refer to the instances where disabilities are being suffered. Private enterprise is flexible in that regard, and I think that is good. In that respect the Government scheme is different from many private schemes. On the other hand, the Government superannuation scheme is much more generous in most instances than are the private schemes, because in the latter the employers' contributions vary so much. In cases of sickness, people should be able to get out before they are 65 without losing superannuation benefits.

I think it is essential to provide that people serve 10 years in the Public Service before they can qualify for a pension. I do not think this provision for retirement at 60 will be of any benefit to those people who are

now 50 or 55 years of age. but I have no doubt that the provision is a good one for younger people who have been in the service for only 10 years or so. However, I am fearful that the retirement of so many people at an earlier age will create a waste of manpower. One thing that needs to be explained is how much extra these provisions will cost the taxpayer. The Treasurer, in explaining this Bill, did not mention this cost, but it could be considerable. I know that the figures have been worked out actuarially and that there should not be any great cost involved, but we do not know how many public servants will take advantage of this provision to retire earlier, and therefore it will be difficult to estimate what cost there is likely to be to the taxpayer. If the cost is not much greater than it is at present, I will give my full support to the Bill. Actually this scheme is a compulsory savings scheme, for it is the individual's extra contribution, together with assistance from the taxpayer and the Government, that will provide sufficient money for these people to retire at 60 years of age.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading, and I do so substantially for the reasons that have been given by previous speakers. I think it fair that provisions for superannuation in this State should be on a par with those in other States, and all members regard this as desirable. In 1965 an amending Bill brought South Australia roughly into line with other States for existing contributors, but did nothing for those already receiving a pension. Under that Bill as under this, they received no benefit. During the debate last session several members on this side, including me, complained strongly that the Government had refused to take action to benefit existing pensioners. It had refused to increase the value of the unit of pension, and this has happened again. I protest against the refusal of the Government to help those already receiving superannuation benefits under this Act.

Mr. McKee: Why didn't you do something?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know, as the member for Port Pirie knows if he is in the confidence of his Government—

Mr. Nankivell: Do you think he is?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I sometimes doubt it because of the extraordinary things the honourable member says. But, if he is, he will know that representations were made to the Government well before this Bill was introduced—

Mr. McKee: To your Government!

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—for some relief.

Mr. McKee: What representation was made to your Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am referring now (and the member for Port Pirie does not like me doing this because he is apparently trying to put me off) to the fact that in the middle of last month representations were made to the present Government for relief for those on superannuation pensions, but nothing has been done. The Treasurer did not say anything about this when he introduced this legislation. He gave himself a pat on the back because he had put himself out by meeting these people at night, but he did not say that representations had been made to him, what case had been made out, or that the Government apparently intended entirely to ignore the case made out. He said:

However, I have conferred with the Superannuation Committee, which represents contributors to the scheme, and the members of that committee are extremely capable people. The main purpose of this Bill is to give effect to representations made, particularly by that committee.

Not to give effect to all the representations made by that committee, because an important aspect has been entirely ignored. He said later:

I assure the House that, in attending conferences on the matter with representatives of the Superannuation Committee, I have tried to meet their convenience in every way . . .

The Treasurer did not say that he had turned down flat, apparently, the submissions on the point made to him, nor did he say that the Government was prepared to consider them and bring in another Bill later in the session, or at all. I complain about this strongly. As the Treasurer has not (nor has any Government member) seen fit to say anything about this, I intend to give a few facts supporting the submissions made on behalf of present pensioners, who fall into three categories: first, those who receive less than \$7 a week, and therefore are still entitled to full Commonwealth social service benefits; secondly, those in receipt of a pension between \$7 and \$19 a week, who qualify in whole or in part for social service benefits; and thirdly, those who receive a pension of more than \$19 a week, and who are excluded from social service benefits. Because the cost of living is rising all the time, these people on a fixed income are suffering. Recently, the increase in the basic wage was supported by this Government before the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. What

benefits are these people to get from that increase? None at all: they will suffer because of the increases in the cost of living that undoubtedly will take place.

Representations made in this matter asked for an increase in the value of pension of about 12 per cent to 15 per cent. The Treasurer was reminded of what he had said and what his Attorney-General had said in 1961, when the circumstances were precisely the same as they are now. At that time, the Treasurer (as Leader of the Opposition) said that, in his view, the unit value of the pension should bear some relation to the basic wage. I agree that it should. Let us consider what has happened if we accept that proposition. In the 1920's the unit value of the pension was about 11 per cent of the then basic wage. Over the years it has fluctuated from as much as 15.9 per cent during the depression to 6.2 per cent in 1961. For the benefit of the member for Port Pirie, who was interested in this matter a short time ago, in 1961 the previous Government increased the unit value of the pension to 7.1 per cent. What is the present position? The basic wage in this State is \$32.30 a week and the unit value of the pension is 6.2 per cent, which is as low as it was in 1961. Pensioners are in the same position now as they were in 1961 before the Playford Government increased the unit value of the pension. Members opposite, who were in Opposition in 1961, strongly advocated an increase in the value of the unit from \$1.75 to \$2.25, and this would have raised the value of the unit, compared with the then basic wage, to 7.9 per cent. If it were good enough for the Labor Party in 1961, why is it not good enough for the Labor Government in 1966? The present Treasurer, when he spoke on this matter in 1961, said:

When the scheme was first introduced, contributors on the basic wage were limited to four units. In those days the unit was worth about 11 per cent of the basic wage, but today it is worth only about 7 per cent.

It is now worth 6.2 per cent. He continued:

I mention that in passing because I—like many of my colleagues here—believe that under any superannuation scheme, unless its units can maintain their percentage value of the basic wage, hardships will be imposed somewhere along the line.

That was true in 1961 and it is just as true in 1966, but the Treasurer did not even see fit to mention that he had had any further representations on the matter. He then went on to support an increase in the value of the unit to \$2.25. He seems to have changed his tune

now. Other members of his Party, including the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), spoke along the same lines. The member for Adelaide said:

To bring this into line with other superannuation schemes in the Commonwealth the Bill should provide for 22s. 6d. a week for each unit.

I will pass on from what the member for Adelaide said, because he is not a member of the present Cabinet, as the Treasurer is, and therefore is not able directly to influence this matter, to what the member for Norwood (Mr. D. A. Dunstan) said. He is now, of course, the most influential member of the present Cabinet. He referred to the Public Service Association, and said:

The association requested that a unit be valued at 22s. 6d., but the Bill does not provide that. For a long time this State has been lagging behind other States and the Commonwealth; contributors in other States have been able to contribute for a greater pension and their contributions have been less than in this State. In more recent years, increases have been made in other States without any increase in contributions, whereas there have been increases in contributions in South Australia. In consequence, there has been a long and anguished cry from public servants in this State that they have not been fairly treated by this Government.

I can respectfully adopt these very words and use them of the present Government. He went on to say:

I believe it should provide for 22s. 6d. a unit for pensioners, and that this would be the only fair thing in the circumstances.

This was five years ago, and now the Government of which he is an influential member has refused to increase the unit value of the pension. He continued:

However, as other members have said, we are forced to accept half a loaf or get no bread. In consequence, since this alleviates the position of pensioners and widows and copes with some of the anomalies that have existed, it deserves the support of members. I hope that next year—

that was in 1962—

this State will be in a position to have a Government that will give 22s. 6d. a unit to Public Service pensioners and put them in a position similar to that which they were in under a previous Labor Government, when they were getting benefits comparable with those received by public servants elsewhere in the Commonwealth.

A long time has passed since then. This is the second Bill on superannuation that the present Government has introduced and it has refused this time, as it refused before, to do anything to increase the unit value of the pension despite what was said in 1961 by two

members of the present Cabinet as well as by other members, despite the representations made by superannuitants, and despite the fact that the value of money has declined and the cost of living has risen considerably in the last five years. What is the explanation for the Government's refusal to do anything? What is the explanation for the Treasurer's not even mentioning that he has had these representations but trying on the contrary to pretend to the House that everything has been done by agreement and that he has done everything to meet the convenience of people who have made representations to him? "Hypocrisy" is one word that can be used to explain this, and it is, frankly, the only explanation I can think of. I think it is a very shabby business that the Government is now refusing to do anything about it. If in his reply to this debate the Treasurer does not explain why nothing has been done, I propose to ask him in Committee why it has not and whether the Government will consider doing something about this during the present session, as these people are suffering because the purchasing power of their pensions has reduced over the years. They deserve a better deal than they are getting from the present Government.

That is all I have to say. I hope my words will not have fallen on deaf ears but that the Government will do something to help a very deserving section of the community—a section which it said it would help in 1961 when it was in Opposition but which so far it has declined to help. I hope this position will not continue.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The member for Mitcham, who has just delivered an oration on this Bill, did not take any part in the debate on this matter in 1961. He says this Government has done nothing, yet when this Bill passes the third reading the Government will be able to say with all confidence that it has carried out all the promises it made before the last election in relation to superannuation, which is something that members opposite cannot say of their record over the years. The honourable member advocated increasing the unit value of the pension, but when his Party was in office it increased unit values without considering that almost every pensioner who had been receiving social service payments in addition to the pension lost the social service payments as a result. That is what he wants us to do.

Mr. Millhouse: You know perfectly well that that is no excuse for not doing anything.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Grow up! Use the intelligence you possess.

Mr. Millhouse: I am, but you are not using yours.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Grow up!

Mr. Millhouse: Say something else!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am showing how stupid the honourable member has been over the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Like fun I have been!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member has been positively stupid about it. Even if I find out what he wants to know in five minutes, I doubt that he would understand it. Apparently, this is the first time he has considered taking part in this debate.

Mr. Millhouse: I said the same thing in the last session of Parliament.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member would not know what he said. He has been talking about what happened in 1961, but nothing is recorded about that. He had no part in the matter. Agreement has been reached between the Government and the Superannuation Committee, which made investigations and met me in a deputation. If I desired to take the honour and glory, I could say that I went out of my way to ensure that the deputation took place at a time suitable to the members of it. If that is to be regarded as a pat on the back, I cannot help it; I have not asked for it. I make no apology for having done what I did. I only wanted to give these people an opportunity to state their case, and I did that.

The relation of the basic wage to superannuation was discussed and we also talked about what would take place in future regarding increased units. Despite that, my honourable friend, who was not on the deputation, wants to accuse me of having done nothing. I do not have to give this House details of the business of every deputation that waits on me, nor will I do that. The member stands in his place and hurls personal abuse at me because I do not see eye to eye with him on his stupid attitude. I do not think anything is more harmful at present than the attitude he has taken this afternoon. I remind the House that the Government is still meeting 70 per cent of superannuation payments. The remaining 30 per cent is paid by contributors. This Government raised its contribution to 70 per cent, and it is not prepared to reduce the obligations of the Commonwealth on these matters.

Mr. Millhouse: This is a specious excuse.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Oh, shut up, will you? I did not interrupt the honourable

member: I gave him full rein. I am on my feet for the purpose of telling the House what really took place. I shall not dwell on the matter, because I have met my obligations. The Commonwealth Government is expected to give a decision soon regarding pensions and, whether the member for Mitcham or any other honourable member likes it or not, the Government of South Australia will not commit the State to a further payment towards superannuation benefits until it knows the intentions of the Commonwealth. It was my desire to retain the confidence of the members of this responsible committee who were at the deputation, along with that of other people, about what we were doing. That would be in the interests of those persons. I say unhesitatingly that this Government has met every obligation and promise: indeed, it has gone beyond that. The committee has been informed about how far we are prepared to go.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) sought information regarding the probable cost of the amendment permitting Government employees to contribute for retirement at the age of 60 for men and 55 for women instead of the compulsory retiring ages of five years more in each case. When the option is taken up, this will add five years of pension to males, who at 65 have a life expectation of about 12½ years, and to females, who at 60 have a life expectation of about 19½ years, but it will have no effect upon the widows' pension. Accordingly, it is estimated that, if all employees should exercise the option, the cost to the Government, which has to bear seventenths of total pensions, will increase by, perhaps, 30 per cent.

However, there is no prospect that any large proportion of employees will avail themselves of the opportunity. First, they must pay their 30 per cent share of the increased costs, and this will be fairly heavy, particularly if the extra contribution is not undertaken when the contributor is quite young. Secondly, earlier retirement would give, at the most, a pension that would be equal to 50 to 60 per cent of the income that would be earned between the ages of 60 and 65. In other States, it has been found that only relatively few take advantage of this provision. If one in five should do so, the ultimate impact on the State will be an increase in the costs of about 6 per cent and if one in 10 should do so the increase in the State's costs will be about 3 per cent. Moreover, these increases will be long delayed in their full effect until employees who are now young reach retiring age.

The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) has referred to a similar matter this afternoon, but I do not think there is any need for me to add to what I have said. The matter of retirement of males at 60 years of age was also raised by that member. I do not think many such retirements will take place, nor do I think anything will be gained by many contributors retiring to take vacant positions outside the service. I consider that it will not be to the advantage of a person who has been in the State service for 30 or 40 years to try to obtain a position outside when he is 60 years of age and to hope to be able to receive superannuation as well as his wage. The Bill is a step in the right direction for people who, through unfortunate circumstances, may be obliged to retire earlier than they otherwise might have. It will assist such people, and enables them to pay into the fund the necessary sum for them to retire on the same pension as the one they would have normally received on retirement at 65 (or 60 in the case of females). I shall move an amendment in Committee in regard to the option of earlier retirement.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Commencement."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said it was not intended to bring the Act into operation until the necessary arrangements had been made. Will the Premier delay the operation of these clauses until the Government can look at the question of increasing the pension's unit value? In support of that request (which I now make to the Treasurer without any heat or resentment which he attributed to me when replying during the second reading), I point out that in the last few months relief has been granted in this way to pensioners in other parts of Australia. In 1965 the unit value of the Commonwealth was \$1.75 and in 1966 there is to be, in addition to this, a distribution of a surplus in the fund that will benefit existing pensioners. In New South Wales the value of the unit has been increased from \$2 to \$2.25; in Victoria—

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member in order in discussing the unit value of the pension under clause 3 of this Bill—

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you want to stop me?

Mr. HUDSON:—when neither this clause nor any other clause refers to the unit value of the pension?

The CHAIRMAN: So long as the honourable member relates his remarks to the commencement of the Bill, he will be in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. I am asking the Treasurer to delay the operation of these provisions while he considers these matters, because his explanation, in answer to me in the second reading debate, was that it would simply mean more money in the pockets of the Commonwealth. I point out that this has not been the view taken in other States. Nor is it a fact that it would happen in more than a fraction of the cases of pensioners, but only in the case of those who are now in receipt of a part pension, or of those who would be taken out of the range where those benefits were available. For most pensioners there would be an advantage, which has been recognized in other States. Therefore, I most sincerely ask the Treasurer on behalf of these people, who are deserving and who are now suffering, whether he will delay the commencement of these provisions until he can have a look at this matter, with a view to introducing another Bill to give relief.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I do not doubt the honourable member's sincerity, but I say again that this matter has been considered by the Superannuation Committee. The agreement reached is entirely the business of the committee and the Government at this juncture, and the Government does not intend to delay the passage of the Bill. If and when the occasion arises, the Government will further consider the matters raised by the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Provision for retirement at 60 for males and 55 for females."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

After new subsection (5) to add the following subsection:

(6) (a) On and after the commencement of the Superannuation Act Amendment Act, 1966, the rate of contribution for each reserve unit of pension shall be in accordance with such of the Schedules XI, XII, XIII or XIV as is applicable.

(b) Where a contributor who is contributing for reserve units of pension in accordance with Schedule XI or Schedule XII subsequently makes an election under the provisions of subsection (2) of this section the rates of contribution payable for those reserve units of pension shall from and after such election be in accordance with Schedule XIII or Schedule XIV

respectively. The said rates of contribution for each such reserve unit of pension shall be deemed to have been payable as from the day when the contributor first commenced to contribute for that unit and any arrears of contributions payable by virtue of this subsection shall be deducted from the salary of the contributor in such instalments and at such times as the board fixes.

The amendment inserts in the Bill the necessary consequential provisions relating to reserve units.

Mr. CUMBE: The amendment is formal; it is obviously necessary for the operation of the Bill, and is accepted as such.

Amendment carried.

Mr. CUMBE: I thought this legislation might cost the Government a little more than the Treasurer had stated, bearing in mind the experience of the Commonwealth Government when it introduced a similar scheme a few years ago. We do not know how many members of the Public Service are likely to take advantage of this provision. Will the Treasurer say whether he believes, from the representations made to him, that the option provided will be widely availed of?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Inquiries have been made (to what extent I know not) to try to ascertain how many members of the Public Service would be likely to take advantage of retiring at the age of either 60 or 55, not counting those forced to retire earlier because of sickness or some other disability. For that type of retirement there is provision at present, and it was taken into consideration in trying to gauge the ultimate position. Generally, those members of the Public Service considering an early retirement would probably have some long service leave outstanding, the money payable in lieu of which could be used for the extra payment needed to make up for the period of five years not to be worked. An attempt has been made to assess the future position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It appears that the provision we are now discussing gives a greater benefit to one public servant than to another from the point of view of money contributed by the Government. The Treasurer shakes his head, but the position is that any male officer who retires at the age of 60 will receive much more superannuation benefit from the Government than he would if he retired at the age of 65. The officer who continues to work for the Government until he is 65 (or, if a woman, until the age of 60) receives far less financial benefit from the

Government than the officer who retires at 60, or 55 in the case of a woman. I do not know whether this Bill was designed for that purpose, but that is its effect. The Government's contribution is made up not by the fund but by a direct payment from the Budget provisions each year of the sum necessary to bring the pension up to the prescribed amount determined by the number of units held.

Therefore, if a man retires at the age of 60, he is a charge on the Government for five years longer than if he retires at the age of 65. It means that the person who stays with the Government and really makes the Public Service his career, in his last five years probably giving the Government his best value because of his experience, will get five years' payment less than if he retired at 60. I do not know what answer the Treasurer has to that but I think it would be fairer to have a system whereby extra money was made available generally rather than restrictively. A person who leaves the Public Service at the age of 60 gets five years' additional superannuation compared with the person who remains in the service until he is 65. Some provisions in this Bill need to be looked at, and in particular this one.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I regret that the member for Gumeracha was not here earlier when I dealt with this matter. I accept his late contribution to the debate but think he understands as well as I do that at present the Government is paying 70 per cent of the total and the contributors 30 per cent. Let me repeat what I have already said. First, those who elect to retire before reaching normal retiring age must pay their 30 per cent share of the increased costs, and this is fairly heavy, particularly if the extra contribution is not made when the contributor is young. Secondly, retirement would give, at the most, a pension equal to 50 to 60 per cent of the income that would otherwise be obtained for another five years. If one person in 10 retired at the earlier age, it could mean that the extra cost to the State would be about 3 per cent; and, if one in five retired at the earlier age, the cost would be doubled—6 per cent.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What would that be in money?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have those figures. As much time has been spent on this matter and the Opposition has indicated that it desires the Bill to be passed, I consider I have given a fair and reasonable explanation.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 7, schedules and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 4. Page 889.)

Clause 16—"Power to transfer lands to trust"—to which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford had moved the following amendment:

In subclause (1) after "require" to insert: Provided further that no such proclamation shall be made in respect of the North-West Reserve as defined in the proclamation of His Excellency the Governor on the thirteenth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four as land reserved for Aborigines, unless both Houses of Parliament, during the same or different sessions of any Parliament, have resolved that such proclamation should be made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): At the time this matter was last before the Committee, I moved that progress be reported so that I could place on the file an amendment that I anticipated (I hope correctly) would satisfy the objections of Opposition members and at the same time allow the protection that takes place of this land being placed under the trust, so that if the land is transferred to the trust, and is no longer in the hands of the Government, it can be dealt with by proclamation (as it can be at the moment) but held by the trust on the terms of the trust. At the same time, Opposition members want to ensure that if the land is in the hands of the trust it cannot be alienated from use by Aborigines and cannot be mortgaged. I have therefore designed an amendment to provide that, if it is in the hands of the trust, there is restriction upon its dealing with it in the ways objected to by members opposite unless the proposed dealing is agreed to by resolution of both Houses of Parliament. This is not opposed to the Government's object in introducing the Bill. If the amendment is satisfactory to them, I hope Opposition members will allow the clause to pass.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is a difference between the Minister's amendment and mine. The amendment I moved provided that the land should not come under the trust at all unless such action was approved by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. I understand that the Minister's amendment provides that land should come under the operation of the trust but that it should not be alienated except by a resolution of both Houses of

Parliament. I am not sure whether the alienation is absolute or applies only to white people. Under the Minister's amendment, can the trust alienate land to a person of Aboriginal blood? I think that under his amendment the trust will be able to lease land to Aborigines for the purpose of establishing a cattle station, for instance.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not agree with this because the land has been provided for a specific purpose. The adjoining lands in the Northern Territory and Western Australia are retained as hunting grounds, and some areas also have a religious significance for the Aborigines. I believe the Opposition would agree if the Minister's amendment provided that there should be no alienation by the trust except by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. A lease would take away from the many and give to a comparative few. The Opposition is completely sincere when it says that it wants this area retained. We do not mind whether it is retained under the control of the trust or under the control of the department, but we say it should be retained. I think the Minister sees the point I am making, that it should not be leased and turned into a cattle station because, if it is, a few people of Aboriginal blood may get some additional benefit but many people will be deprived of traditional hunting grounds.

Will the Minister give his view as to whether I have stated the effect of his amendment? As I see it, his amendment enables land to come under the control of the trust but it also enables it to be alienated to people of Aboriginal blood, and that is a very wide definition. In any case, I would not be prepared to vote for this land to be alienated to anyone, unless there was some very much better ground for it than we have at present. The time may come when the trust puts forward a case to Parliament that there are no people who desire to use this land as a hunting ground, that the Aborigines have been more or less assimilated and that it is no longer necessary to use the land for that purpose. However, that time has not yet arrived. I think the Minister's amendment offers scope for compromise, but it does not go as far as I should like it to go. If the Minister were prepared to provide that any alienation or any mortgaging of the property should be subject to Parliament—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is "any mortgaging" as it stands in the amendment. It cannot be encumbered in any way.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that the Minister's present provision states that it cannot be encumbered in any way. I seriously ask the Minister to consider providing that, if the land comes under the operation of the trust, the trust cannot dispose of it in any way unless a resolution is passed by both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find great difficulty in doing what the honourable member suggests. Some people on the North-West Reserve now are seeking settled housing, and some people purchase houses themselves out of their Savings Bank money. We have several prototypes of settled houses for people moving there. Those people wish to put these houses up close to Musgrave Park station. We have to give them some security of tenure with the settled houses they put up, and even giving them a licence with an interest to use a little plot of earth around them is in itself some alienation from the authority, because it takes away the authority's exclusive rights, whoever is holding them (at the moment it is I), to use that little bit of land. It is an alienation in form. When we execute agreements about the houses put up at Musgrave Park, we do not want to have a resolution of both Houses of Parliament authorizing it, for that would be impossibly cumbersome.

I point out to the honourable member that what he is seeking that I should do at the moment in altering my amendment is not done by his amendment, because at present if this land is not held by the trust I can alienate it to anybody of Aboriginal blood within the terms of the Aboriginal Affairs Act right now. At the moment there is nothing to stop the Minister from executing a lease agreement in respect of the North-West Reserve to any Aborigines or any person of Aboriginal blood, as the land stands. Under that Act, I may not alienate land for use by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood where it is declared reserve land and where they are using it. However, I assure the honourable member that I have been forced to grant some leases of Aboriginal reserve lands in the last year, some in the member for Albert's district, which were not being used by Aborigines. I had to do that in order to provide for vermin control and erosion control. As things stand, there is nothing in the law to prevent the Minister from granting a lease on the North-West

Reserve to a person who is an Aborigine or a person of Aboriginal blood.

The protection the Aborigines will get is far greater under this Bill than in the present circumstances under the Aboriginal Affairs Act. It is not the intention of the Government to deprive the people of tribal areas of the right to retain a reserve which is tribal in essence. Indeed, this is the whole basic policy of the Government for which we have fought. The honourable member has the further protection that no alienation could take place under my amendment by the trust to Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood unless the Minister was satisfied that the use and benefit to the Aboriginal people (that is, all of them) of this reserve was retained. Quite frankly, I think my amendment goes much further in protection than the honourable member suggests, and his amendment does not provide this protection. I do not see a way of drafting that particular protection, because we would have to specify the kinds of alienation and go through all the cases and circumstances that may come, even about the granting of a licence, and this would be too cumbersome.

The Executive is subject to scrutiny in this Parliament, and the provisions of this Bill will make the scrutiny much more public than it was under the honourable member's Administration, when there were oil exploration leases (and at one stage a mining lease) granted in respect of this, without any sort of publicity at all, to people other than Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood. We do not intend that that should go on, and I assure the honourable member that under this Administration nothing of the kind that he fears can happen. I cannot see how it can happen under the terms imposed on the Minister under this Bill, whereas it certainly can happen under the present law, when the Bill does not apply to the North-West Reserve, although, of course, it certainly would not be the Government's policy that it should happen.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the honourable member for Gumeracha in the attitude he has taken. Everybody acknowledges that the North-West Reserve is used by nomadic Aborigines either for the whole of the year or for moving about on during part of the year. We are concerned at the possibility of the North-West Reserve being alienated from that type of land use and being used for some form of production. If that is so, both Houses of Parliament should be able to scrutinize and approve the action.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not what the amendment of the member for Gumeracha provides.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Both Houses should know why the action is to be taken and the use to which the land will be put. The Opposition has queried how the trust will operate at this reserve, but we have been told that it is too early to know what will happen, and whether this reserve is to be controlled by the trust. We have been told that people living in the area will be asked, but we know that it will be many years before such a question can be put to them. It is better to allow Parliament to consider this question and to allow it to scrutinize the future of the reserve after we have seen how the trust operates.

Mr. SHANNON: Nomadic Aborigines on this reserve travel where it is easiest for them to survive. People who have observed them in their native state say that they are strong and healthy, and compare more than favourably with Aborigines who have been in contact with our society. Apparently, we have done some natives a dis-service: their physical wellbeing has deteriorated and they have learned bad habits from the poor whites. On the North-West Reserve this cannot happen, as a white man is prohibited from entering the reserve without special permission. Many of these people are not ready for a sophistication that we have learned over many years. This amendment will do no harm to the trust, which will have to solve many problems in other reserves. Apparently, some Aborigines are capable of carrying out agricultural pursuits on a share-farming basis from which they earn much money. These people share what they have with their fellows, and to change this will take time. The trust may be able to change their attitude towards the ownership of property, and I want to ensure that anything secured for these people will be retained by them. If the Minister agrees to the exclusion of the North-West Reserve from the operation of this legislation, the Opposition will be happy. I do not want anything done that will change their way of life.

Mr. McKee: There is no suggestion about changing their way of life.

Mr. SHANNON: No, I do not think the Minister intends to do that, but the next Minister may have different ideas.

Mr. McKee: It will be a matter of Government policy, not the opinion of the Minister in power.

Mr. SHANNON: But we should ensure that future Governments will not change this policy.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The amendment of the member for Gumeracha leaves it right where it is.

Mr. SHANNON: It excludes this area.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And leaves it within the power of the Minister to do just what the member for Gumeracha does not want done.

Mr. SHANNON: I want this reserve to be preserved in its entirety. Perhaps in future something can be done for the benefit of the Aborigines there, but at this stage we do not know. We cannot ask the people concerned, because they are nomadic, difficult to find, and shy.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister says that his amendment is as good as the assurance in the 1962 Act, but there is a vast difference in the circumstances. The 1962 Act was under the control of the Minister, who was charged with certain responsibilities and who had to answer questions in this place on the way he carried them out. If he had alienated even one acre of the reserve, there would have been an immediate outcry by this Parliament. However, although the Minister has certain responsibilities set out in subclause (6), his power is circumscribed, as the subclause provides that he shall not withhold his consent unless he is satisfied that the sale, lease, mortgage or dealing fails to preserve to the Aboriginal people the benefits and value of the land in question. This means that the Minister cannot withhold his consent to a lease to any person of Aboriginal blood.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Then what do those words mean? If the lease is to an Aboriginal, it does not fail to do these things.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It may.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The active supervision is being taken away from Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not in my amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Bill provides for the making on or before October 1 every year of a very good annual report on the working of the Act during the preceding financial year and the provision of a summary of the receipts and expenditures during the same period and any other particulars that the trust may from time to time consider fit to be included in the report. Is this a matter that the trust would think fit to include in the report? I think it would consider it a matter proper to be left out. Parliament will be given the financial results but

not a report on the leasing procedures that take place.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: When has it ever had that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present, we have the Minister here and we can ask questions on every day that Parliament sits. If we do not get a satisfactory reply, we can move the adjournment of the House to consider the matter. If we still do not get a satisfactory reply, we can move a vote of no confidence in the Government. In other words, matters can be raised here at any time. However, the report under this legislation could be tabled a year after the event and even then not give particulars of the granting of any lease.

The Crown Lands Act requires the Minister of Lands to disclose particulars of Crown leases, and I am not satisfied with the Minister's amendment. It obviously means that leases are contemplated. If such were not the case, there would be no need to provide for the approval of leases. I suggest that the granting of any lease should be done by resolution of both Houses.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why didn't you do it when you were in Government, if you thought it necessary?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Over the last 25 years no Minister of Lands has had difficulty in obtaining approval for any action considered necessary under the Crown Lands Act. I consider that the North-West Reserve is a particular reserve and would have gone along with the Minister if he had not contemplated granting leases without the approval of Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have never said anything of the kind. You are talking untruths.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It would be difficult to get any information on the desire of the people on the reserve, but it is obvious that some alienation of the reserve is contemplated and I support my amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have sat here with a certain impatience listening to the utter nonsense that has just been spoken by the member for Gumeracha. I am appalled that a member condemns a situation for which he is responsible. He does not want it to happen under this Government, though it happened under his! His Government was criminally responsible for giving away the rights of the Aborigines on the North-West Reserve willy nilly. I have never known a Government

to be responsible for such disgraceful actions as those for which the member for Gumeracha's Government was responsible in relation to the North-West Reserve. Yet he now sheds crocodile tears about it.

His amendment is worthless, as he knows. That has been pointed out to him and all he can do is waffle and say, "Here we have the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in front of us, and we can ask him". What information did his Government give about the oil or mineral leases that it gave on the reserve? This Government will not give away the rights of the Aborigines on the North-West Reserve and this measure is designed to ensure that actions of the kind for which the member for Gumeracha has been responsible will not take place again in this State. The people well know that. If the honourable member tries to fight this Bill in the Upper House, he will see what the Aboriginal people of South Australia do about it. They will be here in hundreds. They have been telephoning me over the weekend about the way the member carried on last week and they are prepared to come here and lobby every member if an endeavour is made to continue to do to the Aborigines what has been done in the past.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think it is time I spoke, because I have personal knowledge of this area, having lived there for many years. I have not employed Aborigines from the Far North-West, because they are not employable other than on work such as tracking and catching dingoes. These Aborigines are not good employees. They have not the same mentality as the whites, the people of New Guinea, or the negroes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What do you mean by mentality?

Mr. HEASLIP: They are a different type of people and cannot be brought in. Some are bright but most are not. In the North-West they are tribal and nomadic and it is impossible to get their opinions on this matter. They go from South Australia to Western Australia or to the Northern Territory and are able to travel 100 miles on foot in 24 hours. Yet, the Government is trying to bring these nomads into our civilization.

Mr. Langley: What about the ones that live in the city now?

Mr. HEASLIP: They are not the same type as those in the North-West. Many Aborigines on the North-West Reserve have seen white people but that is about all, for they are shy and try to avoid us. Having had practical experience as a pastoralist in the area, I know

that to stock or lease the North-West Reserve will merely create another desert. Although the sandhills in the area are now holding some growth (most of which was dead when I last saw it), the presence of stock will denude the land. The area will be ruined, regardless of the little money that may be obtained from it. Mineral rights are useless to the Aborigines; they are not interested in collecting chrysoprase.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What nonsense! We exported \$12,000 worth in this last year, which was collected by the Aborigines, yet you say they are not interested in collecting it.

Mr. HEASLIP: They are not.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense! They've got teams up there collecting it now.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad they have, but they were certainly not interested in chrysoprase two years ago. That is about all the Aborigines can collect, anyway. What good to the Aborigines are minerals under the surface?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Can't they sell them?

Mr. HEASLIP: If we are going to stop the use—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that what all this is about? Now we are getting to the real motive. You don't want Aborigines to have the mineral rights; you want to give them away like you did before!

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that. Instead of the Government's supplying the money, the people who develop the wealth of that country should give the royalties to the Aborigines. I am not concerned about money; I am concerned about the Abo's. They do not want money; they desire broad acres so that they can continue as they have done in the past—so that they can hunt naturally and not artificially, as they would under the present proposals. It is ridiculous to relate the North-West Reserve to any other reserve. The North-West Reserve and its inhabitants are vastly different from other Aboriginal reserves. Abo's on Yorke Peninsula are partly trained and educated and, therefore, partly useful, but those on the North-West Reserve are not. To say that the Abo's know what is going on, is ridiculous.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Call them "Abo's" and see what kind of reaction you will get! It is indicative of your attitude.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is not disgraceful to call them "Abo's". I do not know why they should not like it, for it is merely an abbreviation. I am totally opposed to any move that will enable the reserve to be leased and grazed

for money. The area should be left for the Aborigines in its native state, or it will be destroyed. The Minister said that the previous Government was criminally responsible for giving away the rights of the Aborigines on the North-West Reserve. He also said that the Aborigines would know what was going on, but I consider it is impossible for Aborigines on the North-West Reserve, where they are nomads and constantly on the move from one State to the other, to know what is going on. He further said that the Aborigines would storm Parliament House in hundreds, but that is silly, because it would be impossible for them to come from the North-West Reserve and to invade Parliament House.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister, who knows that his predecessor, the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson), is absent on other business, made some rather trenchant criticisms of some of the things the former Government had done. I shall not argue with him about that; he may be correct, but I point out that his predecessor was responsible for securing for the Aborigines a valuable piece of territory at the top of Eyre Peninsula, known as Yalata.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was before his term.

Mr. SHANNON: If that is so, the land was secured in his predecessor's term, which was still during the Playford Administration. Provision was also made for further areas for Aborigines. If the Minister's approach is correct, he has satisfied me beyond any shadow of doubt that the member for Gumeracha is seeking to do the right thing, namely, to preserve the North-West Reserve intact, without interfering with the people who now inhabit it. I desire the Minister's assurance that he is prepared to accept an amendment that will exclude at this stage the North-West Reserve from the operation of the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Certainly not!

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister will not permit that. In my view, that is fundamental. I want to leave the North-West Reserve to its own devices, with no interference from any social or Aboriginal trust. The members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust will, of necessity, be, to a certain degree, sophisticated; they will not be Aborigines from the nomadic tribes in the North being represented on this trust. That would be impracticable. So the members of the trust will have had some association with our white civilization and will run the affairs of their own people who know

nothing of us, who have no idea even how the white man lives since they have not come into contact with him. The Minister has satisfied me by his criticism of the former Administration (which was completely unjustified) that sufficient evidence is available to show that we should now make sure that that cannot happen again. It could happen again if it fell within the ambit of the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

Mr. McKEE: I oppose this amendment and support the Bill as it stands. Never before have members opposite shown so much interest in the Aborigines. The Minister has pointed out that the North-West Reserve cannot be excluded, because, as I understand it, the people there desire certain improvements. The Minister is doing his utmost to improve the conditions and welfare of these people. I have witnessed in the past outside Port Augusta during the administration of the previous Government people travelling under adverse conditions and in ill-health down from the North-West Reserve seeking medical attention and other facilities not provided for them in that reserve by the Government. They squatted outside Port Augusta under appalling conditions through lack of interest taken in them in their reserve. It appears that members opposite are covering up and making excuses for their past lack of interest in the Aborigines. In their long period of office they made no effort to improve the lot of these people. The only reason I can see why members opposite are opposing this legislation is that the Government is trying to do something for the Aborigines, who are not happy about the Opposition's attitude to this measure. Let members opposite assist the Government in trying to improve the lot of the Aborigines.

Mr. QUIRKE: I oppose any alienation of that country to Aborigines or to anyone else. It is a vast area, valuable for grazing purposes, but by far the greater part of it is absolutely waterless.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: One could not put stock on it.

Mr. QUIRKE: No. Any attempt to stock that country would be detrimental to the land itself and to the people who tried to do it. It would ruin that country. Thousands of people in South Australia are of the same mind. Has the Minister consulted the people who really know about these things or has this come about merely because he thinks it will be good for them, so it has been included in the general picture? This land should not be

alienated—certainly not to white men and certainly not to the natives. I forecast that in 50 years' time there will not be a tribal nomad native in that area. As soon as we start to develop a place like this and make it nice for them, they come out of it, as they have done in every other similar place. They lead a life probably more strenuous than that of any other people on earth. It is marvellous how the Aborigines have adapted themselves to that country. What we regard as terrible privation is merely ordinary living for them. They are remarkable people. They are certainly not, in this age and generation, adapted to running cattle on that country.

Mr. McKee: Who said anything about running cattle?

Mr. QUIRKE: Well, what would be a reason for refusing the trust the right to alienate that country to Aborigines, which the Minister says can be done?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What would you think about the leasing of a shed?

Mr. QUIRKE: I would concede that, but I would not want to lease areas to people in that vast area. They would have to be centralized so that they could be looked after. If they wanted to walk about, they should be able to. If the country were needed for that purpose, I would have no objection. People of high repute in every State of Australia say that that area of country should not, in the interests of posterity, be interfered with, and certainly in no circumstances should it ever be grazed. I am concerned that any form of alienation will produce something to the detriment of that land. I would not object to hutments on the fringe of it, because that is eventually where they will go and remain. For every year that they are attended to on the fringe of the white man's country they will show less and less inclination to wander out to where the waterholes and soaks are miles apart. They will quickly give away that game until none of them is left. Then there will be no purpose in alienating that land. It is a matter of what we do now. I see no need for the trust to have the right to alienate any of that land except an area that would be available to the Aborigines for building their houses. In some parts of that vast area there is water. If there is power to alienate the land where there is water, temptation will arise. Nobody wants to go where there is no water. Any number of people will take up the southern and eastern parts of the land and the other land will be precious to those who

come later because water will probably be found there at some stage. The Aborigines should be instructed in looking after the country and employed in rabbiting and other ways. They should be given jobs on the land because they are the only people who will walk over it. They will be happy to work on the land in this way. Also, if they are given rations these should be more nutritious because in the past their poor rations caused malnutrition resulting in their resistance being broken down and their contracting diseases which wiped out many thousands.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Get back to the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: In the 26 years I have been in this Chamber the Minister is the first member of Parliament I have encountered who knows everything about everything.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to speak to the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not believe in the alienation of this land for any purpose; it must be maintained as a reserve. It must not be alienated to the white man or to the black man. The land now without water may not be without water in 50 years' time. Therefore, even though land is without water now it should not be alienated.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister referred to trifling alienation such as that necessary for building a house or something like that, but I point out that even that has some problems. The moment an area is alienated it has to have access, otherwise it cannot be used effectively. The Minister and I agree that this area has been well policed. Sightseers and others who have had no valid reason to enter it have been kept out. However, alienation must bring with it the right of access.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: A licence with a restriction could be granted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Assuming there was a case for the alienation of a small portion of land for a house, how long would it take Parliament to pass the necessary resolution? When a stock route is considered in Parliament (and this is analogous) it takes three minutes for it to be moved and five minutes for it to be approved. Only in cases where there was some dispute would Parliament take any time. At present people in this area cannot voice their opinion effectively. Representatives on the trust will not be drawn from people of this area but mainly from people of the metropolitan area and possibly from reserves on which live more

sophisticated Aborigines. However, in the process of alienation the hunting grounds, which were set aside specifically for these people and which were built up by the last Government, will be subject to alienation and this Parliament will not have an effective voice in controlling the matter. The Minister's amendment deals with alienation in the plural and, under the Acts Interpretation Act, the plural indicates an individual also.

I wonder whether the Committee realizes how wide is the definition of Aboriginal blood in the principal Act. The definition covers at least quarter-caste Aborigines, so that the Minister's amendment is far too wide.

The Committee divided on Sir Thomas Playford's amendment:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg, Millhouse, and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters, Hurst, and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.
Amendment thus negatived.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

After subclause (6) to insert the following subclause:

(6a) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (6) of this section, the Trust shall not in any way alienate any portion of the North-West Reserve (as defined in the proclamation of His Excellency the Governor dated the thirtieth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four as land reserved for Aborigines) from use by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood nor shall the Trust encumber any portion of the said Reserve unless both Houses of Parliament during the same or different sessions of any Parliament have by resolution authorized such alienation or encumbering.

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that the member for Gumeracha has something in mind to improve this new subclause to ensure that nothing will happen on the North-West Reserve without the knowledge and consent of both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the Minister to consider the point of view expressed by members of the Opposition. This amendment places some restriction on the trust in the use that it may make of the land,

as the trust will not be able to mortgage it but will be able to lease it only to people of Aboriginal blood. However, it does not place any restriction on the things I fear may happen. I do not suggest that the Minister intends to approve of the leasing of this land, but this is a long-term arrangement and a future Minister or trust may approve.

The previous Government found it necessary to take over one reserve in the Upper Murray because administration was difficult, and I think the Minister will agree that the administration of reserves is difficult. The trust may in future regard this reserve as a nuisance and think it is advisable to hand over the land to one or two people or companies of people of Aboriginal blood so as to avoid the necessity of administering it. The Minister will have achieved his purpose if the land is under the control of the trust: it is not necessary to provide that it can be disposed of. I know the Minister's political history indicates that he will not dispose of the reserve, but in 10 or 15 years the provision I have suggested may be helpful. I ask the Minister to consider striking out two or three words in his amendment so that, although the land will be under the control of the trust, it cannot be disposed of except with the approval of Parliament. If the trust wanted the land to be leased, it would have to submit the matter to the Minister who, if he considered the lease was justified, would submit it to Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek leave to amend new subclause (6a) as follows:

After "not" to insert "sell, lease nor".

If these words are inserted, "alienate" will refer only to a method of alienation other than by selling or leasing. This will leave it open to licensed Aborigines under certain conditions to use the land but not to sell or lease it. They will not have the exclusive use or possession of the land but will have the right to use certain sections. This will meet the wishes of the Administration and probably of members opposite.

Leave granted.

Mr. SHANNON: The new subclause as amended meets my wishes.

Amendment carried.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

In subclause (7) after "provision" to insert "Notwithstanding any provision of this Act no land under the control of the Aboriginal Lands Trust may be sold unless such sale is approved by a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament."

The amendment will ensure that Parliament is aware of the fact that a certain area that was

secured in all good faith for the Aborigines' use is no longer suitable for the purposes for which it was secured. If the Minister of the day decides that it should be sold, Parliament will at least be informed of that fact. I do not think departmental administration will in any way be affected. Parliament, in this case, should have some knowledge of and some control over the selling of the land.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The wording of the amendment should be in a different form; "under the control of" should be replaced by "vested in". The amendment should read:

Notwithstanding any provision of this Act no land vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust may be sold unless such sale is approved by a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament during the same or different sessions of any Parliament.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister has added some other words but, if he agrees with the principle of the amendment, I am happy to accept his wording.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to accept the principle of the honourable member's amendment, for I certainly do not wish to see Aboriginal lands sold. Only in very exceptional cases do I think the selling of land would be advantageous to Aborigines.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the member for Onkaparinga withdraw his original amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I ask leave to withdraw that amendment, Sir.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment will now read as follows:

Notwithstanding any provision of this Act no land vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust may be sold unless both Houses of Parliament during the same or different sessions of any Parliament have by resolution authorized such sale.

Mr. SHANNON: I formally move that amendment, Sir.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Power to grant assistance."

Mr. NANKIVELL: I move:

To strike out "in connection with trust lands".

The object of this amendment is to widen the powers of the trust in relation to the distribution of any moneys that would or could accrue to it from the development of mineral or petroleum rights or from any other source. These moneys under the clause as it stands are restricted and can be used only for purposes in

connection with trust lands. As there are 6,000 Aborigines that we know of in this State and only a few of them are on reserves, not all of them would be interested in land whereas many of them would be interested in education and would benefit from some welfare assistance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has moved this amendment with good reason. He knows the problems connected with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. As his amendment improves the Bill significantly, I am happy to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (19 and 20) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 4. Page 883.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support this Bill, the purpose of which is to clarify an amendment made to section 5 of the principal Act in the last session of Parliament. It would appear from the wording of that amendment that mental deficiency and psychiatric nurses must be members of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation to be able to exercise their vote to elect a member to represent them on the Nurses Board. That is definitely not intended, because only 17 of all mental deficiency and psychiatric nurses are members of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation (South Australian Branch).

In supporting this Bill, I point out that this is the second occasion in the very short time that this session has proceeded on which members on this side have had either to amend an Act from which something had been omitted or to approve a Bill to clarify an amendment to an Act. The other Bill to which I refer is the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill, where my colleague, the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), moved to have words reinserted to clarify a certain provision. Although we are all somewhat implicated in this because we all, as members of Parliament, have opportunities to study Bills, it is the prime responsibility of the Government to see that Bills coming before us are clear for us to understand and interpret. This is something in respect of which the Government should perhaps exercise more supervisory control when introducing Bills. As I understand the position, Cabinet instructs that a Bill be drawn up in certain terms and under its direction. I

imagine that, when it has been roughly drafted, it comes back to Cabinet, each member of which looks at it in the form in which it will be introduced and perhaps offers advice on or some constructive criticism of it. It is obvious from this Bill and from the other to which I referred that perhaps these points have been overlooked and that this has necessitated the introduction of a Bill of this kind and an amendment to the other Bill to which I referred. I support the Bill on behalf of the Opposition.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the remarks of the member for Burnside. As she said, the Bill is the result of a mistake in drafting, or in interpretation among the various bodies, and the position should be rectified. I read in the *Advertiser* recently about the Labor Party claiming how thoroughly it prepared Bills and how it went through various procedures so that it would bring down a perfect Bill. Of course, members have read what took place at Surfers Paradise when the Labor Party changed one of its policies overnight.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is getting off the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out that some drafting errors have escaped the notice of both Houses and this was the case in regard to at least one Bill last year. As this Bill corrects such a mistake, I support the second reading.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 19. Page 524.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Undoubtedly this Bill will be passed without much opposition as it extends the operations of the Prices Act for another 12 months. Although I support an extension for 12 months, I would not support the Bill if it were to provide that the Act be permanently placed on the Statute Book. However, as it is expected that the Prices Department will continue its function of controlling consumer prices in this State for another 12 months, I am happy to support the Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said that this State was particularly vulnerable to cost increases. The Opposition is aware of cost increases in the State, not all of which have come about through private industry or commerce. We are aware of general increases in costs, some of which have been contributed to by deliberate actions of the Government.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Premier that the State is particularly vulnerable to cost increases. His reasons were excellent. He said, in effect, that we were particularly vulnerable because, first, as a result of the limited local market, a large proportion of our factory output had to be sold in other States in competition with goods made in those States; and, secondly, in the case of primary producers, nearly two-thirds of the State's primary production amounting to about \$280,000,000 was exported, and was, in the main, subject to world prices. I hope that, in keeping a close watch on prices (which I hope he will do), the Premier will remember what has been South Australia's main advantage in competing with other States: South Australia has had a lower cost of production. If this factor is destroyed by either Government action resulting in loss of confidence by the community or by neglect, South Australia will lose the main advantage through which it has been able to attract industries from other States and from overseas. I hope the Premier will always remember what I said when he considers price increases whether caused by private enterprise or by the Government.

In considering the Bill, I referred to the speech made by the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) when, as Premier, he explained a similar Bill in 1964. At that time he explained in some detail the history of and the reasons for price control in South Australia. I do not wish to repeat all the reasons he gave but they still stand as the basis for price control and are the basis upon which I, for one, support it. One reason given by the former Premier (and again given by the Premier on this occasion) concerned the increases in commodity costs resulting from a wage rise. In 1964 the former Premier dealt at some length with the effect on primary producers. Of course, their costs depend on the prices of manufactured and processed goods, whereas their income comes from exporting mainly on world parity prices. He referred to the special investigatory activities of the Prices Department and said that the reason why house building in South Australia was cheaper than that in other States was that the Prices Department kept an efficient oversight on the cost of house components here. He referred to the undesirable practices that had been controlled by recent amendments to the Prices Act, and said that the system of "lost leaders" in the commercial world had been suppressed to a large degree because trading firms could not adver-

tise special goods of a limited quantity but had to sell all they had at the price advertised. Obviously, the reasons why price control will be supported this year are much the same as they have been in the last few years.

In his second reading explanation the Premier said that this Bill foreshadowed another Bill on unfair trade practices. This year we have heard references made to sellers of articles retailing their goods below the average retail price. I infer from remarks of Government members and of the Premier that the Government regards with dismay retailers who consistently undercut competitors. I believe there is cause for alarm among those who believe in efficiency in trading through competition. If the Government's attitude is taken to extremes and results in a minimum as well as a maximum price, this interference in the efficiency of retailing by such methods will strike a blow at efficiency throughout the State. I would not support a minimum price structure if it interfered with efficiency. I do not accuse the Premier of saying that he will do this, but I hope that we will not restrict our thinking about price legislation to a minimum price. As the Premier said in his second reading explanation that the State is vulnerable to increasing costs, I trust that he will keep this in mind when dealing with the State's financial matters.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Last year I challenged members by saying that if someone could put up a case for the prices legislation I would vote for it: however, I voted against it. Honourable members have been flirting with this Act for so many years that they should marry it and make it a permanent feature (if they believe in it), otherwise have nothing to do with it. It is claimed that this is price control but how can prices be controlled with so many various factors causing price rises? Last year the excuse given for the continuation of this legislation was the change to decimal currency: control was needed because unscrupulous people would increase prices, and the consumer had to be protected. This was the only State with price control, yet our prices rose more than the Australian average. One of the factors causing increased prices in Australia and in this State is indirect taxation. Over the years, with price control in this State, prices were slightly below the Australian average, despite this puny legislation covering a few commodities. This happened because taxation was lower here than in other States.

With prices rising throughout Australia because of a rise in the basic wage, it is argued that we must have price control because of this increase, but prices in South Australia will not increase any more than in States that do not have price control. Competition is the best governing factor: it will do what the Government is trying to do by price control, as with free competition prices do not rise. Woolworth's, in competition with Coles and other stores, has a profit margin of 2½c in the dollar on its total sales, and that is as low as a margin can be. With keen competition comes greater efficiency and cheaper goods, and there is no monopoly. However, this free competition is restricted in many industries. My political philosophy is to eliminate restrictive trade practices that destroy the life blood of a free economy; this occurs if competition is reduced. More competition exists in the superphosphate industry now than there was a few years ago. At that time, under Fertilizer Sales Ltd., a purchaser could not nominate from whom he wished to purchase his superphosphate and this period was the most inefficient we have had in deliveries of superphosphate; the quality was not up to standard; and prices were higher than in the rest of Australia.

It was not under effective price control, although the Government said it was. Proper price control could have been achieved by free competition between the superphosphate companies, as this would have made them more efficient. They did not install modern machinery, whereas today more efficient methods are used, together with modern machinery, and the price is now near the Australian average because of the competition and the better methods used. The companies have installed improved loading facilities, otherwise carriers would go elsewhere to pick up superphosphate. Prices are kept down by competition; industry is more efficient and produces a better article. The Premier spoke about price control on tyres and said that he would not allow an increase in South Australia. However, an application has now been made for an increase in prices. A restrictive trade practice has existed for several years among those who sell tyres. An organization in which I was interested wanted to sell tyres, but its members had to obtain a small interest in a garage before it could sell them.

This permitted the organization the benefits of restricted trade practices as it could sell tyres at a reduced price. It was a fair price, but the scheme broke down because of the competition between tyre makers. In the last

couple of years, if one went to certain people one could get terrific reductions in the prices of tyres. If there is competition goods are cheaper, but if there is no competition a state of lethargy arises. The Premier is now experiencing difficulty because some people are selling petrol at below the fixed price. This is because two extra firms have entered the field and, because of the existence of competition, it is possible to get greater concessions than ever before. It is said that petrol is cheaper in this State than in other States, but before these two companies came here the petrol ring invoiced petrol from overseas at a higher rate than that at which it was invoiced to other countries. The oil ring can avoid price control by adjusting invoice prices. In this way it can make the same margin as it would have made if there had been no price control. This should be tackled as a restrictive trade practice instead of by this Act, which has proved to be ineffective.

The basic wage has increased because the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has said that Australia is prosperous and can afford to pay the extra. When the basic wage rises, prices follow. It is said that price control is necessary to prevent undue increases, but prices will rise in South Australia just as much as in other States. As a result of the increase in the basic wage, manufacturers will be able to get from the Tariff Board an increase in tariffs and thereby get protection. I think the Tariff Board allows the manufacturer a 9 per cent margin. We do not know how the South Australian Prices Commissioner fixes prices or what margin of profit he allows. The price of bread is controlled and, although it is cheaper here than in other States, our total food prices are higher than the Australian average. Where is the justice of this? Although the price of bread is controlled, the machinery used in its manufacture is not under control. If control is to be effective and just, it must cover all articles. We have had an experience with the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will know that this is not related to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The Premier has mentioned price control, and I am trying to prove that it is ineffective and to show its effect on the community.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: You wouldn't know what you're talking about!

The SPEAKER: I am not saying that the honourable member cannot make his point, but he cannot speak at length on that matter.

Mr. McANANEY: The Premier and I never seem to be on the same wave length. I do not know the basis of some of his arguments, but perhaps if I am here long enough I shall. Unless everything is controlled, price control is ineffective. In one State there was price control over essential goods, so sufficient quantities were not produced. However, unessential goods were in good supply, and as a result there was not a correct balance. From March, 1964, to March, 1966, prices rose by 8.1 per cent in the whole of Australia and by the same percentage in Adelaide, so how effective was our price control? In the June quarter of this year Australian prices rose by .8 per cent and prices in Adelaide rose by 1 per cent. In March, the Australian increase was .2 per cent and the increase in Adelaide was .4 per cent; that was just after the introduction of decimal currency, and our increase was twice the Australian average. Over a 20-year period the Australian index rose by 135.4 per cent whereas the Adelaide figure rose by 133.1 per cent. Our smaller increase was due to our lower taxation rates. In the four years up to March, 1966, the Australian index rose by 11 points and the Adelaide figure by 11.2 points. No matter what way one looks, one cannot find anything in favour of price control.

Under price control, motor tyres have deteriorated in quality. Much as I like to buy Australian products, recently I have had so many Australian tyres that have blistered that I have bought Japanese tyres. However, perhaps I am transgressing Standing Orders by mentioning this. As the Attorney-General has said frequently, the consumer must be protected. We were told that the Prices Commissioner dealt with about 400 complaints. Each complaint has cost the State \$370, although I admit that the Prices Commissioner has other work to attend to. In only 172 of these cases was there just cause for complaint. The cost of operating the Prices Department is about \$140,000 a year, so the cost of investigating each complaint that was thought to have some justification was about \$900.

Mr. Lawn: Therefore, you think it is useless?

Mr. McANANEY: I am developing the point that, perhaps, some protection ought to be given to the consumer. These complaints were mainly in regard to services rendered. People who did not enter into contracts to have repairs done received accounts that they thought were too high and referred their cases to the Prices Commissioner, but most people are able to look after themselves. A person who thinks he has been charged too much tells

the person who sent the account. Then, the person who sent the account has redress if the client refuses to pay. If the person sending the account has not a just case, he drops it. Although most people can solve these things for themselves, a certain section cannot and we might consider legislation to protect that section.

Mr. Lawn: You may be talking about what happens in country centres, but I cannot follow you as far as the metropolitan area is concerned.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not know what the member for Adelaide has in mind.

Mr. Lawn: If a person who wants a job done is not prepared to pay the price asked, he does not get the work done. Under the Act, he can go to the Prices Commissioner afterwards if he thinks he has been charged too much for a job.

Mr. McANANEY: Unionists were claiming that subcontractors were doing work for far less than what they should have been charging. We have much competition and low prices at the moment.

Mr. Lawn: You fellows cannot even get a plumber in the metropolitan area. If you want one, you come to me.

Mr. McANANEY: If I had to fill out all the forms that a plumber has to complete, I would turn to something else.

Mr. Lawn: You would be better at something else. You are not a financial expert.

Mr. Clark: You are being political, instead of answering the question put to you by the member for Adelaide.

Mr. McANANEY: I did not realize it was a question. The member for Adelaide has been telling me, not asking me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Curren: He is getting confused now.

Mr. Lawn: He has been confused all night, as he usually is.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Adelaide is being facetious, as usual, and I cannot answer a question unless a suitable one is asked. Certain practices must be guarded against, and that is the whole basis of the Premier's second reading explanation. The only thing to which I object is that, although this is said to be a Bill to control prices, it does nothing of the sort. I would gladly support a Bill that protected the consumer who could not look after himself. I would agree to his being given a period of adjustment, such as three days from the time a purchase is made. The statistics show that it is ridiculous to say that we are controlling prices in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: I come back to my first interjection. According to you, it is useless. Is that right?

Mr. McANANEY: Control of prices by this legislation has proved to be useless.

Mr. Lawn: So, you are opposed to the Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: I am opposed to the Bill, but not to the various provisions the Government has added to it.

Mr. Lawn: It took me 10 minutes to find out what I wanted to know.

Mr. McANANEY: I voted against the measure last year; I shall vote against this Bill now. If the Government had dealt with unjust, unfair and restrictive trade practices that result in inflated prices, I would support it, because competition keeps prices down and we cannot believe in competition and at the same time support restrictions that inflate prices. Unless a case for price control is put up, I shall vote against this Bill. However, as I have pointed out, I would support a Bill that afforded protection to the consumer.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I support this Bill because, unlike the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), I consider that it is of advantage to the general public of the State. We all know that, under the Prices Act, a service is provided to the public for the investigation of complaints of overcharging in relation to both controlled and uncontrolled goods and services. I, like the member for Stirling, was interested to hear the Premier's remarks when he explained the Bill that, in the 12 months ended June 30 last, more than 400 complaints of overcharges on goods and services had been investigated and that in 172 cases refunds or reductions in the amounts of accounts were obtained.

The member for Stirling said that, as the cost to the State of the Prices Department was \$140,000 a year, the cost of investigating each complaint was about \$900. However, I think he lost sight of all the other work done by the department. Further, it would be interesting to know how much money was saved for the people concerned in the 172 complaints. Those figures would be available in the Prices Department. I inquired of the Prices Commissioner as to the main complaints received by the department and he informed me that they related to electrical repairs and installations, plumbing repairs, house-painting, joinery, repairs to electrical appliances such as refrigerators, terrazzo and concrete work, any type of building additions, roof repairs, plastering, repairs to houses, motor car repairs and hire-purchase charges. The department was

successful in its negotiations in 172 of these cases.

Since my election to this House, I have received complaints that have necessitated my asking the Prices Commissioner and his department to make investigations and some of these were in respect of potato crisps, dentures, comprehensive motor insurance, glass, and a built-in bedroom suite. I consider that the department's investigations provide a useful and valuable service to the general public and that, for that reason, the legislation should be retained. I was also interested in the Premier's statement that, apart from its price-fixing function, the Prices Department continues to cover a number of other activities, including inquiries into complaints regarding hire-purchase agreements and used car transactions. Other members may have known that the department carries out these investigations but I was not aware of it myself. Having received many complaints of this nature, I shall in future refer such matters to the Prices Branch, and the 172 cases may well be increased considerably by next year. Some honourable members may not be aware of the types of complaint investigated by the Prices Department. During the debate last year a list of declared goods and services was furnished to the House. I have been provided with a similar comprehensive list, and ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Declared goods and services as at March 5, 1965.

Division 2—Groceries and foodstuffs:

9 Bran and pollard and sharps, and stock foods containing bran, pollard or sharps.

10 Bread and bread rolls.

10A Breakfast foods.

27 Flour, wheaten, wheat meal and self raising.

34 Wheat.

37 Infants' and invalids' foods.

47 Milk.

50A Prepared stock and poultry foods.

50B Sauce, tomato.

56 Soap, toilet or laundry.

63 Wheat meal (for stock foods).

Division 3—Fuel and ice:

69 Firewood.

70 Mallee roots.

Division 5—Clothing:

99 Clothing, garments and apparel of all descriptions other than:

(a) Handkerchiefs.

(b) Bathing costumes, trunks and caps.

(c) Furs and articles of apparel made from furred skins.

(d) Garters, arm bands, braces, suspenders and belts.

(e) Hairnets.

- (f) Millinery.
- (g) Clothing, garments and apparel made, or principally made from alpaca, mohair, astrakhan, seal-ette, fabric imitating fur, imitation camel hair cloth, velvet, velveteen, plush, lame, tinsel, fabric including lame or tinsel, pure silk, chenille, linen, lace effect fabric, handpainted fabric, applique designed fabric, and nylon.
- (h) Women's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions.
- (i) Men's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions, other than working attire.
- (j) Maids' gowns, dresses and frocks where designed for use as evening, dance or wedding wear, being ankle length or longer.
- (k) Safari jackets, other than for college wear, jodhpurs and leather jackets.
- (l) Surgical garments.
- (m) Foundation garments, other than maids' or girls' brassieres.
- (n) Scarves.
- (o) Ties, other than school and college ties.
- (p) Men's shirts, other than working shirts.
- (q) Men's youth's and boys' felt hats.
- (r) Maids' and girls' socks, stockings, and sockettes made from nylon, pure silk or wool.
- 100 Diapers.
- 101A Footwear.
- 101B Parts for the manufacture of footwear—soles, heels, boot and shoe uppers and all component parts, materials and aids to manufacture, partial manufacture or repair for use in the manufacture, partial manufacture or repair of footwear of all descriptions.
- 105 Nursery squares.
- 108 Infants' and babies' shawls.
- Division 7—Household equipment and appliances:
- 141 Cooking, kitchen utensils.
- 154 Water tanks.
- Division 8—China, earthenware and glass:
- 156 Glass, namely—
- (a) Bent, bevelled and blasted or engraved.
- (b) Bottles, flasks, jars, vials and tubes.
- (c) Louvres.
- (d) Plate.
- (e) Sheet, figures, rolled, cathedral, milled, rough cast or wired cast.
- (f) Sheet, plain or fancy.
- Division 9—Timber, bricks and other building materials:
- 159 Bricks and building blocks, including refractories.
- 161 Builders' hardware of any material, including hinges, locks, fasteners and casement catches, and builders' small hardware.
- 162 Building boards, including caneite and masonite.
- 163 Cast-iron porcelain enamelware, and substitutes therefor made from metal or plastic.
- 168 Earthenware and stoneware other than ornamental or decorative.
- 172 Fibrous plaster sheets.
- 173 Fibrous plaster, mouldings, cornices and cover battens.
- 175 Fittings and equipment of a type used in the installation of water, drainage or sewerage systems in buildings.
- 178 Joinery and joinery stock.
- 188 Roofing sheets.
- 189 Sleepers.
- 190 Tiles of all kinds, including roofing tiles, wall tiles and floor tiles.
- Division 10—Metals—raw or processed:
- 195 Galvanized iron and zinc anneal sheet—plain or corrugated.
- 201 Galvanized steel pipes and fittings.
- 202 Malleable pipe fittings.
- Division 13—Hides, leather and rubber:
- 222 Leather.
- 223 Leather, imitation leather, and fibre kit-bags, attache cases, satchels and the like.
- 224 Rubber pads, soles and heels.
- 225 Slipper forms, and piecegoods for use in the manufacture of boots, shoes or slippers.
- 226 Tyres and tubes.
- 227A Articles manufactured wholly or partly from rubber other than rubber gloves and rubber floor coverings.
- Division 14—Paper and stationery:
- 228 School requisites, namely:
- (b) Coloured chalks.
- (c) Coloured pencils.
- (d) Compasses and dividers.
- (e) Drawing paper and pins.
- (f) Erasers.
- (g) Maps.
- (h) Notebooks.
- (i) Pasting books.
- (j) Pens, nibs, pencils, including drawing sets.
- (k) Protractors (celluloid).
- (l) Rulers.
- (m) Set squares.
- (n) "T" squares.
- (o) Drawing and sketching materials.
- 248 School exercise books and the like.
- 252 Text books, primary and secondary schools.
- Division 15—Drugs and chemicals:
- 257 Acid, sulphuric.
- 271 Manure and fertilizers, organic and inorganic, including:
- (a) Blood and bone fertilizers.
- (e) Sulphate of ammonia.
- (f) Superphosphate.
- 277 Poisons, drenches and sprays, namely:
- (b) Arsenate of lead.
- Division 16—Oils, paints, varnishes, adhesives and plasters:
- 285 Kerosene.

- 289 Oils—mechanical and lubricating.
 292 Patent dryers and putty.
 293 Petroleum and shale products, other than aviation gasoline.
 295 Resins, including synthetic resin.
 296 Shellac, sandarac, mastic, and other dry gums, other than Yacca gum.
 298 Thinners.
 299 Mineral turpentine and turpentine substitutes.
 302 Whitelead.
 303A All raw materials used in the manufacture of paints, colours, varnishes, enamels and lacquers.
- Division 17—Packages and containers:
 304A All types of grades of bags, sacks (other than new bags and sacks) but including bags and sacks filled for the first time.
- Division 18—Miscellaneous:
 335 Sand and gravel.
 339 Stone.
- Division 19—Services, etc.:
 352 Any process in respect of timber including kiln drying, sawing, planing, milling and machining of all kinds and descriptions.
 352A Any manufacturing process in respect of clothing, fabrics and textiles.
 354 Boot and shoe repairs.
 355 Bricklaying and laying of cement and concrete masonry units and blocks.
 356 Building of dwellings.
 357 Building repairs, alterations and renovations.
 358 Carpentering.
 359 Cartage, haulage and delivery rates excluding crane hire and fork lift truck charges.
 361 Commissions on declared goods and services.
 364 Electrical work and repairs.
 364A Footwear manufacture—sole sewing, stuff cutting, upper sewing, shanking and all other services supplied in the manufacture or partial manufacture or repairs of footwear of all descriptions.
 367 Funeral, cemetery and crematorium services.
 368 Men's and boys' haircutting.
 371A Manufacture of bricks or blocks of cement or cement concrete.
 372 Meat pies and pasties.
 373 Painting, paper hanging and glazing.
 374 Plastering.
 375 Plumbing and repairs, including installations of hot water services.
 376 Public utilities—communications and gas.
 382 Supply and fix fibrous plaster.
 383 Tiling and floor laying.
 384 Termite (white ant) treatment services.
- Division 20—Non-intoxicating drinks and ice-cream:
 386 Non-intoxicating drinks of the following kinds:
 (a) Aerated waters.
 (b) Mineral waters.
 (c) Drinks made from fruit juice, cordial, cordial extract or syrup, with the addition thereto of water or aerated water and with or without the addition thereto of any other ingredient.

387 Icecream, including icecream whether coated or otherwise, served in containers or packages of all kinds and descriptions.

Mrs. BYRNE: Summarizing the list, I point out that it contains items under the headings of foodstuffs, clothing, cooking and kitchen utensils, footwear, building, metals (raw or processed), leather and rubber, school requisites, and many miscellaneous items. Having inquired how goods came under price control I was informed that the Prices Commissioner recommends to the Minister in charge of the Prices Department that a certain item should be controlled and that, if agreed to, the Governor issues a proclamation accordingly. On examining the comprehensive list of declared goods and services, I noticed the omission of several divisions, the reason being that some items have been decontrolled since the State took over from the Commonwealth Government the controlling of prices. I should like to know why those items have been decontrolled, for I believe that more items in this State should come under price control. Being of the opinion that the Prices Act is a valuable piece of legislation that should be retained, I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept my assurances concerning the matters he has raised in the Bill. I assure him, too, that neither I nor any other member of this Parliament benefits by increased prices. The Leader stressed the importance of competition from other States.

Mr. Hall: Not from other States!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As an illustration, I refer to the increased price of copper and the consequent increase in price of copper appliances supplied from another State. Surely, the Leader cannot expect me to prevent such increases from taking place. I assure him that it is with no degree of satisfaction that I witness the increase of prices. Extensive investigations are undertaken by the Prices Commissioner before any recommendation for an increased price is made. Bearing in mind that legislation dealing with a totalizer agency board is about to be debated in the House, let me assure the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) that no two-way bets can be made in respect of this Bill. It would be wrong to suggest that we do not agree with price control; it was first introduced in wartime, so that the Commonwealth Government could control prices because of wage-pegging that was imposed at the time.

Since the Commonwealth Government relinquished price control, it has been continued in South Australia to the advantage of the whole State. It is unreasonable to suggest that permanent legislation to control prices should not exist. Because of limited local markets, much of our factory output has to be sold in other States in competition with goods produced in those States. Nearly two-thirds of the State's primary production (amounting to about \$280,000,000) is exported and is, in the main, subject to world prices. The Prices Commissioner is obliged to try to prevent prices from increasing. I believe that the history of the Prices Department shows that every effort has always been made by the Prices Commissioner (regardless of whom he may be) to give a mature consideration of all matters associated with price control. Without price control we might be much worse off than we are today.

I think the member for Gumeracha, with his long experience of price control, would agree that, irrespective of whom the officer in charge of the department may be, investigations have always been conducted fairly and above board, matters having been completely examined before an increased price is recommended. No difference exists today in the set-up of the department. The Prices Commissioner has an obligation to carry out investigations, and exercises reasonable control over the items that come under his jurisdiction. In addition, investigations have been made into many matters which do not exactly come within his control but which have been advantageous to everybody concerned. It would be far from my thoughts to make any innuendoes about another place, but I hope this Parliament will agree to this legislation for a further 12 months.

Question—"That the Bill be now read a second time"—declared carried.

Mr. McANANEY: Divide!

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Speaker, as I am the only member who has called for a division, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stirling has asked leave to withdraw his call for a division. Is leave granted?

Members: No!

The SPEAKER: The division will proceed. The question is "That the Prices Act Amendment Bill be now read a second time." There being only one vote in the negative, I declare the motion for the second reading carried.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, 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 August 4. Page 882.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Many members are watching this Bill with interest and wondering how the outcome of it will affect their past involvement in this matter. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) will be conscious of the fact that he moved a motion in this House last year and I am sure that many members of the Government are aware of the financial implications of this Bill, some of them at least regarding it as a revenue-raising measure. The motion that was moved by the member for Frome in the last session of Parliament (and carried by this House) reads:

That in the opinion of this House a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria.

To refresh my memory, I read this morning the honourable member's explanation of that motion to this House. I read through pages of history of and philosophy and moralizing about betting. Eventually, I arrived at some detailed thoughts on the matter. However, it was a comprehensive effort by the member for Frome. I recall that Opposition members during that debate said that perhaps the Victorian system would not absolutely suit the needs of South Australia. One member on this side moved to amend the motion to that it would not refer to a system similar to that in Victoria. That amendment was designed to provide a scheme that might suit the South Australian scene. Government members swiftly rejected the amendment, saying that the motion must refer to a system similar to that in Victoria. Of course, the Bill now before us provides for a system with significant departures from that operating in Victoria.

As one who voted for the motion of the member for Frome on that occasion, I say that I am disappointed that the Government has neglected to heed the terms of the motion passed by the House. This attitude by the Government devalues motions that may be before Parliament at present or may come before it in future, if we are expected to

vote on motions as we see fit, because of arguments put forward by their promoters, only to see the Government neglect some important measures included in them. The member for Frome went to some trouble to show why we should have a system similar to that in Victoria. As a supporter of T.A.B. in this State, I had always envisaged that its introduction would coincide with the removal of the winning bets tax. It will be futile for any member to say that the public does not hold this view.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Victoria has abolished it.

Mr. HALL: Yes, South Australia is the only State with the winning bets tax.

Mr. McKee: Who imposed it?

Mr. HALL: I do not want the member for Port Pirie to try to draw his red herrings across the debate; let him confine himself to the present subject, which is a Bill brought into the House by the Labor Government, not something put forward by any past Government.

Mr. McKee: You're talking about the winning bets tax.

Mr. HALL: Bills brought forward now are the responsibility of the present Government. I make it clear now that, at a later stage, I intend to move to abolish the winning bets tax altogether.

Mr. Hudson: From what date? Immediately on the inception of T.A.B.?

Mr. HALL: From the relevant date, as explained in the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: On the appointed day?

Mr. HALL: I hope the honourable member is not confusing the relevant day and the appointed day, because this is an important consideration in the Bill. If the honourable member has not studied this aspect he should do so.

Mr. Hudson: Do you mean after 12 months?

Mr. HALL: I have seen the honourable member try to confuse debates in the House before. Either he knows or he does not know: I accept his correction if he does know. As the abolition of the winning bets tax is important, I expect support from Government members in this direction. I have not had time to read all the remarks of Government members on this matter, but this morning I referred to remarks made by them (as recorded in *Hansard*) when they were debating the 1964 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill, which was designed to increase the turnover

tax by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I shall refresh the memories of honourable members on what they said on that occasion. I have not gone back 10 or 15 years to see what they said because that would be of little use. The former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Walsh) said on that occasion:

The object of this Bill is to increase the bookmakers' tax by 50 per cent whilst still retaining the iniquitous winning bets tax, and to my knowledge ours is the only State in which a winning bets tax is imposed.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that he used the word "iniquitous".

Mr. McKee: We were all opposed to it—we are now.

Mr. HALL: The then Leader of the Opposition continued:

Over the years, this Government has deliberately bled the racing industry white.

They are strong terms in anybody's language. In the same speech, he said:

Even if a person backs a winner he still pays the Playford tax.

I see that the member for Port Pirie nods his agreement.

Mr. McKee: I said it myself on every possible occasion.

Mr. HALL: I know, because I have the honourable member's words before me. I will quote them soon to refresh the honourable member's memory. On October 22, 1964, the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) said:

I would not agree to any extension of gambling unless it was demanded by a referendum.

His attitude in this debate will therefore be different from that of other members and he will obviously vote against this Bill. I favour T.A.B. in South Australia for many reasons to which I will refer shortly. The member for Hindmarsh also said:

Even though I am not in favour of gambling, I would accept the decision of the referendum.

He justified any support only by reference to a referendum. On October 22 of that year, the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said:

In addition to the $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent turnover tax, which the bookmakers will pay from money they receive from punters, the punters will pay a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent tax on winning bets. It is not $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent tax on their winnings: it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on what they collect.

Mr. McKee: Did you oppose the winning bets tax on that occasion?

Mr. HALL: I do not think we need stay behind with the member for Port Pirie; let us deal with legislation for which he is responsible (as a member of the Government).

Mr. McKee: Your Government was responsible for introducing the winning bets tax in the first place.

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member wishes to run back to other matters it will do neither him nor his Party any good on this issue. On August 18, 1965, the member for Port Pirie said:

I should like now to mention the winning bets tax. As this is all tied up with betting, I do not think I am out of order in referring to it. This is bad legislation that should be abolished as soon as possible, and I hope that if T.A.B. is introduced the tax will be removed.

Mr. McKee: That is right; it will be, too.

Mr. HALL: Apparently the honourable member has not been able to prevail upon his Party. The quiet member for Port Adelaide, sitting on the back benches said, by way of interjection, "If there is total T.A.B. that will be automatically finished." I have not had time to consider all previous remarks on this question made by Government members, but I expect that some members have supported the removal of this tax. I should think that they would properly consider a summation of the system and of its abolition. I have a set of figures that I believe is a good basis for the abolition of this tax. I emphasize that I have not set out to financially embarrass the Government on this matter. The member for Glenelg may smile, but he can read the figures and dissect them if he can.

Mr. Casey: Your conscience must have pricked you when you used the words "revenue for the State".

Mr. HALL: I have no need to worry about my conscience because it is the Government that is responsible for this measure.

Mr. Casey: I am talking about your amendment.

Mr. HALL: This is more a revenue measure than one introduced to provide a facility for the people of this State. The member for Port Pirie must be out of sorts because of his recent remarks about this measure. I notice he is walking out of the Chamber, but I should like him to stay because he may then change his mind. I am glad to see the honourable member has returned and I am grateful to him.

Mr. McKee: You need not be: you might be sorry.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your protection.

Mr. Ryan: You might want it, too.

Mr. HALL: I have four examples that I have checked: whilst they will not be accurate to the last \$1,000 and in some cases to the last \$5,000, they are based on the estimates of the Betting Control Board after it inquired in Queensland and Victoria on a possible

T.A.B. system for South Australia. Members who have studied that report know that it includes estimates of possible income from T.A.B. in South Australia that the board considers not unreasonable. I have based my calculations on the B.C.B. report as I consider it to be the only estimate worth referring to in this State. On its figures, we find that, to a large extent, this is a revenue-producing Bill. As the Premier has disclaimed that it will have any influence on his regular budgetary procedures, I understand that these procedures will go ahead, and all moneys accruing to the fund (as it is called), or to the Government side of the system, will be set out as extra payments to hospitals.

Mr. Freebairn: It is a fundamental part of the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I do not know about that, but the Premier has stated that that is so, therefore, no Government member can claim that we are interfering with normal budgetary procedures by referring to these figures. I am taking the Government's statements at their face value: I do not hear my interpretation being denied by members opposite. Whilst I am quoting these figures members need not copy them as they can look at them afterwards.

Mr. Lawn: They probably won't make sense.

Mr. McKee: I have been reading your previous speech.

Mr. HALL: At least I have the interest of the member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: You were not interested in the winning bets tax on that occasion.

Mr. HALL: It would seem that the honourable member has not left this side of the House: I assure him that I am doing my best to get him back here. Under the Government's scheme, the income from betting would total \$9,510,000 after five years. However, the first alternative scheme I am putting forward, assuming turnover tax is increased to 2 per cent after one year of T.A.B. operation (all additional revenue to go to the Government) and winning bets tax is abolished after three years, would result in a total of \$9,269,000 income from betting in South Australia. Secondly, if the winning bets tax is abolished after two years of T.A.B. operation, there will be a total return of \$8,218,000 for the five years. If this tax is abolished after one year of operation of T.A.B. (the same period as is allowed in this Bill for removing the tax on the stake) we get an interesting sum, which I

shall quote in detail, as I believe it is possible for the winnings tax to be removed completely after T.A.B. has been in operation for 12 months. I base this contention on the figures I have. At the same time as the winning bets tax is eliminated, I envisage increasing turnover tax by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent so that it will be the same rate as applies in Victoria. This will increase the revenue from this source from \$280,000 to \$550,000. Although this may not seem to be correct in relation to an increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, it must be remembered that the Government does not get all the present turnover tax, but I envisage that it will get the whole of the increase.

I have a table showing the position if turnover tax is increased to 2 per cent after one year of T.A.B. operation and the winning bets tax is abolished after one year. This shows that in the year immediately prior to the setting up of T.A.B. the State will receive \$1,100,000 from winnings tax and \$280,000 from turnover tax at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—a total of \$1,380,000. During the first year after the setting up of T.A.B. it will receive \$400,000 from T.A.B., \$1,100,000 from winnings tax, and \$280,000 from turnover tax at $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—a total of \$1,780,000. At the end of that year, I envisage the abolition of winnings tax, so that in the second year after the setting up of T.A.B. we shall receive \$600,000 from T.A.B. and \$550,000 from turnover tax at 2 per cent—a total of \$1,150,000. In the third year after the setting up of T.A.B., because of the increase in T.A.B. income, the total receipts will be \$1,400,000, and in the fourth year they will be \$1,600,000. It is significant that the average for the first and second years of T.A.B. operation will be \$85,000 more than we are now getting from betting, so we shall not have to go through a year of low revenue. As a result, I contend that there will be no hardship for the Government. If the Government sees the South Australian racing industry as something to be milked, obviously its members will not depart from their past declared intentions of supporting what is, after all, a revenue measure, but if they are interested in bringing T.A.B. to a properly workable form that will not drive people away from the courses (which a continued winning bets tax will be inclined to do) they will support a scheme which will introduce T.A.B. but which will not penalize the racing public. The scheme I have suggested will mean increased revenue as years go by, but at the same time there will not be any imposition on any part of the racing public.

I draw the Minister's attention to the many complaints that honourable members have made about the winnings tax. Undoubtedly these complaints were prompted by past protests, and I would expect that honourable members would use their endeavours to eliminate the tax. It cannot be said that the Government will lose revenue if it is abolished. In fact, everyone who has studied the Betting Control Board's estimate of turnover in the initial years of T.A.B. will know that my figures are conservative. This is obvious if they are compared with the Victorian figures, so the revenue will probably be greater than I have said. My figures, which can be checked, prove that the winning bets tax can be removed after 12 months of the operation of T.A.B. and that nobody in the State will suffer. The income of racing clubs will not be affected. Honourable members may smile, but I think that is so. As members know, racing clubs will not receive anything from winning bets tax after two years of the operation of T.A.B. For the first year of its operation they will receive only half the normal allocation, and for the second and subsequent years they will receive nothing. I do not think the clubs will quarrel with what I have suggested, as I think it will tend to popularize the sport on course.

Although I am not a racing fan, I see no reason why, if we are to have a close network of betting agencies in the city, my suggestion cannot be followed without there being any effect on the courses. It has been put to me that a tax of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, although it may not seem much, is a large sum when applied to the turnover for even one day. South Australian bookmakers can lay off their risks or bet in Victoria without paying the winning bets tax in Victoria. There are many aspects of this matter, the most important of which is the protest that has been raised by members opposite in recent years about this tax. If they recall their attitude, they will support a move to safeguard Government revenue, club revenue and the racing public. I do not think they can refuse to do that.

I do not intend to deal with all matters covered by the Bill. Doubtless, the debate will be complete and members will deal with the provisions in detail. I have spoken of the matter about which I feel strongly and I hope members will give consideration to what I have said. I ask permission to have the table relating to estimated Government revenue from T.A.B., winnings tax and turnover tax incorporated in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: Did the Leader not read it?

Mr. HALL: I read it, except certain figures. If my request is not within Standing Orders, I shall not press it.

The SPEAKER: I understood that the Leader read it. I shall put the request to the House.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: The Government, in rebuffing the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has fixed a figure of 14 per cent of totalizator turnover, which is in excess of the figure that the member advocated in this House. I would protest at this figure if the winning bets tax remained in relation to betting on the course. However, I understand that in two other States the percentage is as high or higher and, provided other matters are tied up, I shall not make much protest. No doubt operating costs have increased since the figure of 12½ per cent was fixed in Victoria.

I do not envy the Minister regarding some of the decisions for which he will be responsible. It appears that he will be in control of the apportionment of moneys paid from the tax and that he will be responsible for the establishment of premises. The establishment of premises could be a political matter and, although I am not offering an alternative at present, I express some surprise that the Minister is assuming this control. Proposed new section 31b provides that there shall be a board called the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board and that the board is to have the various rights that most boards have.

The most important matter is the constitution of the board. The chairman is to be appointed on the recommendation of the Minister and the other members are to be nominated by the South Australian Jockey Club Incorporated, the Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated, the Port Adelaide Racing Club Incorporated, The South Australian Trotting Club Incorporated, the Country Trotting Clubs Association of South Australia and the South Australian Country Racing Clubs Association. I have studied the constitution of the Victorian board, which is similar. Perhaps the member for Frome is smiling because the Government has adopted some part of his proposal in this regard. Regardless of what other States have, the Government is setting up T.A.B., the clubs will benefit from it and the punters will use it. However, I cannot find provision for representation of the punters on the board.

Mr. Quirke: Look at some of the dejected faces!

Mr. HALL: I think it only fair that the punters be represented.

Mr. Hudson: Elected by the Racegoers Association? Will you move for that?

Mr. HALL: I am not going to fall in by answering the question. I should like to see a punters' representative on the board, but the difficulty is where to get him. I shall be honest with the member for Glenelg, as I usually am.

Mr. Quirke: Anyone they tried to get would probably run for cover.

Mr. HALL: Yes. I am aware that a South Australian Racegoers Association has been formed this year. However, it would be presumptuous of me to say that someone from this association should be nominated, because it has been in operation for only a few months. Several other bodies possibly could nominate a number from which one could be selected. However, I think the House should not ignore representation of punters on this board. The member for Frome may snigger, but the suckers, the punters, will meet the cost of providing the necessary facilities and I think they should be represented.

Perhaps the member for Frome himself would be interested! I understand that he is a good loser. I think he has lost in good humour in regard to his resolution in the House. I think members could take as a point in the debate the representation of the punters on the board and I hope an acceptable suggestion will be made.

I also notice that the board must furnish a report to the Minister. However, I do not know whether the report must be tabled in Parliament. That matter occurred to me only when I was reading the Bill and I hope that the report will be tabled. The provision regarding the establishment of credit intrigues me. There is to be no payout of winnings on the day of investment. T.A.B. will be open for such payouts only on a day subsequent to the day of investment. I understand this is the principle behind the setting-up of T.A.B. in South Australia, and I think it is one of the matters that honourable members should bear in mind when supporting the measure. But I ask the question: it is possible to establish credit because the Bill provides that, notwithstanding subsection (3) of this section, a dividend in respect of a bet made by a person at any office, branch or agency of the board may be credited to a credit account established by that person with the board at any time after the dividend is declared? It may be an

ESTIMATED GOVERNMENT REVENUE FROM T.A.B., WINNINGS TAX AND TURNOVER TAX.

	(a) T.A.B. \$	(b) Winnings Tax. \$	(b) Turnover Tax. \$	Total. \$
I. GOVERNMENT SCHEME—				
Immediately prior to setting up T.A.B.	Nil	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,380,000
During first year after setting up T.A.B.	400,000 (4¼%)	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,780,000
During second year after setting up T.A.B.	600,000 (4¼%)	908,000 (c)	280,000 (1½%)	1,788,000
During third year after setting up T.A.B.	850,000 (4¼%)	1,051,000	280,000 (1½%)	2,181,000
During fourth year after setting up T.A.B.	1,050,000 (5¼%)	1,051,000	280,000 (1½%)	2,381,000
				9,510,000
II. ALTERNATIVE SCHEME—				
(1) Assuming turnover tax is increased to 2 per cent after 1 year of T.A.B. operation (all additional revenue to go to Government) and winnings tax is abolished after 3 years.				
Immediately prior to setting up T.A.B.	Nil	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,380,000
During first year after setting up T.A.B.	400,000 (4¼%)	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,780,000
During second year after setting up T.A.B.	600,000 (4¼%)	908,000 (c)	550,000 (2%)	2,058,000
During third year after setting up T.A.B.	850,000 (4¼%)	1,051,000	550,000 (2%)	2,451,000
During fourth year after setting up T.A.B.	1,050,000 (5¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,600,000
				9,269,000
(2) Assuming turnover tax is increased to 2 per cent after 1 year of T.A.B. operation and winnings tax is abolished after 2 years.				
Immediately prior to setting up T.A.B.	Nil	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,380,000
During first year after setting up T.A.B.	400,000 (4¼%)	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,780,000
During second year after setting up T.A.B.	600,000 (4¼%)	908,000 (c)	550,000 (2%)	2,058,000
During third year after setting up T.A.B.	850,000 (4¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,400,000
During fourth year after setting up T.A.B.	1,050,000 (5¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,600,000
				8,218,000
(3) Assuming turnover tax is increased to 2 per cent after 1 year of T.A.B. operation and winnings tax is abolished after 1 year.				
Immediately prior to setting up T.A.B.	Nil	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,380,000
During first year after setting up T.A.B.	400,000 (4¼%)	1,100,000	280,000 (1½%)	1,780,000
During second year after setting up T.A.B.	600,000 (4¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,150,000
During third year after setting up T.A.B.	850,000 (4¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,400,000
During fourth year after setting up T.A.B.	1,050,000 (4¼%)	Nil	550,000 (2%)	1,600,000
				7,310,000

(a) Betting Control Board estimates.

(b) Based on 1964-65 revenue.

(c) Assuming 28 per cent of revenue comes from tax on stake.

administrative matter for the board to determine, but it seems to me that a person with substantial winnings from, say, the first race of the day could establish credit and re-invest on a subsequent race on that day.

Mr. Nankivell: By telephone betting!

Mr. HALL: No, this provision does not refer to telephone betting.

Mr. Lawn: You haven't got a clue.

Mr. HALL: The member for Adelaide has been quiet since I quoted his contrary views earlier. It seems to me that it would be possible to establish credit immediately dividends were declared. Could punters circumvent the provision that winnings should not be paid out until a subsequent day? Racing clubs will receive assistance by way of a 1½ per cent rebate to assist in the establishment of T.A.B., the board receiving a rebate of 1 per cent. New section 31s provides:

All moneys paid into the fund under this Part shall after meeting the payments, if any, made under subsection (4) of section 31nb and under section 44c of this Act, be used for the provision, maintenance, development and improvement of public hospitals and equipment for public hospitals in such amounts as the Treasurer shall, upon the recommendation of the Chief Secretary (but subject to such appropriations for the purpose as Parliament may from time to time determine), approve.

In view of the Premier's recent public statement that such a provision is not to be regarded as a substitution for the hospital funds usually appearing in the Budget presented to Parliament each year, we are to assume that the provision authorizes payments to hospitals in South Australia, over and above those at present made. Clause 9 (b) refers to the period in which the winning bets tax will continue to apply, and provides that after one year of the board's operation the clubs will receive half a normal year's income from the winning bets tax. I shall be moving an amendment to this provision to accomplish what I mentioned earlier. In stressing the importance of the winning bets tax, I suggest that honourable members study the figures closely, and that they decide for themselves whether this is, in fact, a move to introduce T.A.B. into South Australia, or whether it is merely another move to milk the racing industry. I support the Bill, with the object of having some changes made in Committee.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I am staggered by the Leader's performance.

Mr. Ryan: You wouldn't be an orphan!

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader sometimes waxes eloquent about the Government's terrible performance in having a deficit; on other occasions, such as during the debate on land tax and again tonight, he acts rather like a "floozy" playing fast and loose with the Government's revenue. Indeed, that is what his suggestion amounts to. Do members of the Opposition support their Leader's stand on this matter? Do they think that the winning bets tax should be removed after the "relevant day", that is, a year after the establishment of T.A.B., and that the turnover tax should be increased by ½ per cent? Or is the Leader only giving his own opinion on this matter? It is necessary to know the answers, if the people of South Australia are to judge his proposals. If he is not speaking for the Opposition as a whole, his suggestion is clearly an irresponsible one, designed to mislead people. Should the Leader at some stage become Treasurer, there can be no guarantee that any action would be taken on this matter. After all, the Leader supported a Government which introduced the winning bets tax in the first place, and which kept it in operation for about 16 years.

The Leader desires to remove the winning bets tax after 12 months' operation of T.A.B. and, at the same time, to increase the turnover tax by ½ per cent. On his estimate of turnover from T.A.B. (which may or may not be accurate), the Leader expects that T.A.B. will provide about \$680,000 revenue in the second 12 months after the winning bets tax is abolished. Coupled with the extra ½ per cent turnover tax, this would make an additional revenue of \$950,000. The loss in winning bets tax to the Government would be \$1,100,000 which, coupled with the payment of 50 per cent of the clubs' previous share in winning bets tax of \$180,000, would mean that the Government would lose a total of \$1,280,000, and would obtain, as a substitute, only \$950,000. So the Leader calmly suggests that this Government should commit itself at this stage to a probable loss in the second year of operation of T.A.B. of \$330,000. As usual, he is being completely irresponsible, for he knows, as well as every other member of the House (and as well as every member of the South Australian public) that if he were at present in Government he would be unable to deliver the goods on the proposal that he has advanced.

In fact, his proposal is worse than I have already represented, because the money from T.A.B. under this Bill goes into the fund to

be used for hospitals, whereas the lost revenue from taking off the winning bets tax comes out of general Revenue. So the Leader proposes to put more money into the hospitals fund and to take it out of general Revenue in the second and third year. In other words, he implies that the expenditure should be switched from general expenditure items to hospitals. I do not know whether the Leader knows it, because I am not sure whether he has fully worked out the implications of his remarks; but he has a responsibility to tell the House, if he proposes to take money out of general revenue and put it into revenue for hospitals, what expenditure he proposes to cut.

Mr. Rodda: He will increase the turnover tax.

Mr. HUDSON: The turnover tax plus revenue from T.A.B., as I explained (and the member for Victoria would do well to listen to this) would provide in the second year of operation of T.A.B. \$680,000, on the Leader's estimate, plus \$270,000 for the turnover tax—a total of \$950,000, as against a loss to the Government of \$1,100,000 from the removal of the winning bets tax, plus another \$180,000, which under the Bill we are committed to pay to the clubs for the second year, a net loss to the Government of \$330,000. I regard myself as a reasonable man. As well as this net loss of revenue, under the Leader's proposal there is this switch of revenue to hospitals from general revenue, because at present the winning bets tax is paid into general revenue and, if the Leader is to have this money from the fund resulting in extra expenditure on hospitals, then the implications of his proposals are that

expenditures in other directions will have to be cut. In what directions will cuts be necessary? As a result of that, I suggest again that this is just another example of the Leader's being completely irresponsible, of his not working in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

Mr. Casey: He has not done his homework.

Mr. HUDSON: That is so. If we compare the position in South Australia with that in Victoria (and the Leader is trying to make great play on the position in Victoria and on a so-called lack of similarity between this Bill and what happened in Victoria) I point out that as a result of the introduction of T.A.B. in Victoria there was a net gain of revenue to the Government of that State. However, he wants to deny a net gain of revenue to the Government of South Australia, which as everyone knows is in a difficult financial position, and he wants to base this on an estimate. Can honourable members imagine what would happen if I came along with such a proposal based on an estimate? The Leader of the Opposition would get up and say, "The member for Glenelg is being theoretical; he is up in the clouds again. He should come down from his ivory tower." The fact of the matter is that with the responsibilities of Government one simply cannot take the kind of risk involved in the Leader's suggestions. At this stage I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 10, at 2 p.m.