

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 17, 1966.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

- Cambrai and Sedan Railway Discontinuance,
- Dentists Act Amendment,
- Enfield General Cemetery Act Amendment.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The **SPEAKER**: I notice in the gallery His Excellency Mr. S. T. Stewart, High Commissioner for Singapore in Australia. I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that he be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the honourable the Premier and the honourable the Leader of the Opposition to introduce His Excellency.

Mr. Stewart was escorted by the Hon. Frank Walsh and Mr. Hall to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE.

Mr. **HALL**: As we are adjourning today until late in February, can the Premier tell the House of any progress that may have been made towards fixing a date for the meeting that was to be arranged between the Premiers and the Prime Minister concerning the general finances of the States, a meeting that was reported to be scheduled for some time early next year?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I have not been officially informed of anything. Because of the pending general elections, the Prime Minister was not able to give a firm decision. However, as soon as the date of the meeting is fixed, I shall be able to make it known to the Leader and other honourable members. I cannot say anything more than that at this stage.

DOVER GARDENS ROAD.

Mr. **HUDSON**: Last Tuesday I asked the Minister of Education for information relating to the projected closing of Quintus Terrace, separating the Dover Gardens Primary and Infants Schools. Has he a reply?

The Hon. **R. R. LOVEDAY**: Quintus Terrace, which separates Dover Gardens Primary and Infants Schools, has now been formally

closed by the Lands Department. The Public Buildings Department has called tenders for the removal of the existing fencing and for the general development of the closed road area for school purposes. Tenders have been received and are at present under consideration by the Public Buildings Department.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. **G. G. PEARSON**: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my earlier question about exploratory work at Polda Basin and at the lower Tod River weir site?

The Hon. **C. D. HUTCHENS**: In response to the honourable member's request for further information, I have obtained from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief details of the salinity readings taken at the suggested gauging weir site on the lower Tod River, and as referred to in my reply of October 13. However, as they are in table form, I ask leave to have them included in *Hansard* without reading them.

Leave granted.

SALINITY IN LOWER TOD RIVER AT SUGGESTED GAUGING WEIR SITE.

| 1963— | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Date. | Total Salinity. p.p.m. |
| 7/10/63 | 3,049 |

| 1964— | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Date. | Total Salinity. p.p.m. |
| 20/7/64 | 679 |
| 27/7/64 | 1,330 |
| 3/8/64 | 1,570 |
| 18/8/64 | 2,228 |
| 24/8/64 | 2,010 |
| 31/8/64 | 2,424 |
| 7/9/64 | 2,710 |
| 16/9/64 | 2,775 |
| 21/9/64 | 2,885 |
| 13/10/64 | 2,620 |
| 19/10/64 | 3,005 |
| 26/10/64 | 3,270 |
| 2/11/64 | 3,415 |
| 9/11/64 | 3,790 |
| 16/11/64 | 3,600 |
| 23/11/64 | 4,000 |
| 30/11/64 | 3,930 |
| 7/12/64 | 4,240 |

| 1965— | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Date. | Total Salinity. p.p.m. |
| 7/6/65 | 5,700 |
| 15/6/65 | 5,700 |
| 21/6/65 | 5,700 |
| 28/6/65 | 5,300 |
| 5/7/65 | 4,800 |
| 13/7/65 | 3,480 |
| 20/7/65 | 3,660 |
| 27/7/65 | 4,080 |
| 2/8/65 | 4,080 |

1965—continued.

| Date. | Total Salinity. p.p.m. |
|----------|---------------------------|
| 9/8/65 | 3,130 |
| 16/8/65 | 2,500 |
| 23/8/65 | 2,255 |
| 30/8/65 | 2,810 |
| 6/9/65 | 3,096 |
| 20/9/65 | 3,940 |
| 27/9/65 | 4,240 |
| 4/10/65 | 4,313 |
| 11/10/65 | 4,375 |
| 18/10/65 | 4,430 |
| 25/10/65 | 4,556 |

1966—

| Date. | Total Salinity. p.p.m. |
|----------|---------------------------|
| 20/6/66 | 6,660 |
| 28/6/66 | 6,900 |
| 4/7/66 | 6,900 |
| 11/7/66 | 5,700 |
| 18/7/66 | 5,340 |
| 25/7/66 | 4,556 |
| 1/8/66 | 1,896 |
| 8/8/66 | 2,750 |
| 15/8/66 | 2,710 |
| 22/8/66 | 1,554 |
| 5/9/66 | 3,270 |
| 12/9/66 | 3,665 |
| 20/9/66 | 2,900 |
| 21/9/66 | 2,800 |
| 3/10/66 | 2,325 |
| 11/10/66 | 2,940 |
| 18/10/66 | 3,275 |

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In answer to the honourable member's remarks on the mixing of Tod water with water from "Uley and elsewhere", the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has supplied the following comments from the Engineer for Water Supply:

The salinity of the Tod reservoir at the last check was 208 grains per gallon. For the period 1957 to 1961 the average salinity was 160 grains per gallon and the range of salinities was from 76 to 230 grains per gallon. Water from the lower Tod would be useful as stock water and could be "shandied" with Uley water. It is, however, a matter of economics as to whether additional supplies for Eyre Peninsula should come from underground basins, or whether a scheme for the lower Tod should be developed. There are many objections to using waters of high salinity, and the department aims at providing the best quality water that can be economically obtained. Until such time as the underground basins on Eyre Peninsula are fully developed, future requirements will be obtained from these basins in preference to obtaining poor quality water from the lower Tod, provided the underground water can be obtained at a reasonable cost.

The honourable member also sought further information on the Poldia Basin investigations, and the following report has accordingly been obtained by my colleague, the Minister of Mines, from the Director of Mines:

The following work has been completed in county Musgrave, Eyre Peninsula, during the current financial year:

Forty-five bores have been drilled, 21 of which yielded water of less than 1,000 parts per million (70 grains per gallon). The latest drilling has extended the known area of good quality water to slightly more than 200 square miles. Within this area, which occupies much of the hundred of Kappawanta and parts of the hundreds of Hudd, Ward, Talia, Tinline and Blessing, salinity of the groundwater is less than 1,000 parts per million. In the hundred of Ward, near Bramfield, water with a minimum salinity of 340 parts per million was recorded (23.8 grains per gallon). This area, the full extent of which is not yet known, is separated from the Poldia area (50 square miles) by a zone of rather more brackish groundwater. Drilling with percussion plants was suspended towards the end of October.

In order to assist in locating areas of saline water and to reduce drilling costs, a resistivity survey has been recommended, particularly in areas where little or no drilling has been done. This work is now in progress. For the remainder of the year, approval has been given for a programme of 100 bores. These will be drilled by rotary methods to an average depth of 60ft., and fitted with 2in. galvanized water pipe for observation purposes. Estimated cost is \$17,000, and work is expected to commence in January, 1967.

SPEED LIMITS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the speed of trains through country towns in my district?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

I have to report that trains do not work through streets in Strathalbyn or other places on the Victor Harbour line. In Strathalbyn, Goolwa, Middleton, Port Elliot, and Victor Harbour, however, there are level crossings which are traversed by trains at varying speeds. In the case of trains which stop at the stations, speed is necessarily reduced while the train is approaching and departing from the station. In the vicinity of Goolwa and Port Elliot the speed of trains is restricted by sharp curvature of the track to 25 miles an hour, and in the vicinity of Strathalbyn and Victor Harbour speed is restricted to 35 miles an hour for the same reason. Some level crossings are traversed in the vicinity of the stations named. No restrictions apply elsewhere along the route where the railway crosses main roads carrying heavy peak traffic.

In considering whether existing speed limits may be reduced or other limits prescribed, the question has arisen as to the extent of such limits, both in degree and the distance over which they should apply. In this connection, it is appreciated that the speed on impact involves not only the speed of the train but also the speed of the other vehicle concerned.

Cases are on record of serious damage sustained by road vehicles which have collided with stationary trains. Departmental records do not disclose any case in which the effect of collision appears likely to have been mitigated by a reduction in the speed of the train concerned. In these circumstances, it appears that no useful purpose would be served by prescribing speed limits for trains travelling in the vicinity of country townships. I may add that, should such limits be applied generally, they would have a drastic effect upon the whole of the railway time tables.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: As work on the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme was expected to start in September last, can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am indebted to the honourable member for notifying me that she would ask this question. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has notified me that work has been commenced in the southern portion of the scheme on the 9in. approach sewer in Willow Brook Avenue. Up to the present, about 1,500ft. has been laid and it is intended to continue work on this sewer until completed, after which sewer reticulation mainlaying will be started. The whole scheme is expected to take about 18 months to complete.

PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When glancing through the report of the Public Service Commissioner which was laid on the table of the House a few days ago, I was glad to see that the policy of the Government is to make payments into the Superannuation Fund on behalf of officers of the Public Service who are National Servicemen serving in Vietnam. Apart from this being an indication of tangible support for the Commonwealth Government's policies in this regard, I ask—

Mr. Jennings: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am just asking the question.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that comments in questions are not allowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was not a comment.

The SPEAKER: I think it was a comment, and I have repeatedly asked that comments should not be included in questions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that, Sir: it was an innocent transgression. I ask the Premier what the other reasons for this policy may be.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know what is associated with the present Com-

monwealth Government's policy. However, if I can obtain further information on general policy on this matter, I shall be pleased to do so.

CIGARETTES.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to my question of last week about analysing various brands of cigarette to determine their tar content and about making public the results of such analysis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have the following report supplied to the Minister of Health by the Director-General of Public Health:

The content of various tar derivatives in cigarette smoke has been determined many times overseas. However, there are many different substances of this kind in cigarette smoke, and it is not known which of these contribute to the cancer-producing action of cigarettes. I am not aware of any reliable evidence that cigarettes yielding a high tar content produce more cancer than other cigarettes. It would be possible for the Chemistry Department to analyse cigarette smoke for substances of this class, but in my opinion the information gained would not be commensurate with the expense and effort involved, as it would not be possible to say that the cigarettes producing smaller amounts of tar were safer than others. I have discussed the matter with Dr. B. S. Hanson, President of the Australian Cancer Society, and he supports these views.

CAMBRAI-SEDAN LINE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: When speaking last week in the second reading debate on the Cambrai and Sedan Railway Discontinuance Bill, I observed that this line might be able to serve a useful, albeit short-lived, purpose for the carriage of the many pipes required in the construction of the Swan Reach to Stockwell main in my district. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At the commencement of construction planning for the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, an approach was made to the South Australian Railways asking if the section of line between Cambrai and Sedan could be used for the transport of 36in. diameter pipes to Sedan. Agreement was reached, and the first train load of pipes will be received at Sedan in mid-December. It is planned to run two trains a week and this traffic will continue for about 10 months.

FRUIT JUICE.

Mr. OURREN: Often during past sessions I have advocated that schoolchildren not receiving free milk under the Commonwealth-State scheme be supplied with fruit juices, as a health measure. To obtain some idea of the number of children involved, I asked the Minister of Education on June 29, 1965, for a report. He informed me that 3,860 children attending 104 departmental schools in South Australia were not being supplied with free milk. Since receiving that information, on contacting members of Parliament in other States I have received replies indicating that, with the exception of one State, many schoolchildren in the other States of Australia are not receiving milk under the scheme. As this matter affects all State Governments and the Commonwealth Government, will the Minister discuss with Ministers of Education in each State and with the Commonwealth Minister for Health (or with the appropriate Minister), at the next conference of Education Ministers, a proposal to provide canned fruit juices to those schoolchildren not now supplied with free milk?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Australian Education Council, which is usually attended by all Ministers of Education, is expected to meet in about the middle of next February. I shall be pleased to raise the matter on that occasion along the lines suggested by the honourable member.

EDUCATION SERVICES.

Mrs. STEELE: Yesterday, when explaining a question, I said that in a letter from the Minister of Education the Director of the Public Buildings Department had been quoted as saying that, as part of the re-organization of the department, the appointment of district building officers and their establishment in depots close to the assets they were responsible for maintaining would improve the maintenance services his department was able to provide. I asked the Minister of Education how long it would be before this service would be fully implemented and whether members would be informed of depots to be established in the various districts. Can the Minister of Works comment on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: These depots are to be established so that a service may be provided to a person when it is desired without the matter having to be referred to head office. Small things, such as leaking taps and damaged drain pipes, often require prompt attention; the person at the depot will be authorized to spend

a certain sum over a period, thus enabling him to provide a prompt service. As soon as the localities of the depots are known, the honourable member will be notified. We shall be interested to hear members' comments regarding the efficiency of the depots, which I am sure will be forthcoming when they are established.

HARBORS BOARD.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Marine indicate the employment situation in the Harbors Board Department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Because Loan funds were less than expected, it has been necessary to retrench some employees. The General Manager, the Chairman of the board, and the other members of the board approached me some months ago and explained the position. They established the fact that, in order to avoid dismissing many men later, we would have to dismiss as few men as possible early in the financial year. Some months ago a start was made in putting off men on the basis of last on first off. Of a total of 70 men to be dismissed, to date more than half have been retrenched. Because of the efforts of Mr. O'Malley, all men dismissed have been offered employment in other departments and some have accepted it. Because we want to give the remaining 25 men the greatest opportunity, we intend to give them three weeks' notice to allow them time in which to seek other employment. The board will continue to make every possible effort to secure them work in other departments.

Mr. HALL: I am dismayed that the Minister has announced retrenchments by the Harbors Board. Can the Minister say how long the men retrenched would have had to be kept on before they could replace men lost through normal wastage of labour?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member well knows, the Harbors Board has the right and the responsibility to govern its own affairs. This matter was put to me and inquiries were made to see whether there was any wastage; it is not likely there will be such wastage.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. COUMBE: I ask this question because of the imminent adjournment of the House, as I seek information concerning the appointment of justices of the peace. Can the Attorney-General say what progress has been made on the preparation of the revised list of

justices, especially on the outcome of the suggested list given to members of Parliament and the invitation to members to discuss with the Attorney-General appointments in their districts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: About half the members of the House have communicated with me to make an appointment to deal with outstanding applications in their districts. Unfortunately, I have not heard from all members and appointments have not been made in all cases. I have made myself available during the sittings of the House for some weeks past to discuss these outstanding applications in particular districts with the member but, as a result of not having been communicated with by all members, I now intend to write to members telling them that if they do not make an appointment within the next week I shall go through the outstanding applications and complete them myself without advice from honourable members. Asking for and receiving the advice of honourable members on the vacancies and outstanding applications was a departure from previous practice, but I thought it would assist honourable members. It is time that all outstanding applications were cleared up and, if I do not hear from members who have so far not communicated with me, I intend to do this shortly.

COOKE PLAINS SCHOOLHOUSE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my recent question about work being done on the schoolhouse at Cooke Plains so that it will be habitable for the next school year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director, Public Buildings Department, has supplied the following details concerning improvements to this residence:

A contract is at present in progress for the installation of a septic tank system and the provision of a water service at the Cooke Plains residence. In addition, general repairs are being carried out prior to painting. All of the work is nearing completion except for the provision of the water service for which negotiations are at present taking place with the Engineering and Water Supply Department and a local resident. This matter should be resolved shortly. Departmental painters now working in the area are programmed to commence work at the Cooke Plains residence in mid-February, 1967. Every effort will be made to put the residence in such condition that it may be occupied at the earliest possible date.

VEHICLE INSURANCE.

Mr. RYAN: I was asked by a constituent whether my attention had been drawn to an

article in this morning's *Advertiser* concerning damages in an accident case, as my constituent was affected by a similar case. The article states:

In 1960, a woman travelling as a passenger in a taxi-cab was involved in an accident. The injuries sustained necessitated her giving up an excellent position, and have turned her into a semi-invalid, with no prospects of earning her own living. In December last year her case was heard by a Supreme Court judge, who awarded her £4,621 special damages and £15,000 damages. However, because the accident occurred in 1960, and at that time taxi companies carried insurance only up to a maximum of £4,000 on their passengers, this woman will receive only £4,000—even though this figure does not cover her expenses, let alone give her a future free from financial worries.

This woman has to live according to present-day laws, and yet the insurance company concerned is able to use a law from the past to evade payment of the compensation awarded to her. This is probably not an isolated case, and the public should be made aware of the heartbreak and sufferings brought about by these companies who always seem to have the law on their side.

Can the Premier say whether cases like this can be dealt with in accordance with a court order? Also, can he ascertain for me whether the same law that operated in 1960, as quoted by this constituent, operates today, and, if it does, whether it can be amended to be brought up to present-day requirements?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member. However, because of the adjournment of the House, I will have to correspond with him, and I shall do this as soon as I have the information.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Recently I asked the Premier questions regarding registration under a special permit of motor bicycles that had to cross roads dividing properties. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Permits to primary producers under section 15 of the Motor Vehicles Act enable vehicles to be used to work separate parcels of land where roads divide farms. These discretionary permits are designed to provide relief to primary producers who own vehicles which would otherwise have to be registered and which would be costly to register. The application of this discretion to motor cycles and trailers, for which registration fees are small, is not considered justified. The normal fee for a motor cycle or a trailer is \$4.50 a year. The most costly fee for a motor cycle (that is, one with a side car) is \$6 a year. I would add that very few requests for these permits for such vehicles have been received.

EDITHBURGH JETTY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the re-positioning of a winch used for hauling fish at the end of the Edithburgh fishermen's jetty. Has he a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I referred this matter to my colleague, the Minister of Marine, who has now supplied me with the following report:

The crane installation on the fishermen's jetty at Edithburgh was inspected by the board's Engineer for Maintenance earlier in the year. To obviate the disability of the operating platform swinging over the sea on certain angles of slew, the crane is to be re-sited, and it is expected that a gang will be available for this work in December.

QUORN-HAWKER ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to a question I asked recently regarding the Quorn-Hawker road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the contract for roadworks between Quorn and Gordon on the Quorn-Hawker district road provided for construction to sub-base standards. Although this has been completed, the addition of a crushed rock pavement is necessary before bituminous sealing can be carried out. Crushed rock from two crushing contracts is at present being stockpiled, and it is expected that tenders will be called within two months for the laying of the crushed rock and application of the bituminous seal. Depending on progress, the bulk of the length of road should be sealed before winter, 1967.

LEFEVRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding augmentation of the LeFevre Peninsula water supply from Semaphore Road to Taperoo?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that steel plate for the pipes should arrive at the manufacturer's works in March, 1967. Pipe deliveries would then commence the following month, and actual pipelaying by the department would begin without delay. This work will continue until the job is completed, which is expected to be by the end of August, 1967.

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand the Minister of Works can give me cheering news about the water supply to Watervale. Will he be so good as to give me that news?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The following report which I have received from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief sets out the present position:

Investigations have been made into schemes to supply water to Watervale, with alternative schemes to extend to Penwortham and Sevenhills. It has been found that the most suitable scheme would be by a connection to the Warren trunk main with a main laid along a route to the west of the township of Auburn. This scheme would supply additional land en route and be independent of the existing Auburn supply. The hydraulic investigations have now been completed, and estimates of the cost and revenue return will be prepared as soon as possible to enable full consideration to be given to the schemes.

GILES POINT.

Mr. FERGUSON: Not having a proof of yesterday's proceedings of this House at my disposal, I will have to rely on my memory, but I believe that the member for Semaphore yesterday, in asking a question of the Minister of Marine, said that he had been to Yorke Peninsula inspecting the crops and that he was concerned about the establishment of the bulk handling facilities at Giles Point. I understand that the Minister, in his reply, said he would confer with the General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited about this matter. Can the Minister say when this conference will be held? Also, if and when it is held, will he give me a report of any decision made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member certainly has not outlined the position quite correctly. What I said was that I would have a conference with the General Manager of the Harbors Board (and that conference was held this morning) with a view to taking the matter up with the Treasurer. Both the Minister of Agriculture and I have had discussions with the co-operative. We hope that after we come to a definite decision about when work can be started by the Harbors Board we shall be able to confer with the co-operative in order that the work might be commenced simultaneously by the co-operative and the board.

FRANCES RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. RODDA: Last year I asked a question about access to the Frances railway yard and the silos there. The weighbridge at Frances is situated on the side of the cattle yard away from the silo site, and there is only one entrance to the silo. The position is now aggravated because trucks wishing to go to the oat silo have to enter at one point and

then go out the same way. Consequently, vehicles have to queue up on the main road in the centre of the town, thus interfering with the flow of traffic and the turn-round of trucks delivering to the oat silo. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport to take the matter up with the Railways Department and South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to see whether something cannot be done to improve the situation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take the matter up with my colleague, and as soon as a reply is available I will forward it to the honourable member.

INSECT SPRAYS.

Mrs. BYRNE: My attention has been drawn to an incident on a vineyard near Yatala Vale; a man using a spray designed to kill leaf-eating insects was taken ill after first feeling dizzy. After collapsing, he was attended by a local doctor and later admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital where he remained in a serious condition for some days: he was unconscious for some of the time, and almost died. Even after returning home, he was still in a dazed condition and partly lost his memory. The local doctor who attended him stated that his condition was undoubtedly caused by the spray he was using. I have been assured that the man complied with all the safety directions and warnings on the tin containing the spray and, in fact, took more precautions than were recommended. This spray was recommended by the Agriculture Department, samples having been tested by the viticultural station at Nuriootpa for efficiency in this sphere. When I was told of the incident, I was also informed of another incident that occurred 12 months before: a man was using another spray for curculio beetle, an explosion occurred and the man's face and hands were burnt and his eyebrows singed off. The doctor attending this man stated that it was the worst flash burn he had ever seen. The tin containing the liquid was not marked "inflammable", but it did say that the user must not smoke while using it because of the obvious toxic nature of this spray and the danger to those using it. If I give full details to the Minister of Agriculture, will he have the matter investigated to protect others who use it in the future? Will the Minister also inform me if the department, when testing agricultural chemicals for their efficiency, also tests them for their danger to the public and, if it does not, will this proposal be considered by the department or some other body?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am concerned to hear of the unfortunate accident and I will certainly obtain a report. I would appreciate it if the honourable member would give me the particulars she mentioned because these would assist the investigations. My sympathy goes to her constituent.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question regarding the acceptance of tenders for the new Jervois bridge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads states that the schedule of tenders will be ready shortly for submission to Cabinet. Following advice of the acceptance of his tender, the contractor will have three months in which to commence operations and 32 months to complete the work.

HIGHWAYS ESTIMATES.

Mr. CUMBE: The Treasurer may recall that during the Budget debate earlier this year I raised the question of obtaining further information for members concerning the Estimates, especially in connection with the Highways Department. At that time the Treasurer said he would see whether it would be possible to provide further information for members when the next Estimates were prepared. Has he considered this matter and, if not, will he consider it during the coming recess?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have considered the matter. I discussed it with the Minister of Roads, but that is as far as I have gone. Undoubtedly, we shall have an opportunity to consider this matter, and I hope that Cabinet will be able to deal with it soon.

BUS STOPS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about bus stops at busy intersections?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads referred this matter to the Minister of Transport, who received the following report from the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust:

The bus stops in Winston Avenue, Edwardstown, have been in their present locations for many years and it appears likely that they were established at a time when there was less traffic on the roads than is the case today. A recent survey made by our traffic officers suggests that some of the stops are not ideally located, having regard to present day traffic

conditions. We are, however, confronted with many problems in relocating stopping places, for it is not only difficult to find a sufficient length of kerb space in a suitable position, and free of driveways to commercial premises or private dwellings, but objections are frequently made to proposed sites by local government authorities, shopkeepers and individual householders. We will take the matter up with the councils concerned with a view to relocating wherever possible those stops which might cause inconvenience to other road users.

ABDUCTION PENALTIES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my previous question about penalties for offences relating to the abduction of children?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have asked Their Honours the Judges to comment on the honourable member's question. I have not received a reply as yet but, as I told the honourable member, I will notify him when I have.

MOSQUITO CREEK.

Mr. RODDA: The Naracoorte Anglers Club has requested that an area at the Naracoorte Caves reserve be fenced off to enable cattle to be grazed at that section of Mosquito Creek that is overgrown with reeds, in order to control reed growth and to improve the area for fishing. As I believe that such action would be desirable and would help provide a tourist facility, will the Premier investigate this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the matter with my colleague and, as soon as I have a report, I will forward it to the honourable member.

HIGHWAY No. 8.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to questions I asked last week about the Highways Department's plans to improve Highway No. 8 at the Moorlands junction and at the corner at Coomandook?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the intersection of Main Road Nos. 37 and 5 at Moorlands, there have been 14 reported accidents in the two-year period up to November 4, 1966. Six of these accidents have occurred between east-bound and west-bound traffic on the Pinnaroo and Tailem Bend to Bordertown Roads respectively. Three of the accidents involved injuries and one involved a fatality. The other accidents were single car accidents resulting from loss of control at the junction or on the bend. On the sharp corner of Main Road No. 37 at Coomandook there have been 10 reported accidents in the past three years.

The majority of these have been single car accidents resulting from loss of control on approaching the intersection from the east.

Consideration has been given to the improvement of these two corners. In view of the high cost involved in achieving a fully satisfactory design at Moorlands, and the requirement to by-pass Coomandook in order to effect a satisfactory improvement there, it is considered that the realignment of the main road between Tailem Bend and Coomandook to follow generally the railway line should be further investigated. Accordingly, it is not proposed at this stage to undertake major improvements at Moorlands involving special separation of the conflicting traffic streams but, rather, to improve the safety of this intersection by channelization, special signing and the installation of a "stop" sign on Pinnaroo Main Road No. 5. Arrangements are being made to effect the improvements to the Moorlands corner soon.

In addition, the Highways Department is not proceeding with the proposal to by-pass Coomandook. The re-routing of Main Road No. 37 between Tailem Bend and Coomandook to follow the alignment of the railway is under consideration by the department but, because of the limitation of funds and the requirements of more urgent projects, this work is not at present included in the department's forward works programme.

CITIZEN MILITARY FORCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday about Government policy with relation to Government employees who are in the Citizen Military Forces?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member has asked many questions on this matter in the past. If and when the Government decides to amend the conditions under which payment is made for leave to attend Citizen Military Forces camps, the honourable member will be informed.

UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the levelling, draining and paving of an area at the Unley Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Since the transfer of the Unley Girls Technical High School, four surplus timber rooms have been removed from the grounds of the Unley Primary School. No levelling and paving have yet been carried out, and it will be necessary to redevelop the grounds. An inspection has

been made by officers of the Public Buildings Department, and a scheme is being designed to incorporate the regrouping of physical education equipment. An estimate of cost will be prepared as an urgent matter, and this will be submitted for consideration of allocation of funds along with other urgent matters.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE STEPS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Mr. Speaker, have you now a reply to the question I asked some time ago about who controls the front steps of Parliament House?

The SPEAKER: I refrained from answering the question earlier because certain cases were before the court, and I considered that the question was, in some respects at any rate, *sub judice*. Those charges have now been determined by the court and it seems that the court considered the steps of Parliament House to be a public place within the meaning of the relevant Act. From the best advice that is available to me, I am of the opinion that Parliament looks to the President and the Speaker to exercise a joint control in this area. This was the understanding, as far as I can gather, before 1941 when the Joint House Committee became a statutory body; and I am of the opinion that nothing in the Joint House Committee Act alters this situation, although that Act does place the entrances under the control of the committee. I would point out that for such control the committee does not have any of its own staff and, in practice, entrances are controlled by the staff of the two Houses.

Holding this view, I had no hesitation in answering an earlier question in relation to an incident on Parliament House steps, in which I stated that, as long as there was no disturbance of the peace, and no nuisance was created, I could not see any cause for action in this matter. Accordingly, the demonstrators were allowed to remain all day. Towards evening, however, it was noticed that placards were attached to the building. I considered this to be undesirable. Demonstrations have been held in a number of places (public places) but I think that custodians of any building would object to the placing of placards on that building, irrespective of the wording of the placards or the cause being espoused. I therefore approached the President, in company with officers of the House, and informed him of the answer I had given the honourable member, and explained my attitude as far as placards were concerned.

We agreed that we would ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to request the demonstrators to remove the placards from the building. The demonstrators had a discussion, took a vote, and decided that they would not comply with the request. The Sergeant-at-Arms was then directed to contact the police and ask them to order the removal of the placards. I had an important engagement in my district, and left with the understanding that the placards would have to be removed from the building but that, if this were done, the demonstrators would not be interfered with unless there was some disturbance of the peace or a nuisance was created. That was in conformity with the statement I made to the House earlier the same day. I arranged to be contacted by telephone should there be any development requiring my attention.

The demonstrators were on the Legislative Council side of the building. However, as the Legislative Council was still sitting and the House of Assembly had adjourned, and as the responsibility was a joint one, Assembly officers handled the matter. Next morning I received a telephone message from the Sergeant-at-Arms to the effect that the demonstrators had once again refused a request by the police to remove the placards, that the President had received advice that nuisance had been created, and that he had issued instructions to the police for the removal of the placards and the demonstrators.

The President was acting quite within his authority in the action that he took, and I have neither commented on nor criticized it. However, prepared statements were made by the President in which my name was freely used (quite wrongly in some respects), and references were made to the Assembly staff, statements and references of such a nature that I consider it would have been a courtesy had I been consulted first. Two more demonstrations were held, and on each occasion a discussion took place. I asked that no action be taken against the demonstrators so long as there was no disturbance of the peace, no nuisance was created, no placards were attached to the building, and passage-ways were kept clear. On the last occasion the Commissioner of Police himself discussed the situation with the President and me, and fully agreed to the attitude taken. That is the understanding with the police today.

I believe (and I think Parliament believes) in the right of free assembly, freedom of speech and freedom to demonstrate and no action of mine has been inconsistent with that

belief. There is one other matter to which I must refer in order to put the record straight. It was suggested in statements issued that I intended to discuss this matter with the Labor Party. This was a complete misunderstanding. I considered that the responsibility in the matter of the incident referred to was clearly one for the President and the Speaker, and I would not discuss it with any other body; nor did I do so and no other body—neither Party in the House—sought or had any discussion with me. It was suggested also that the Attorney-General had made overtures to me, and that he had conveyed to me a decision of the Government. No such decision was ever conveyed to me, and, if it had been, I would have considered it to be highly improper.

I gave an undertaking to the President that, on completion of the hearing of the charges before the court, I would be prepared, if he so desired, for the question of the control of the steps of Parliament House to be taken up with both Parties for clarification and definition. The President expressed the opinion that the steps were under the control of the Joint House Committee. However, he has agreed completely with me in this situation, and in the instructions which have been given to the police, and which will operate until they are altered.

KEITH POLICE STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Just before the House met, I received a telephone call from the senior justice of the peace in Keith regarding the staffing of the local police station. Two officers are attached to this station and, when one is on leave, only one officer remains to carry out the duties. As innumerable accidents take place on the main road and as other work takes the officer on duty away from the station, the result is that often no officer is on duty at the station. That has been the position hitherto, but fears have been expressed that the position could become worse, because the constable will be on leave over the Christmas period and the sergeant will have to handle all the responsibilities and duties during that time, and it could well be that the station will not be manned as a result of the sergeant's being called away for lengthy periods. A request has been made for assistance to be provided by the provision of a relieving constable or a cadet, if that is possible, so that the station can always be manned. Will the Premier take up the matter with the Chief Secretary to see whether something can be done?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and I will inform the honourable member as soon as I have a reply.

FIRE FIGHTING.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Barossa District Fire Fighting Association has requested that the Engineering and Water Supply Department fire-fighting units at the Warren, South Para and Barossa reservoirs be able to attend fires within reasonable distance of depots. Will the Minister of Works say what is the department's attitude to this request?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The question of providing departmental assistance for fire fighting has been raised often and approval given for assistance to be made available in certain circumstances. The conditions of service are clearly stated in the Emergency Fire Service instructions, index 11, as follows:

It is understood that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be called upon only if all available volunteer and local government resources have proved inadequate to cope with a situation threatening life and valuable property.

The department has only a small maintenance organization at each of the reservoirs, with only two or three men at each location. The fire fighting facilities at each place consist of a 200-gallon tank, 1-1½ centrifugal pump, fire beaters, rakes, and knapsack sprays. These facilities are maintained primarily for the department's protection and for the protection of those properties that could be affected by the department's operations. In these circumstances, any planning by the local emergency fire service to handle a fire emergency should disregard the existence of the department's unit. This means that the department can accept no responsibility, but it does not mean that it would be unwilling to give assistance in case of dire emergency. Generally speaking, conditions which cause a fire to start and spread in another part of the district would mean that the fire hazard was also high near the department's works. This is the time when it is essential to have the unit standing by, for its absence could leave the works and their environs wide open to a fire outbreak.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister said the equipment of the Engineering and Water Supply Department at some places consisted of a 200-gallon tank, a centrifugal pump, some beaters, and so on, but that equipment would have as much use today as a sore posterior to an ambling boundary rider.

Can the Minister say whether that is all the equipment the department has, because it has to cover a tremendous area of country that surrounds reservoirs and must itself depend on the emergency fire-fighting units in the event of a major conflagration. Can the Minister say whether the department intends to install fire-fighting equipment equivalent to that used by the Emergency Fire Services units?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member said that the gear we had was about as much use as a sore posterior to an ambling boundary rider: this, of course, makes its presence felt. As I explained to the honourable member for Barossa, we only expect to use this equipment in an extreme emergency; we depend mainly on other organizations. The department is not a fire-fighting instrumentality: it only looks after the immediate needs. In view of the honourable member's question, I shall take the matter up with the department to see whether it considers it should have a more adequate type of fire-fighting appliance.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the citrus industry and he referred me to Appendix 3 of the first report of the Citrus Organization Committee to see what was the policy of the committee regarding the licensing of packers. As I could not find a relevant passage in the appendix, I asked him to refer me to it. In reply he said:

In view of the difficulty experienced by the honourable member I will endeavour to obtain for him a precise reply by tomorrow.

Can he now give me a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret I have not a precise reply for the honourable member. I attempted to contact the Manager of the Citrus Organization Committee (Mr. Sanders) this morning, but unfortunately he was not available. However, as soon as he returns from the river areas, I will get the information and let the honourable member have it by letter.

TRAVELLING CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some time ago I asked the Premier a question regarding fare concessions for university students. As I understand he has a reply, I should be glad if he would give it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Municipal Tramways Trust is investigating the possibility of extending travel concessions to university students. The Government will consider the trust's report when it is completed.

TIMBER STOCKS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding timber stocks held and whether the Woods and Forests Department had additional timber available for the fruitcase industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret I have not got the information for the honourable member, but I will get it and reply to him by letter.

AGRICULTURAL COURSE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the possibility of establishing an agricultural course in the Upper Murray area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Planning is at present under way at Urrbrae for a special fourth and fifth-year course in agriculture that would not ignore the needs of a general secondary education but would also include a strong practical side for boys who are assured of an opening for employment on the land on leaving school. This agricultural element would be no substitute for a course at a technical agricultural institution such as Roseworthy, but the agricultural content would be much more extensive than that provided in normal secondary school agriculture. Dependent upon the way this course turns out (it is to begin in 1968), thought will be given to its extension into selected country centres. The Murray River districts would have obvious possibilities.

AGRICULTURAL ADVISER.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have received a copy of a letter sent to the Minister by the District Council of Pinnaroo, dated November 16, which the Minister may not have seen. It is suggested in the letter that, because of the development that will be taking place south of Pinnaroo and because the agricultural adviser stationed at Loxton is fairly heavily committed, consideration should be given to placing a new adviser in Pinnaroo to keep an eye on the new area south of the town and to provide an additional service to those farmers who live on the southern fringe of the district along the Pinnaroo line. I support that request and I ask that consideration be given to the possibility of establishing an experimental property in the area south of Pinnaroo in order to give a guide to the people likely to settle there.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not seen the letter, seeing that it was only written yesterday. I shall be pleased to take this matter up with the department as the idea certainly appeals to me.

CEDUNA-BROKEN HILL ROAD.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Four years ago the Government adopted a policy of bituminizing the road as far west as Ceduna and of connecting it with Broken Hill. Can the Minister say what progress has been made on the Broken Hill section, and when the work is expected to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will consult my colleague on this matter, and no doubt he will send a written report to the honourable member as soon as the information is available.

DAMAGES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the proposal I placed before the House some time ago that there should be legislation for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence. It has been reported to me (in fact, it was in last night's paper) that the New South Wales Government is likely to legislate on this matter next year. As this report is rather at odds with the remarks made by the Attorney-General when he replied on my proposal, I ask him what new developments have occurred since he spoke in the House on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no communication to me by Mr. McCaw on any change of circumstances that could lead his Government to the view reported in the newspaper. However, as I told the honourable member, this matter will be discussed by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and if there is a new development that causes us to alter our attitude I shall report the matter to Cabinet.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. To how many registered physiotherapists did the Physiotherapists Board of South Australia send the circular letter dated July 1, 1966?
2. How many of those to whom the letter was sent were then non-practising?
3. How many of those who were then non-practising are now registered and how many have been deregistered?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are as follows:

1. 511.
2. 265.
3. 190; 58 (17 since returned to practising list).

RECREATION OFFICER.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Social Welfare): I ask leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On October 6, the member for Burnside asked me a question regarding the secondment of an officer in the Social Welfare Department to the position of Recreation Officer. The honourable member, in her preface to the question, said:

There is some concern amongst Probation Officers of the Social Welfare Department (and I understand some embarrassment has been caused to heads of institutions) as a result of the recent appointment of a Recreation Officer.

Following on this statement by the honourable member, I have today received from the male Probation Officers of the department, the Senior Probation Officer and the Field Supervisor a communication in relation to this matter. They say:

Male Probation Officers of the Social Welfare Department are concerned at Mrs. Steele's reference to Probation Officers in the opening sentence of her question, "There is some concern amongst Probation Officers of the Department of Social Welfare. . . ." Then follows a brief summary of the work programme of this officer. It is requested that the Hon. the Minister of Social Welfare and the Director of Social Welfare be advised that on no occasion have any Probation Officers been concerned with Mr. Hall being made available to carry out these duties. In fact, rather than be concerned, we were most pleased to see such a move made and believe Mr. Hall to be most capable to carry out these duties. Male Probation Officers have discussed Mrs. Steele's statement and we are at a loss to know where she procured such information. The Hon. the Minister may desire to inform Mrs. Steele and the House of Assembly of Probation Officers' feelings on this matter which would then clarify the position to other members of the House of Assembly who may consider, because of Mrs. Steele's statement, that there is a dissatisfaction amongst Probation Officers regarding Mr. Hall's position that in actual fact does not exist.

This note to me is signed by all male Probation Officers of the department and by the Senior Probation Officer. The Field Supervisor adds the following comment:

I have heard no comment from these officers which could in any way be classified as "concern" in regard to the seconding of Mr. A. H. Hall to carry out his present duties. Mr. Hall is held in high regard by his fellow officers and I am confident no dissatisfaction exists.

The Director of Social Welfare has forwarded these statements to me.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you take any action to procure those documents?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not take any action whatever.

The SPEAKER: This is not a subject for debate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member for Mitcham, by interjection, suggested that in some way or other I had induced the receipt by me of the document to which I referred.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! I simply asked you whether you had.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member asks whether I had, he is obviously suggesting by innuendo that it might have happened. The honourable member knows very well that that is the effect of what he said. In reply to the honourable member's innuendo—

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! That's a silly thing to say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am making a personal explanation since an allegation has been raised against me by the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a simple question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the honourable member want to hear the reply?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Attorney-General has sought leave to make a personal explanation, and that is not subject to debate. Interjections are out of order. Consent having been given to his making a personal explanation, the honourable the Attorney-General should be heard in silence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statement was forwarded to me spontaneously by the officers concerned. I have had no communication from them prior to this arriving on my desk today; the Director of the department has this to say in his minute:

At the specific request of the staff members whose names appear as signatories to the attached memorandum I forward the correspondence for your personal information. However, as permanent Public Service head of the department, I do not associate myself in this matter with these public servants who, in their apparent concern for their personal situation, attempt to enter uninvited into questions asked and statements made in Parliament. The matter to which they refer is not an issue departmentally and I do not know of any complaints by any person within the depart-

ment to any person outside the department about the matter.

That will answer the honourable member. If he is not satisfied with that, I invite him, as well as the member for Burnside, to speak to any of the persons who signed this statement. Indeed, I give them full permission, despite the provisions of the Public Service Act. I do not doubt that these officers will tell either honourable member what they think about what was said on this matter earlier this session.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Morris Hospital Paraplegic Training Centre,

Port Augusta High School Additions, Port Augusta Technical College.

Ordered that reports be printed.

FISHING INDUSTRY.

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

That the Hon. D. N. Brookman and the Hon. G. G. Pearson be discharged from attending the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry and that Mr. Broomhill and Mr. Hudson be appointed in their place.

This motion results from two identical letters I have received, which state:

Dear Mr. Minister,

I am writing to you expressing my desire to be relieved of the responsibility of serving on the Select Committee. Whilst I had some misgivings about the magnitude of the task when this committee was appointed, in the short time available to me to decide I agreed to accept the appointment. However, in the meetings that we have had so far it has become clear that we cannot do justice to the terms of reference or to the importance of the industry.

In Western Australia, a Royal Commission inquiring into boat safety matters sat for a period of nearly eight months and in its inquiry interviewed 172 witnesses and visited about 20 centres to take its evidence. In South Australia some years ago, a Royal Commission on the fishing industry required over a year to report. At present in this State there is a related inquiry into power boats, which has been in progress for more than a year. The management of fisheries is such a wide scientific question that a Select Committee is inadequate to inquire into it. The Select Committee is asked to report upon all these subjects.

On the other hand, some of the questions are clearly matters of policy and the Government has available expert departmental advice upon which to base such decisions. I wish to state that I have no complaint whatever with the manner in which you as Chairman have

conducted the affairs of the committee or with members for the way in which they have commenced their work. In view of the foregoing, I am submitting my resignation at this early stage. May I assure you that any measures the Government may bring before the House which will assist the fishing industry will have my earnest attention.

One letter is signed by G. G. Pearson and the other by David Brookman. Following the receipt of those letters I discussed the matter with Cabinet, and I have received a letter from Mr. Millhouse, Secretary of the Liberal and Country Party in the House of Assembly, which states:

Dear Mr. Minister,

The Leader of the Opposition has handed me your letter of November 14 addressed to Mr. Nankivell concerning the resignations of the Hon. G. G. Pearson and the Hon. D. N. Brookman from the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry. Mr. Hall has asked me to reply to your letter on behalf of the Party. While we assure you that the Opposition will give earnest consideration to any measures for the benefit of the industry, our members feel that for the reasons stated in this correspondence they cannot accept appointment to the committee.

As the Government considers that the inquiry should continue, it has nominated two Labor members to the committee. I thank the members for Alexandra and Flinders for the kindly way in which they stated their case.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I refer the Minister to the wording of the motion, because it may require slight modification to comply with Standing Orders, which provide that five members can be elected to a Select Committee. I should think that the motion should state that the resignation from the committee of these members had been accepted, as "discharged from attending" does not mean the members are discharged from the committee. I speak subject to correction, but it seems that they would still be members of the committee, even if the motion were passed, unless we accepted a formal resignation.

The SPEAKER: The position is set out in Standing Order No. 375, which states:

Members may be discharged from attending a Select Committee and other members appointed after previous notice has been given. The motion before the House is in conformity with Standing Orders.

Motion carried.

**WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Irrigation) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment Bill, 1966, has the honour to report:

1. Your committee held two meetings and took evidence from the following witnesses:

- Dr. W. A. Wynes, Parliamentary Draftsman;
- Mr. S. W. Heritage, Chairman, Renmark Irrigation Trust;
- Mr. T. M. Price and Mr. J. M. Barrington, Members, Renmark Irrigation Trust;
- Mr. D. L. Tripney, Secretary, Renmark Irrigation Trust.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the daily press inviting persons desirous of submitting evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. There was no response to these advertisements.

3. The Bill deals solely with the fixation of the fees of the Chairman and members of the trust. Evidence revealed that at the last annual general meeting of ratepayers of the trust a unanimous recommendation that the fees should be doubled was agreed to. The board agrees with the proposal contained in the Bill.

4. Your committee considers that the Bill affords a desirable degree of flexibility in the fixation of fees, and at the same time provides an adequate and appropriate safeguard.

5. Your committee is aware of no opposition to the Bill and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

Bill read a third time.

**SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.**

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, lines 38 to 42 (clause 8)—Leave out all words after "settlement" and

insert "made by the deceased under which the deceased had any interest of any kind".

No. 2. Page 4, line 31 (clause 8)—After "any" insert "person or".

No. 3. Page 4, line 31 (clause 8)—After "jointly" insert "with the deceased person".

No. 4. Page 4, line 46 (clause 8)—After "aforesaid" insert—

: provided that where the policy has been effected by the deceased person or by his spouse and expressed to be for the benefit of his spouse or of his children or of his spouse or children or any of them and no interest whether vested or contingent was held or retained in such policy by the deceased no amount shall be subject to duty but the total amount of any premiums paid or provided by the deceased in respect of that policy during the year immediately preceding his death shall be subject to duty.

No. 5. Page 5, line 13 (clause 8)—After "policy" insert—

: provided that where the policy has been effected by the spouse of the deceased person and expressed to be for the benefit of the spouse or children of the deceased person or of his spouse and children or any of them and no interest whether vested or contingent was held or retained in such policy by the deceased person no proportion shall be subject to duty but the total amount of any premiums paid or provided by the deceased in respect of that policy during the year immediately preceding his death shall be subject to duty.

No. 6. Page 6, line 13 (clause 8)—Leave out "thereafter" and insert "during the period of one year immediately before his death".

No. 7. Pages 10 and 11 (clause 23)—Leave out the clause.

No. 8. Page 13, lines 39 to 41 (clause 29)—Leave out all words after the word "company".

No. 9. Page 14, lines 11 to 18 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in paragraph (a) and the word "and" at the beginning of line 18.

No. 10. Page 14, line 40 (clause 29)—Leave out "Twelve" and insert "Twenty".

No. 11. Page 15, lines 1 to 8 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in paragraph (a) and the word "and" at the beginning of line 8.

No. 12. Page 15, line 30 (clause 29)—Leave out "Twelve" and insert "Twenty".

No. 13. Page 15, lines 35 to 42 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in paragraph (a) and the word "and" at the beginning of line 42.

No. 14. Page 16, line 6 (clause 29)—Leave out "Twelve" and insert "Twenty".

No. 15. Page 16, lines 12 to 19 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in paragraph (a) and the word "and" at the beginning of line 19.

No. 16. Page 16, line 28 (clause 29)—Leave out "Twelve" and insert "Twenty".

No. 17. Page 16, lines 31 and 32 (clause 29)—Leave out the words "or in respect of moneys received under a policy of assurance".

No. 18. Page 18. After clause 30, insert new clause as follows:

30a. Section 56a of the principal Act is amended by adding the following subsection after subsection (1) thereof:

(1a) Where the mother or the father of an illegitimate child derives any property—

(a) under the intestacy of the child; or

(b) under a disposition (whether testamentary or non-testamentary) made by the child,

the duty payable in respect of that property shall be at the same rate as if the child had been born legitimate.

Suggested Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

Under the present Act a settlement is a disposition other than a will containing trusts to take effect upon or after the death of the settlor or any other person. The Bill as it left this place did not alter the definition of "settlement" but provided for aggregation of the settled funds with the estate of the settlor or with the estate of the person on whose death the trusts are to take effect.

The amendment would restrict the application of the existing definition of "settlement". It would place a liability for duty only on settlements in which the deceased settlor had retained some interest for himself, such as income for his life. If these interests were in the hands of someone else the settlement would be outside the Act. It would then be a simple matter for the settlor to make a settlement in which the income was in the hands of some other person, say a life tenant; the property would be tied up until the life tenant's death. The settlor would have divested himself of the property so that it would not be taxable as property passing under his will. There would be no need for the life tenant to make a will at all. The amendment would make it easy for settlors to make portions of their estates free from duty even though the funds were tied up for some time after their deaths. In effect, tax free successions would take effect by absolute vesting some time after the settlor's death under an arrangement made by the settlor.

The effect of the suggested amendment is to exempt from any duty at any time any property derived from a settlement where the disposition takes effect other than upon the death of the settlor. This leaves wide open a means of avoiding duty to persons with very

large amounts of disposable property. Among other things, it reopens the loopholes closed by the previous Government by its incorporating in the principal Act the present paragraphs (1a) and (1b) of section 4. These latter provisions were made after it had been established that one very large estate had avoided duty amounting to hundreds of thousands of pounds by exploiting that loophole, and that future duties were in jeopardy to an even greater extent.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Members on this side moved many amendments to this legislation after voting against the second reading. As this suggested amendment tends to break down the principle of aggregation which the Government is establishing in this legislation, I support the amendment and will vote against the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendments Nos. 2 and 3:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee to agree to these amendments.

Suggested amendments agreed to.

Suggested Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

My reasons for opposing amendment No. 4 apply also to amendment No. 5. The amendments provide only for duty on one year's premiums on insurance policies in the case of spouses and children. The amendments could seriously affect revenue. The Government considers that the provisions in the Bill, as it left this place, regarding insurance rebate were reasonable.

Mr. HALL: There is no justification for rejecting this amendment. Under the Bill property may be given away and, after one year, it is not dutiable. Why should an exception be made in the case of insurance? The proceeds of a policy can be given away, but years later they are dutiable.

Mr. Hudson: They are dutiable now.

Mr. HALL: I am concerned with this legislation. If the Government supports this principle for property, then it should support it for insurance.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: For the reasons I have already given, I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 6:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee to agree to this amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested Amendment No. 7:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

This amendment deletes clause 23 from the Bill. Under the Bill the administrator is liable to pay duty upon all the items that are aggregated. Clause 23 merely enables the administrator to recover the amount of duty from a trustee in whom the property charged is vested or the donee who takes the property. This is a most necessary provision and its deletion would deprive the administrator of his right to recover.

Mr. HALL: I understand this clause makes the administrator responsible for the duty payable. Under the legislation, if we disagree to

the suggested amendments, a gift could be completely dissipated within 12 months and the administrator would be responsible for the duty payable on it. This is an obnoxious provision. I think this is an unpleasant responsibility to place on the administrator and I am sure that is what is behind the move to reject the amendment. I support the amendment and will therefore oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 8:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

This means that the provisions in new section 55e remove any land held jointly in common or in partnership from the primary-producing exemption, and reproduces what is already in the principal Act as introduced by the previous Government. These particular cases were excluded from benefit because it was a fair presumption that the land was held in such a way as to secure taxation advantages, and, accordingly, no further benefit or advantage was appropriate. The Government has not introduced the exclusions but has merely continued them. In these circumstances I recommend to the Committee the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. HALL: This is directed at an obnoxious provision in the legislation. The legislation sets out to replace a concession granted to primary producers in the previous legislation but this clause takes it away from a significant number of owners in this State. The Treasurer said he was excluding joint tenants.

Mr. Hudson: They are excluded under the principal Act. We are not taking away something that exists.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That does not make it right.

Mr. HALL: The process of owning land in partnership has grown considerably. It is presumed that people have done this to avoid

taxation, but we cannot pass legislation on what owners of land may do legally to split income or spread assets. I thought it was Labor Party policy that one person should not have too much. We are considering a new concept concerning concessions for primary producers. As it brings benefit of the concession to widows and people justly entitled to it, I support the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: When the primary-producer rebate was introduced under the old Act the definition of land used for primary production was introduced to specifically exclude the cases of partnership, joint tenancy, and tenancy in common. The definition in the principal Act is repeated in the Bill but the other place wishes to alter the definition so that these cases are included. Where a joint tenancy, a tenancy in common, or a partnership is created it means that some part of the primary-producing property has passed to an ultimate successor before the death of the owner. As a result, duty will only be paid on half the value of the property. These cases were excluded from the original benefit in 1959, because if a succession of \$40,000 were obtained from a joint tenancy duty would be payable on \$40,000 and not on the full value of the property of \$80,000. Consequently, a valid argument was advanced that if there is a special case for privilege to primary producers in the way of a special rebate that does not apply to any other section of the community, it applies only where land is held as the sole property of the deceased where the land has already been split up.

Mr. Hall: It could easily be sole property.

Mr. HUDSON: If it were a joint tenancy, half the value of the property had already passed. On a primary-producing property of \$60,000 held in joint tenancy, the only part that passes and is dutiable by survivorship is \$30,000. The joint tenancy gives a benefit in the avoidance of duty on half value of the property. The amendment means that the rebate of \$12,000 in the original Bill would be available in all cases of joint tenancy where it was only available previously, and the cost of that would be about \$2,400 for every instance in any year. If there were 200 or 300 successions in one year, this simple change in the wording would mean a loss of about \$500,000 in revenue to the State. Apparently, that does not mean much to the Leader. If a succession of \$100,000 went to a widow, that being the value of the joint tenancy in a primary-producing property, the existing Act levies duty of \$15,150.

Under the amendments suggested by the Legislative Council the duty in that case would be reduced to \$13,600. The Leader of the Opposition is supporting a special additional benefit for primary producers in this category that is not available to any other section of the community.

How far can we go in creating special privileges for primary producers? The same thing applies in the case of primary-producing property passing to a son over 21; at present on a joint tenancy or tenancy in common the succession duty on \$100,000 would be \$15,500, and under the Legislative Council's amendment it would be reduced to \$14,800. Also, I point out that an estate with a net value of \$200,000 could well have a gross value of \$250,000 or \$300,000. How far is the Opposition prepared to go in protecting the special interests that they are alleged to represent?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: People who believe in our balancing the budget by reducing taxation!

Mr. HUDSON: In my opinion, this amendment, when coupled with the next amendment of the Legislative Council, would wipe out more than the extra revenue the Government hopes to obtain from this measure. I do not think members in all conscience can possibly support these amendments, for they are simply not justified under any standard, unless the Opposition's standard is to protect the wealthy, and to hell with everybody else!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And that is what they are doing.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If there is any putting straight of the record to be done I should like to attempt it after that peroration of the member for Glenelg. I point out to the honourable member that we are here considering a Bill that is different in its basic approach to the Succession Duties Act. We have aggregation now, and a very much increased scale, as the schedule will demonstrate, for the application of duty. We are not on the same premise as we were in 1959. In any case, that in itself does not make the 1959 provision a just one. The honourable member has been at great pains to use the most astronomical and imaginative figures one could get. I do not know where the \$200,000 and \$300,000 properties exist.

Mr. Hudson: I am prepared to take you through the examples.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am making these remarks, not the honourable member.

Mr. Hudson: You are not going to accuse me of quoting astronomical figures and juggling out of the hat.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know where the honourable member got his figures.

Mr. Hudson: I worked them out.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Government appears to consider that any person who has divided his property by means of a joint tenancy or a tenancy in common has committed some grievous evil against the community. That is utter rot.

Mr. Hudson: It is not.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member goes on to demonstrate how the beneficiaries of a deceased person escape succession duty by virtue of this provision. A person can divide his property either by establishing a joint tenancy or by a subdivision of the new title. If he divides the property into two titles (which he is entitled to do), the exemption automatically applies, because there is no joint ownership and there is a separate title. Now what is the difference? From the point of view of the Government's revenue, it will mean that instead of having joint tenancies people will have separate ownerships and separate titles. This will be accelerated because of the aggregation provision and the steeper increasing scales that are now applicable. The member for Glenelg cannot deny that under these provisions the primary-producer exemption automatically applies. Why do we discriminate in this?

Mr. Hudson: Why did you discriminate in 1959? It was because of revenue considerations.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is based on an entirely different premise. If an owner subdivides his land by separate titles he is then automatically entitled to this benefit. Why should he be precluded from having the benefit if he chooses, for convenience or family arrangement, to have it in joint tenancy? The honourable member just does not understand that there are some people who do not always have an ulterior motive for what they do. I believe there is no justification for the attitude the Government is taking in this matter.

The member for Glenelg says that if a person passes over property to a member of his family he escapes certain charges and certain duties. The honourable member is well aware that duties are payable on properties that are transferred. The best one can do is a duty of 3 per cent up to a certain amount, I think \$20,000, in the Commonwealth sphere.

Mr. Hudson: There is a way around that one, too, and you know it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If a person lives long enough he could perhaps work his way out of it. In nearly every case there is a duty involved in transfer. The honourable member's argument that the handing down of property escapes duty is not correct, and he knows it is not correct. No justification exists for discrimination between people who may happen to hold properties under two kinds of arrangement. I support the amendment.

Mr. HALL: The member for Glenelg said that a surviving partner who received a half share of the property previously held under a joint tenancy with the deceased was receiving a great concession in having to pay taxation only on that half. Does he realize that over the years both partners have put equal money and effort into the property? If the wife legally owns the property, no reason exists why we should be harder on her.

Mr. HUDSON: Under the Act, on a \$200,000 succession passing solely by will to a widow, and solely owned previously by her husband the existing duty would be \$35,150. If the primary-producer rebate under the Act were claimed, the duty would be reduced to \$29,526. If that same property were held under a joint tenancy between husband and wife under the Act, the duty would be \$15,150, which is less than half the duty that would apply if no primary-producer exemption were claimed, and about half the duty that would apply if that exemption were claimed. Under the Legislative Council's amendment, on the passing of property whose net value was \$100,000, the duty would be \$13,600. Why does the Leader wish to penalize, relatively, the person who has a property in sole ownership?

The logical consequence of the amendment is that it would penalize even the primary producer whose estate is held in a joint tenancy, tenancy in common or partnership. The Leader wishes to reduce the duty in respect of a joint tenancy still further and to make the discrepancy greater. If the property that passes through a widow is valued at \$200,000 and held previously in sole ownership by the deceased husband, is there not some equity in treatment to be considered in that case, as against the case involving a property held in joint tenancy in respect of which half the value passes as a result of survivorship?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In moving that the suggested amendment be disagreed to, the Treasurer did not say much but his rather unwelcome supporter from Glenelg said a great deal, and I am now even more strongly against the motion than I was before. As I understand the honourable member's complaint, it is that, because this particular definition was in the Act before, the Legislative Council should not have altered it. The point the honourable member will not see, in spite of the fact that it was referred to by the member for Flinders, is that his own Government, of which he is such a staunch supporter, has entirely altered the basis of computation of succession duty in this Act by introducing the principle of aggregation, which remains in the Bill as it has been sent back to us. Therefore, it ill behoves him to complain about another place making an alteration to the law as it stood before this Bill was introduced.

As to the question of how much revenue the Government will receive as a result of the Bill, I do not know whether or not the hypothetical figures given by the honourable member are correct. His examples were pure guess work. We are getting to the point where the Government will have to decide whether it wants the Act as it stands now or whether it is prepared to accept it in this form. That is a decision the Government will have to make. If it is complaining that it will get less revenue under the Bill in the suggested form, then the choice is open to it.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The 1959 legislation included a definition of land used for primary production which was practically the same as the definition contained in clause 29 of the present Bill. The definition in the 1959 legislation was for the purpose of ascertaining who would be entitled to a rebate of succession duty. The definition in the Bill is of much wider application, because the Bill has in it the obnoxious principle of aggregation to which objection was strongly taken previously by Opposition members in this place. As aggregation applies to assets to which a beneficiary may become entitled, the duty will be considerably higher.

It is all very well for the member for Glenelg to say that a widow inheriting land used for primary production will receive certain exemptions under the Bill. However, we should consider any assets that she might have held jointly with her husband. Under the Act at present, exemptions of \$9,000 apply to assets owned jointly. However, under the Bill the assets jointly owned will

be aggregated with whatever else a widow might inherit under a will. Consequently a higher rate of duty will be applicable to her inheritance if it is beyond the \$30,000 or \$40,000 mark.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 9:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This is a consequential amendment to suggested amendments Nos. 4 and 5, which have already been dealt with. I therefore ask that it be disagreed to.

Mr. HALL: It would be better not to have this amendment. Because I will not call a division on this, it does not mean that I agree with the principle involved. Had the previous amendments been agreed to, I might have supported this amendment.

Suggested amendment disagreed to.

Suggested Amendment No. 10:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to. This increases the rebate in respect of primary-producing property from \$12,000 to \$20,000. I ask members to reject this amendment so that the Government can have as much revenue as possible at its disposal.

Mr. HALL: This amendment takes us back to the Treasurer's policy speech which included a promise in regard to a living area. The Government's definition of living area since its election has been inadequate and has not in any way honoured the promises made in the policy speech. The Bill provides that a living area shall be an area up to the value of \$12,000. The Legislative Council has moved to make that figure \$20,000, which would still be short of the Treasurer's promise. However, as it is an improvement, I support the amendment.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I support the Leader. In his policy speech the Treasurer said that an exemption of \$6,000 would be provided when an estate was inherited by a

widow or children, and that a primary producer could inherit a living area without paying succession duties on it. I thought that this amendment of the Legislative Council would be acceptable to the Treasurer. In Committee I moved an amendment for an exemption of the payment of succession duties on a living area up to the value of \$24,000, but that was not acceptable to the Government and it was defeated.

Although this amendment provides for an exemption of up to \$20,000 on a living area, that will only apply if the living area which is being inherited is of the value of \$20,000 or more. Of course, many rural properties, such as poultry farms, have a living area that is valued at much less than \$20,000, and the exemption stipulated in the Legislative Council's amendment would not apply in its entirety: it would apply only to the value of that primary production land, whether it be \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$15,000. In most cases the living areas used for primary production could not be obtained for \$60,000 to \$80,000. I consider that a reasonable sum should be allowed in respect of a living area, preferably \$24,000.

I ask the Treasurer to give this matter his further earnest consideration in view of his promises in his policy speech. He considers the Government has a mandate for so many matters introduced in this Chamber, and I consider that in this respect the Government may have had a mandate from the primary producers, because they no doubt understood that provision would be made for exemption from payment of succession duties in respect of a living area that might be inherited and used for primary production purposes, irrespective of its value.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: We have seriously considered this aspect and if the exemption could have been provided for we would have provided for it. However, at this stage we cannot go beyond what is provided.

Mr. McANANEY: For primary producers, this is not an improvement on last year's Bill. An exemption of \$6,000 is given for a house property in Adelaide, so that an exemption of \$20,000 for primary-producing property would compare more favourably with the Treasurer's promise in his policy speech.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Suggested Amendment No. 11:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As this is a consequential amendment I ask the Committee to disagree to it.

Suggested amendment disagreed to.

Suggested Amendment No. 12:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This amendment deals with primary-producing land and the case of widows but, as it would mean a loss of revenue, I ask the Committee to disagree to it.

Suggested amendment disagreed to.

Suggested Amendments Nos. 13 to 17:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: All these amendments are consequential on other amendments that have already been disagreed to.

Suggested amendments disagreed to.

Suggested Amendment No. 18:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This amendment introduces a new clause conferring benefit on the mother or father of an illegitimate child deriving property from his intestacy or any other disposition made by him. I ask the Committee to agree to the amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

That the following reason for disagreement with the Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5, and 7 to 17 be adopted:

That the amendments drastically change the concept of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know whether the Government desires to lose this Bill, but I point out that the suggested amendments have been discussed somewhat briefly, and I do not think the reason for rejecting them will be very favourably accepted in another place. I have never previously heard a reason given which has been so much in the nature of a retort rather than a reason.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was almost exactly the wording of most of your motions on the subject.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was always able to give a reason that was acceptable to another place, to the extent that I never had a Bill rejected purely because of the way we considered amendments that may have been moved by another place, which, I

point out, has exactly the same right as this place to make amendments. I consider the Committee might well have looked at these matters more carefully before so cavalierly sending the Bill back to the Council without any acceptance of any of the significant amendments.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HOUSING IMPROVEMENT AND EXCESSIVE RENTS) BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 5 (clause 3)—After the word "tenant" insert the words "to the landlord".

No. 2. Page 3, line 13 (clause 8)—After the word "house" insert the words "which at the time the agreement was entered into was".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask the Committee to agree to these amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, line 20 (clause 7)—After "7" insert "(1)".

No. 2. Page 3 (clause 7)—After line 23 insert new subclause as follows:

(2) Subsection (1) of this section shall not apply in any case where a person employs less than three persons at any one time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): These amendments are designed to affect clause 7 of the Bill and to write in an exception in the provision dealing with employment practices. This exception provides that a person may discriminate against another in his employment by refusing employment or disadvantaging him, and so on, if fewer than three persons are employed. I do not like that amendment. I understand that the point put forward in the Legislative Council was that one ought not to interfere with domestic employment, in which people could be employed in one's own home.

Mr. Hurst: Is that likely to happen?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, one of the cases I previously cited was a refusal of employment to a well recommended coloured woman in the district of Albert. Because I wish to save the very real provisions of the remainder of the Bill, and little as I like this new provision (I think that, if discrimination is wrong in large-scale employment it is

wrong against anyone) I ask the Committee to agree to these amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I think these amendments largely meet the objections previously raised in regard to persons who shared facilities in a boardinghouse. I support the amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROWLAND FLAT WAR MEMORIAL HALL INCORPORATED BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 8. Page 2826.)

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): The Bill vests in the Rowland Flat War Memorial Incorporated certain land at Rowland Flat that has for some time past been held in trust for trustees for certain purposes referred to in the trust deed. In May, 1859, an area of half an acre of land situated in the heart of Rowland Flat and on the main road was vested in four trustees under a deed of conveyance. Those trustees and their successors were to hold the land in trust for the specific purposes referred to in the trust deed, which provided that the land was to be used as a chapel for the celebration of religious worship. The trustees were empowered to permit such ministers of religion belonging to any Christian sect or denomination to use the buildings on or to be erected on the land for the purpose of worship.

The second provision was that the buildings could also be used for a schoolroom for the education of young people; the third provision was that the land could be used for a cemetery; and the fourth provision was that the land could also be used for the erection of a house for the use and residence of the minister of the said chapel and for a master or masters of the school referred to in the trust deed. At present the land has on it a small building of a couple of rooms, the erection date of which I have been unable to ascertain. It might have been on the land at the time the trust was created in 1859 or it might have been erected since then. From inquiries I have made of people living in the district, some of whom are elderly persons who have lived there all their lifetime, I have been unable to ascertain whether at any time since the creation of the trust in 1849 the land has been used for the purposes referred to

in the trust deed. I understand that the old building on the land is in a most dilapidated condition and is ready for demolition. At times this building has been used by itinerants who, passing through the town, were unable to find accommodation for the night and squatted in one of the rooms.

The land was vested in trustees under an indenture, and it was not until January, 1965, that a certificate of title under the Real Property Act was issued in respect of this land. The land was vested in the original trustees, who have passed away, and new trustees have been appointed from time to time. In January, 1965, the land was vested under a deed of trust in two surviving trustees, Messrs. R. A. Gramp and R. G. Haese. They applied under the Real Property (Registration of Titles) Act, 1945, for the issue of a certificate of title, which was issued in January, 1965. As the land is subject to a trust, the certificate of title was naturally endorsed with the words "That the proprietors have no express power to sell the land." Of course, the proprietors are the two persons to whom I have referred, and they are still holding this land subject to the trust deed. Also in Rowland Flat is an association known as the Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated which has been in existence for some years and became incorporated in 1963. The certificate of incorporation was issued by the Registrar of Companies on November 12, 1963. The principal objects of the association are as follows:

(a) To establish a suitable memorial to perpetuate the memory of the men and women of the district who paid the supreme sacrifice in the 1939-1945 World War.

(b) To provide facilities, concessions, and other amenities for returned defence service personnel.

(c) To promote useful knowledge and rational mental and physical recreation for the subscribers and general public by all or any of the following means . . .

Those means are enumerated. The association, realizing that the land is centrally situated in a main street at Rowland Flat, is anxious to use it. Its present intention is to build thereon a hall as a war memorial and for the benefit of the people of Rowland Flat and that district. The surviving trustees are prepared to transfer land to the association provided the necessary approval can be obtained. This Bill was introduced in another place and a Select Committee was appointed. An advertisement was placed in the local press that the committee would be sitting and would be pleased to receive evidence from persons interested in the proposal, but no

objections were received. As the measure has passed another place with slight amendments to the original Bill and as it is intended to erect a war memorial on this land, members may give this Bill as speedy a passage as another place did. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): The Bill concerns land at Rowland Flat in the area I represent in this House.

Mr. Ryan: Very well, too, I may say.

Mrs. BYRNE: As the member for Angas said, this land was conveyed in 1859 to certain named trustees, principally for religious purposes. Because the original trustees have died, new trustees have been appointed from time to time. However, this site has never been used for the purpose for which it was originally intended. Realizing this Bill was to be discussed in this House, I visited the site, and saw that the land was covered with high grass and had a dilapidated building on it. The site is in a prominent position on the main highway through the town but, unfortunately, because of the decayed building and the high grass on the land, it is not an asset to the town, and detracts from an otherwise lovely area. Because of its central position, this is an ideal site for a war memorial, expected to be a hall, to serve the town, and funds have already been raised for this purpose. The present situation has continued for over 100 years, which is far too long, and is not in the interests of the people of the district. As it allows the trustees to use the land for purposes other than those originally stated, I support the Bill and hope its objects will soon be achieved.

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

[*Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2955.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): This interesting Bill deals with three separate provisions that are joined together somewhat tenuously through the medium of the second provision. The first provision is set out in clause 4, which establishes that the purpose of the Bill is to enable additional regulations to be made on specific matters, in respect of which no guarantee exists that such matters come completely within the ambit of the regulation-making power already included in the Act.

The first provision relates to the establishment and maintenance on an Aboriginal institution of premises for the conduct of clubrooms, etc., and to the conditions under which these premises may be conducted. Various opinions have recently been expressed about the desirability or otherwise of establishing canteens on Aboriginal reserves. The position has changed somewhat in the last year or so as the Government has used the provisions inserted in the Act for the progressive development of full citizenship rights through various parts of the State, and by a series of proclamations (two made before the present Government took office and one made subsequently) the whole of the State is now exempted from the provisions of the Licensing Act as they apply under the Aboriginal Affairs Act. That means that all Aborigines throughout the State have the right to consume liquor under the same conditions as those applying to other persons. I have said on various occasions that I think the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has moved too fast in this matter, but we are not here to debate the pros and cons of that now. That is an established fact, and the problems that have arisen as a result of that measure were not unforeseen. Undoubtedly there have been problems, as I accept and as I think the Minister accepts, too. This matter has been the cause of some concern and anxiety and, indeed, fairly severe criticism has been made of this change by certain people in certain areas. I know this provision is still the subject of some criticism. At times the Minister has said that, although these problems were not unforeseen, they were not of any real magnitude. He believes that in due course they will resolve themselves and settled habits will obtain.

Some time ago there was certain controversy in the Port Augusta area. There have also been and still are some rather serious criticisms of the effect of that legislation in the district of the member for Eyre. Some organizations in that area have written to the Minister protesting about things that have occurred there. It seems something of a contradiction, therefore, that the Minister has now said, in his second reading explanation, that it is desired to establish canteens on reserves so that Aborigines can be taught to drink soberly and with restraint. If there is no problem at present, then there is nothing to resolve by this or any other means. However, I do not intend to deal with that aspect; I wish to speak about the advisability or otherwise of the establishment of canteens.

Much can be said in favour of the establishment of canteens, but what exercises my mind most in this matter is just how these canteens are to be run and organized; what are the proposals for their establishment and management; what sort of liquor is going to be dispensed there; and how is it to be consumed. A canteen can be a perfectly useful and hospitable place. The management could determine just what the hours should be and what type of liquor may be consumed there. It could decide whether liquor could be taken away from the canteen and consumed elsewhere and it would be concerned to exercise discipline over the whole matter. The management, and the Minister particularly, will be concerned that these things turn out well. If we are to give our blessing to them I believe we will all be concerned that they turn out well. After all, we have had problems with liquor not only with Aborigines but with other people as well.

I have certain amendments on the file which, if accepted, would veto the proposition for canteens altogether. I want to hear the Minister on this aspect before it is decided in Committee what should be done. I should like the Minister to give certain undertakings to the House, but I will not elaborate upon them because I think the Minister knows what I have in mind. It is important that the Minister should satisfy members as to the methods by which he proposes that these canteens will come into operation, although I know that he does not have to set this out in the Bill or to prescribe it specifically in any legislation. I want to know particularly who is going to manage these places, what sort of liquor will be sold and what will be the conditions of sale. I may find it desirable to withdraw my amendments later, but I want to hear what the Minister has to say on the matter.

I know that the superintendent of one mission is very much in favour of setting up a canteen there. It is in a somewhat remote area where both sophisticated and unsophisticated Aborigines congregate and where there is considerable movement from north to south and *vice versa*. This may be a good place to try out this proposal. In attempting to resolve some of the problems that existed, particularly on one of the older reserves of the State, regulations were promulgated in my time as Minister that there should be no liquor at all on a reserve. Members of the departmental staff resident on the reserves told me that they would be perfectly happy to exclude themselves. This position per-

tained and there was no liquor at all on any reserve, not even in the homes of members of the staff. That was the extent to which they were prepared to make some sacrifice so that it would be common policy that there would be no liquor on the reserve. I referred to that case because it indicated to me the sincerity of members of the staff, who considered that this was a move in the right direction at that time and were prepared to go along with it to the extent to which I have referred. I believe the Minister has countermanded that regulation and has now permitted liquor to be taken on to reserves and consumed there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not every reserve.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was not sure of the extent, but I knew it applied to some. If that is so, then on the reserves to which he has extended this facility it would seem to me to be inadvisable to go backward from that point and restrict the movement of liquor away from the canteen.

With other members, I am concerned to know what the Minister has in mind, and I shall be interested in any statement he may give that may help us to resolve our attitudes on the matter. I believe it is unfortunate that we should be considering special privileges for Aborigines. The word "discrimination" is rather misused and, perhaps, over-used. It applies both ways: there can be discrimination in favour or against. I believe the provisions in this Bill are definitely discrimination in favour. After all, if a group of citizens in any town wants to establish a club it has to comply with certain principles to obtain this privilege, which is not readily obtained. By this regulation-making power, however, we will empower the Government to make regulations that will put Aborigines on reserves in a special category. I do not like that, and I do not believe it is desirable. As I said during a debate on another Bill, I believe that special privileges tend to create segregation and a feeling of discrimination, and probably to do despite to the cause of assimilation or integration. The moment special privileges are created a certain amount of antagonism develops amongst other people. The Minister may not think this is important, but I do and I think he should have regard to it. Despite that, I have not a closed mind on the subject of canteens, and I should like to hear the Minister on this.

The second proposition is to provide regulations for the setting up of Aboriginal reserve

councils on every Aboriginal reserve or institution. In another Bill we have considered this year, we have envisaged the establishment of reserve councils, and the operation of that legislation is contingent upon the setting up of reserve councils in some recognized and statutory way. I have no objection to the establishment of reserve councils; in fact, I am strongly in favour of them. One council was in operation before the change of Government, and it was working out very well. Apart from that, this has been from time immemorial a traditional method of governing the tribe.

The tribal government of Aboriginal people was in the hands of the old men, who by virtue of their knowledge of the customs and rites of their people were in a superior position to the younger men, and they were able to exercise influence and control in a very rigid and realistic way. I think this presages a successful operation of reserve councils, in that it restores a semblance of that type of control to which the Aboriginal people, by long-inherited custom, have become used to and understand. One of the tragedies of this present age is the fact that this respect for and government by the elders of the tribe has largely disappeared because of the intervention of the white man's law, which has undermined the authority of the tribal elders. It has led to the young people taking the bit in their teeth and disregarding the authority of their elders. If they have no respect for the white man's law, they have no law at all. The vacuum created by the transitional period has had a serious and detrimental effect on the Aboriginal people; I do not think there is any escape from it.

There is much to be said for reserve councils as a local authority. They have some future, as they tend to restore a kind of government control and regulation of conduct that was previously administered by the elders of the tribe. I believe that steps should be taken to enable the Aboriginal people to learn to govern and control themselves.

As I have said before, one of the problems is that all authority in this country has been exercised by the white man, and this has created a resentment in the Aboriginal people. If they dislike authority, they will dislike it even more when it is administered by somebody of a different colour. During my term as Minister, I tried to work out ways and means of getting people in local areas to accept some responsibility in the government and management of their own people. This has

worked out on reserves in Queensland. Even though the Queensland law is primitive, the Aborigines have established the principle of having bosses, foremen, and so on in their timber mills and in the various activities around the reserves. The police who patrol the areas of the reserve are Aborigines. I have suggested to the Director of Aboriginal Affairs on several occasions that if we cannot get from this State some capable persons willing to manage and control their own people, we should try to get, from Queensland, Aborigines who are foremen and concerned with police activities. We could appoint them to our reserves in a managerial capacity.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Many Aborigines are employed in senior positions now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is a good thing, and I think the Minister agrees that this is the course to pursue. However, I believe the proposal in the second part of the Bill goes much too far. The Minister proposes that the Aboriginal councils shall have powers so wide and so all-embracing that they supersede the powers of any existing authority. The management of reserves is now controlled by the Minister, the board, and the superintendent, each fulfilling his particular function. The Minister proposes, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, to empower any of such reserve councils to do, perform and exercise any of the powers or functions of the Minister or superintendents for reserves under this Act, provided that, notwithstanding anything in this Act, any such reserve council may grant, with or without conditions, or refuse permission to any person or classes of person to enter, the right to remain. These powers make the reserve council completely all-powerful within the reserve. I put to the Minister that the right of entry would have a serious and far-reaching effect. At the present time the right of entry is controlled by the board.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Subject to the overriding authority of the Minister.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Not in all cases.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Minister can empower anybody to enter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The board has certain powers of authorization, which it has exercised very well in regard to the North-West Reserve. The board has religiously and faithfully supported the policy of the present Minister and myself in this matter, despite

much pressure from other States and the Commonwealth. We are proposing to transfer this power to the reserve council.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not entirely without conditions.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know what the conditions are.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They will be prescribed in the regulations.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister has drafted this Bill in the widest possible terms. No restraint or restriction is apparent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Regulations have to come before this House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be, but the Minister is most unwise in setting out the Bill in these terms. One or two councils operate but we do not know how they will operate eventually.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There will be more than that: they will all ask for it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Of course. However, many people in the community ask for powers and privileges that Parliament will not give.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They asked without being prompted by anyone.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister has to be realistic. He knows it is not wise always to do everything everyone asks for. He does not do it himself in other matters of administration.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Now you are being paternalistic to Aborigines.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Because I advise restraint, I do not become paternalistic. The Minister is prone to use drag-net legislation and phraseology, and to put words into peoples' mouths and to suggest attitudes that are not proper or realistic. I do not accept that statement. I have the welfare of Aborigines at heart as much as has anyone in this Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am not suggesting otherwise.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sincere in this matter, and my opinions are not always wrong. I administered this department for seven years and everyone in this State with an unbiased mind would admit that great advances were made for Aborigines in this State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Everyone would agree with that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have had a longer period administering this department than has the Minister. This proposal is far in advance of realism. To give all the powers

of a Minister, the board, and the superintendent, to the reserve council is unnecessary and unwise. Apparently, we are not consulting the board about this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The board does not oppose this proposal.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have heard members of the board on this matter and I know their attitude. They are reasonable people, but we have given them scant consideration in the last couple of measures that have been introduced. The power to refuse or grant entry to property is not conferred on any other person. We have had heated discussions about whether mushroomers should be allowed into people's paddocks, and eventually they were allowed to do so in certain circumstances. As long as a person does not create a nuisance or make a disturbance no objection is taken to his being on certain property. Prospectors, departmental inspectors, weeds advisers, vermin inspectors, health officers, building inspectors, taxation assessors and union officials are allowed, at present, on properties. Are we to give the council the right to exclude these people, who have legitimate business and proper reasons for entry?

The council can exclude the Minister and members of the board if it wants to. There is no exception to this rule, and even police officers who wish to do their duty can be excluded from entry to the reserves. Even members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust could be refused the right of entry. Perhaps the Minister does not appreciate the power he intends to put into the hands of a reserve council: it is far too wide. I assure the Minister that if, after reserve councils had been established on an advisory basis, he then returned to the House in one or two years with a report of satisfactory operations and the soundness of the suggestions and propositions made by councils (which would indicate that they were capable of accepting further authority), I should be the first to agree that they should be given this authority. However, we are making a serious mistake by handing wide powers to councils at this stage. That is one reason why I strongly join issue with the administration of the Minister. I do not doubt his good intentions, but he has let his enthusiasm outrun his judgment, and has tried to do in a year or two what must take much more time if it is to be successful. The last suggestion is that co-operatives may be set up on reserves and elsewhere and be exempt from

the provisions of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

The new section will enable regulations to be made for the establishment of co-operatives upon Aboriginal institutions otherwise than under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act or the Companies Act. It is considered that these Acts are too complicated and inappropriate in the circumstances obtaining and it is desired to provide for a simpler procedure than that which is applicable under the Acts mentioned.

I cannot follow the Minister's reasoning or logic. He is not consistent in his attitude in this matter compared with his attitude on other matters. He intends to set up an Aboriginal Lands Trust that will have the complicated duties of running business activities. No doubt it will consist of specially selected people. He intends to set up reserve councils that shall have a wide authority. Now, he intends to set up co-operatives. I do not criticize his suggestion that co-operatives should be encouraged: I agree with it, and realize that several are operating at present. To say that the people capable of managing these co-operatives are incapable of fulfilling the conditions under the Act is a contradiction.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They did not do it under you, and they have not done it up to the present. They were operating illegally under your Administration.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be so, but that is no criticism of my attitude, either. The Minister cannot defend this matter by criticizing someone else. He knows and I know that some people operating co-operatives at present are capable of operating them to the extent that they are capable of tickling the peter. I do not think a good case is set out for exempting these people from provisions that apply to anyone else. We are dealing with business concerns that must be run as such. There is nothing seriously complicated about this and nothing that I believe people at Point Pearce, Gerard, Point McLeay or Koonibba could not do in the matter of storekeeping, buying and selling, and filling in returns pursuant to the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. I am astonished that the Minister believes it necessary to suggest this. Frankly, I do not think it compliments the people concerned to say that they cannot do these comparatively simple things.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have prepared returns at Point Pearce, and they are not "comparatively simple".

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is merely a question of preparing daily, weekly or monthly returns required to be submitted under the Act. What is so terribly difficult about that? Further, these co-operatives will have to function in a way which is not only honest but which seems to be honest. I think the provisions inserted in the Industrial and Provident Societies Act are designed to ensure that these co-operatives are properly run. No case exists at all for setting them aside. I oppose that provision because there is no justification for it. I support the second reading because I believe that it is necessary, in particular, to provide for reserve councils. However, I intend to move amendments to the second and third provisions, and my attitude to the first will depend on the assurances the Minister can give.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): This Bill is perhaps an example of putting the cart before the horse in so far as it relates to canteens. Canteens should have been established prior to Aborigines receiving freedom to drink alcohol. Disregarding for the moment Aborigines who have been assimilated into the community, the provision of canteens prior to granting Aborigines freedom to drink would have given people on reserves the opportunity to drink under some kind of supervision. I think I have seen a reference to this as "organized drinking", although I do not think that is a good choice of words, for they could mean anything. South Australia might have benefited from the experiences of the Administration in New Guinea when it first introduced legislation in 1962 giving to its indigenous people freedom to drink. That Administration went through a most difficult period and eventually had to make special provision so that the people of Papua and New Guinea might learn to drink in the proper way, which would not offend Europeans and which would lead Europeans to conclude that the natives were ready for this privilege.

If provision for canteens had been made last year when the Minister introduced legislation giving Aborigines the right to drink, I think it would have resulted in a much better sequence of events. We find that Aborigines will not be subject to the Licensing Act; they are to receive special privileges not available to others in so far as they do not have to comply with the Act. That is discrimination, which is not in the best interests of the Aborigines; in fact, it is discrimination against others in the community. Although I realize

that there may be some good features in providing canteens on reserves, I think Aborigines will be denied the opportunity to learn in a general way in the community how to drink and how to associate with others under normal drinking conditions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why should they be? They are able to go to places nevertheless.

Mrs. STEELE: I realize that but, obviously, the fact that canteens are to be provided on reserves indicates that all Aborigines are not ready in every respect for unrestricted drinking in the community. I think it will become even more difficult when reserve councils are established, because canteens will then come under the control of the councils. I am wondering who will set the example as to the way to behave in these canteens under the conditions that will exist. This is no reflection at all on the Aborigines, but I believe that we must progress slowly.

Mr. Hughes: We haven't progressed much in the last 100 years.

Mrs. STEELE: If that is so, then we obviously have not progressed in the last 12 months. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the member for Flinders. What he expressed is what many other members feel. We shall be interested to hear what are the conditions the Minister envisages for the control of canteens: what restrictions there will be, what hours will apply, and whether liquor will have to be consumed in the canteen or whether Aborigines will be able to buy it and take it to their homes on the reserve. I think it would be a great pity if that happened.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: At Koonibba they are able to take liquor off the reserve and to their homes now.

Mrs. STEELE: We want to know what conditions the Minister has in mind for the drinking of liquor from the canteen on the reserve. I approve the idea of a reserve council, which is a worthwhile innovation, but again I should like to hear more about it. The explanation given by the Minister was rather insufficient considering the three innovations included in the Bill. Members find themselves very much in the dark as to what is envisaged in the setting up of reserve councils. We should like to know what powers they are going to have. The member for Flinders instanced the discretion reserve councils will have in restricting the movement of people, other than those who live on the reserves, in and out of and on the reserves. I wonder how

these people will cope with the complexities of running their own reserves. If this will mean that the elders of the tribe will be, as it were, reinstated and will have more respect from their people, then I think this is a good move indeed, because the elders of the tribe have always been looked up to by Aborigines and have had vested in them much of the culture and laws of the tribes. If the reserve councils are to have as their heads the elders of the tribes then I believe this will be worthwhile because it will bring back the respect of the younger people for their elders. I understand that, in recent years with the impact of civilization on the Aborigines, there has not been the same respect for the elders of the tribe as there used to be years ago.

For many years now at the United Nations the independence of the peoples of Papua and New Guinea has been urged on the Australian Government, which has been asked to speed the coming of the day when those indigenous people will be able to control their own destinies. In that case there is an instance of people who have been prepared over a great many years by the Administration, by people who know the problems of New Guinea and have been associated with those people and have been in a position to train them and advise them and to prepare for their independence. In a limited way this has been done in South Australia but I believe that, within too short a space of time (far less time than the Administration has had to prepare the people in New Guinea for some autonomy), we are prepared to hand over entirely to the Aborigines the complexities of running reserves and the various ramifications involved in industry, education and so on. They have had little experience and preparation for this, and we could be doing them a disservice. I believe they should be given much more time in which to learn to accept responsibility.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: These people believe that if they are not given responsibility there is no use in establishing councils.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, but the Bill envisages handing over to the councils all the powers at present vested in the Minister. I believe much can be learned from studying what has happened in Papua and New Guinea because the Australian Government has exerted a big influence there in recent years, and the Administration has had to face up to many of the problems which the State and Commonwealth Government in Australia must face up to with the Australian Aborigines. The advancement of Aborigines has moved forward more in the

last 10 years than at any other period since the white man came to Australia. The Commonwealth Government has established an effective Administration in New Guinea for decades. However, even now it is handing over only certain autonomy to the indigenous people. In South Australia, after only 10 years since we really began giving privileges and responsibilities to Aborigines, we are handing over completely to them. Although I think it is a good thing to have reserve councils, I believe guidance and oversight by somebody is necessary to see that the councils operate in the right direction.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why should these people be treated as children any more than we?

Mrs. STEELE: Does the Minister say that the people in Papua and New Guinea have been treated as children?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes, and the United Nations has been against it.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister been there and seen the tremendous advances made? However, the people there know they are not ready for complete independence and they do not want the Administration to leave them on their own as yet.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Who said anything about leaving the Aborigines on their own on the reserves?

Mrs. STEELE: The control previously vested in the Minister is being handed over to the reserve councils.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that at all.

Mrs. STEELE: Somewhere in the Minister's explanation I saw that the power vested in the Minister would be handed over to the reserve councils. I believe it is doing Aborigines a disservice to throw them on to their own resources as quickly as this. The best way to learn is by experience and what one learns by hard experience one probably profits from most of all. I believe there is a limit to how far we can go, and that these matters should be taken a little more slowly.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: They have gone too fast in Africa.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. In Nigeria, although the people were considered to have been prepared and trained sufficiently to take over their own country, within a comparatively short time of independence they were in great difficulty, and it must have been a great disappointment to find that the Administration had broken down as it had. I now turn to the question

of setting up the co-operatives. Much of what I have said about reserve councils applies to co-operatives. The quickest way to learn is by personal experience, and this applies to co-operatives. I feel it is good if the Aboriginal people have an opportunity to conduct their own co-operatives. New Guinea is probably **the most pertinent comparison** in regard to conditions in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The provisions of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act do not apply to co-operatives in New Guinea.

Mrs. STEELE: I realize that, but many co-operatives have been set up there, as I saw. The people involved underwent a troublesome time with co-operatives. Difficulties had to be overcome and in more than one instance the Administration had to help them. The same kind of thing could happen here, and I believe that these people need guidance and training to establish these co-operatives and get them going. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

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

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference, at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Brookman, Casey, Dunstan, Loveday, and Nankivell.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 8.45 p.m.

At 8.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 12.10 a.m. The recommendations were as follows:

Amendments Nos. 6 to 8: That the Legislative Council do insist thereon and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

Amendment No. 9: That the Legislative Council amend new subclause (4) of its amendment to read as follows:

(4) The Treasurer shall from time to time pay to the trust such amounts as may be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose up to but not exceeding the

amount of royalties paid to the Crown or a Minister of the Crown in any financial year in respect of any lease or licence granted or issued under the Mining Act, 1930-1962, or the Mining (Petroleum) Act, 1940-1963, in respect of any lands vested in the trust, and that the House of Assembly agree to amendment No. 9 as so amended.

That the Legislative Council make the following consequential amendments:

Page 7, line 24 (clause 19)—After "the" first occurring insert "Treasurer and the"

Page 7, line 24 (clause 19)—Leave out "pays" and insert "pay" and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The managers of this House attended at the conference with the managers of the Legislative Council, and the managers of the Legislative Council considered a number of propositions put forward by the managers of the House of Assembly. Those propositions were advanced in a spirit of compromise and went a long way towards the point of view expressed by members of the other place. However, none of the proposals put forward by the managers from this place was in any way acceptable to the managers from the Legislative Council. It was made clear to us that under no circumstances would mineral rights (even minimal mineral rights; even rights such as those existing in other parts of the State) be provided for Aborigines. In consequence, in order to save the Bill and the advantages that accrued elsewhere in it, our managers were constrained to recommend to members here that they accept the amendment of the Legislative Council, which is presented to us in only slightly altered form, as a result of the conference: the word "may" in the original amendment has been changed to "shall".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That's really important you know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how because, unless the Government of the day chooses to appropriate (and it does not need to appropriate), no money has to be paid. Therefore, in fact, as far as any legal significance is concerned, there is no difference between the two propositions. The only other amendments made to the proposal of the Legislative Council arise from the fact that

the original proposal of the Legislative Council was completely unworkable, as it proposed to pay moneys out of royalties. Because royalties have to be paid into General Revenue, that was a hopeless proposition from a Treasury point of view. Therefore, we put it in order. That is as far as we were able to get with the Legislative Council. Indeed, that is the kind of spirit of compromise that we get from the Legislative Council, some of whose members, I understand, expressed the view within a short period of this conference that it was useless going to a conference unless it was intended to come to some kind of compromise. We found no sort of compromise at all from these people on this occasion.

Mr. Coumbe: Did they find one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What they got from us, in effect, was a capitulation in order to retain what remained in the Bill. However, the original purpose of the Bill (to guarantee mineral rights to Aborigines and to provide for them a guarantee against the depredations of their land that have been carried out in other parts of Australia) the Legislative Council would not allow. It wished to retain the position where any Administration in South Australia could give away minerals on Aboriginal lands without any compensation to the Aborigines at all.

Mr. Heaslip: Your provision would be pure discrimination.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has already told us that he feels discriminated against by our giving any advantages to the Aborigines for the wrongs we have done them in the past. I weep for the honourable member. Unfortunately, we are bound to this provision at this stage, but the Government is determined to guarantee to the Aborigines in South Australia rights in other minerals. Certain administrative action will still be taken by this Government to guarantee those rights, because the Government will not submit to the kind of treatment it has received from the Legislative Council in this and other matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of the emotional outburst from the Minister—

Mr. Hudson: We are going to have one from you, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. There are only two things I want to say. First, I cannot follow the Minister when he says there is no difference between "may" and "shall", because I think he must have overlooked section 34 of the Acts Interpretation Act which sets out plainly that there is, in law, a most significant difference

between those two words. I should be glad if he could give a little more adequate explanation than he gave when he awoke from his sleep a moment ago. Secondly, I require further explanation on these administrative acts that are to be taken, apparently, to defy the compromise that has been reached between the two Houses.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You wait and see.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not prepared to wait and see. Before we carry this motion, the Committee is entitled to know what the Government intends to do.

Mr. Casey: That has nothing to do with it at all, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then why did the Minister refer to it?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: To reassure Aborigines that something will be done on their behalf.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister should let us know what the Government intends to do.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You will see in due course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to know now.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are not going to telegraph it to you.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There is going to be an election.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The sooner the better as far as I am concerned. I ask the Minister, in the spirit of sweet reasonableness at this time of the morning, first, to explain a little more clearly why he says there is no difference now because the verb has been put in the imperative rather than in the permissive and, secondly, what action the Government intends to take to get around this compromise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: New subclause (4) now provides:

The Treasurer shall from time to time pay to the trust such amounts as may be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose up to but not exceeding the amount of royalties paid to the Crown or a Minister of the Crown . . .

That means that the Government of the day has to recommend to Parliament the sum to be appropriated; when it has been appropriated that sum shall be paid. What precisely is the difference between that and providing that the Treasurer may, from time to time, pay to the trust such amounts as may be appropriated? In each case the Government has to recommend the sum to be appropriated to Parliament and, therefore, in each case it is a matter entirely of administrative discretion what is to be paid.

Mr. Millhouse: Why was the amendment made then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because members of the Legislative Council, while agreeing entirely to the legal position I am putting, felt that by having the word "shall" instead of the word "may" it might seem to the Aborigines that there was slightly more moral obligation to pay. As to what the Government intends to do to guarantee rights to Aborigines, when the appropriate action has been recommended to His Excellency in Council and carried out, it will be announced to the honourable member in due course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I can say in response to the Minister's last two sentences is that I think his refusal to give information is an insult to this Committee.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The way in which we have been dealt with by your members upstairs is an insult to the people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What we are considering now is the approval or otherwise of a compromise. The Minister has said that he intends to get around this some way or another, but he refuses to say what ways he intends to employ. I do not believe that the Committee should, or could, approve or disapprove of the compromise until it knows just what is in the Minister's mind. I ask him again to explain just what he proposes.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Does the Government intend to recommend to Parliament the appropriation of the full amount of any royalties obtained? The Minister nods his head, so I take it he does so intend, in which case this Committee cannot reject a recommendation of the Government as presently constituted, and I presume, therefore, that the Minister does not expect to be in office for very long.

Motion carried.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had divided the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill into two Bills, namely, the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill (No. 1) and the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill (No. 2); and that the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill (No. 1), comprising clauses 1 to 5 relating to judges' salaries and leave entitlement on retirement, had been agreed to without amendment.

GLENELG TREATMENT WORKS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works Extensions.

Ordered that report be printed.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGISTRAR).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COTTAGE FLATS BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 14 (clause 4)—After "4" insert "(1)".

No. 2. Page 1, line 14 (clause 4)—After "expend" insert "three-quarters of".

No. 3. Page 1 (clause 4)—After line 16 insert new subsections as follows:

(2) The trust shall expend the remaining quarter of the amount paid to it in each financial year in the building of houses in country areas which shall be let by the trust to persons of limited income.

(3) The provisions of the Country Housing Act, 1958-1960, shall apply to and in relation to any house built by the trust in pursuance of subsection (2) of this section.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

We had a long discussion in this Chamber on country housing. These amendments, making it mandatory that one-quarter of the appropriated funds shall be spent each year in country areas, are neither practicable nor desirable in their present form. Relatively, the country has been well served, as over \$1,000,000 has already been spent on special rental dwellings for needy people in country areas, and each year the revenue from the special fund permits further provisions. The substantial requirement is in the metropolitan area, including Salisbury and Elizabeth.

The General Manager of the Housing Trust does not desire that the Bill should be amended in this way. He expects that country areas can be further helped in the future if, as is proposed, the Commonwealth Government permits local authorities to participate in the \$2 to \$1 subsidy for aged folk's homes. I would welcome any suggestion from the Commonwealth Government that it would assist in erecting country housing. Several organizations

have done a tremendous job in assisting aged people to live in cottage flats: although these flats vary, people are pleased to live in them. I also commend the people who have approached the Commonwealth Government in this matter. As the greatest need for this accommodation is in the metropolitan area, I ask the Committee to disagree to the amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This legislation is to provide houses for people who are in need. The Treasurer and his Party, when in Opposition, made much of the plank of decentralization, and it was referred to here and outside the Chamber. Decentralization involves not only industry but people, who should be the prime consideration in any legislation passed in this Chamber. In those days decentralization was a popular and respectable word in the Labor Party.

Mr. Langley: It still is.

Mr. HALL: It has been forgotten then, although it is still used by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition because, of course, he remains in Opposition. I support the amendments, which I believe represent a small stipulation in regard to the proportions to be applied between the city and the country.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not follow the Treasurer's remarks about the Housing Trust and the opinion of the General Manager. I understand that the Commonwealth Government has provided, and is prepared to continue to provide, subsidies for these purposes to any approved organization, regardless of the fate of these amendments. Whereas we asked for "half" to be inserted, another place seeks to insert "three-quarters" which, in my opinion, is a reasonable compromise. The provision sought is a reasonable allocation in view of the population spread in this State. Although the greatest need undoubtedly exists in the metropolitan area, I think that by far the greatest activity already takes place there. I cannot see how this requirement would be any embarrassment to the authority; nor can I see how it affects Commonwealth policy in any way. It is a reasonable provision, which I support.

Later:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Legislative Council's amendments provide that one-quarter of the sum paid to the trust shall be spent in building houses outside the metropolitan area (as defined by the Industries Development Act) to be let to persons on a limited income. The metropolitan area as defined by that Act includes the municipalities of Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, Glenelg,

Henley and Grange, Hindmarsh, Kensington and Norwood, Port Adelaide, Prospect, St. Peters, Thebarton, Unley, Woodville, the Garden Suburb, the District Council of Campbelltown, and the cities of Enfield, Marion, Mitcham, Payneham, Walkerville and West Torrens. Surely, I do not need to explain where the greatest need and the greatest number of people requiring this type of accommodation exist. The sum of \$1,000,000 has been provided to provide accommodation for those in country areas who may be in necessitous circumstances. The Bill provides that, as Treasurer, I may (not "shall") do certain things. Naturally, I am concerned with those whose needs are greatest. I ask the Committee not to agree to the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sorry that the Treasurer sees fit to continue to maintain that country areas should be excluded from any benefit under this legislation. The money that will be used for this purpose arises from the guarantee fund, which depends on the sale of houses. Many of the houses, the sale of which has furnished this money, are in the country. Where security is readily available, a lending institution is not concerned with the provisions of the Act. At present houses are being sold through the Savings Bank, the Superannuation Fund or building societies and the sale of many houses in the metropolitan area does not come within the ambit of the Act. If the provisions of the Act are not involved, the lending institution concerned does not pay a commission into the fund. In country areas such as Port Augusta (where there may be some difficulty in selling a house if it becomes vacant through some default by the tenant) the houses are nominated by lending institutions, and their sale benefits the fund.

Under the Act, 182 houses have been built in the country, but under other legislation, where other finance is provided, over 1,200 cottage flats have been built in the metropolitan area. The money provided under the Bill should benefit old people in necessitous circumstances, and surely people in these circumstances can be found in country areas. Much has been said by Government members about decentralization. Surely it can be accepted that people in necessitous circumstances in the country want to retire and live in the areas from which they come rather than move to the city. Under the Bill, country people in necessitous circumstances will receive no benefit.

I am disappointed with the amendments, because I believe that over 25 per cent of the population lives outside the metropolitan area. As over 1,200 cottage flats have been built in the metropolitan area and only 182 dwellings have been built outside that area, I cannot understand why the Treasurer insists that the country areas should not receive some small benefit from this Bill, because in many instances the money that will be spent has been derived from transactions arising in the country.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The General Manager of the Housing Trust has said that he expects there will be a proposal to the Commonwealth Government to extend to organizations that have already participated in the \$2 to \$1 subsidy the provisions for building cottage flats in the country. The member for Gumeracha referred to the dwellings built in the country. However, they were not cottage flats: 182 houses have been erected in country areas. The rents of houses built in the country are being subsidized by the Housing Trust. I doubt whether the honourable member could mention three families in his district that would be prepared to live in the type of accommodation provided under this Bill, which is designed to assist widows who live in the metropolitan area. The houses in country areas are subsidized and the rent charged can be as low as \$2 a week. Surely the honourable member would not say that dwellings of four rooms and conveniences, with provision for a sleep-out (as are built in country areas), could be erected as cheaply as the cottage flats proposed under this Bill. The greatest number of people who contribute to this fund to provide for insurance against death and the house to be left to the widow are domiciled in the metropolitan area, not in country areas. At Whyalla, because of the extensive expansion by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, houses were needed for the employees and this Government has made provision so that houses are available to all who go there to work. The previous Government did not provide for people in difficult circumstances, but this legislation caters for widows in the metropolitan area, an area in which the greatest demand exists.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the light of the Treasurer's remarks earlier, I was mildly tempted to support him. He read a report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I did not read it: I quoted from it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I heard what the Treasurer said, I was staggered to think that he would put that forward as a reason for rejecting these amendments. When he referred to the report, it was to the effect that, because there was to be a change in the policy of the Commonwealth Government and an extension of the \$2 to \$1 subsidy scheme to councils in the country or elsewhere, this was the best way to solve the problem of housing elderly people in the country. Since then the Treasurer has been to Unley to speak on the platform with his colleague, the Leader of the Federal Labor Party, in support of that Party in the Federal election campaign. Before he went and since he returned he referred to an item in the policy speech of the Prime Minister. As it is the policy of the present Federal Government to extend this subsidy scheme to councils, we have the farcical situation of the Labor Treasurer in this State relying on the policy that has been put to the electors of Australia by the Liberal Prime Minister: not only relying on it, but assuming that that Prime Minister will be returned to office to put it into effect! This shows the absurdity of the situation into which the Treasurer has led himself. No reason exists why the amendments should not be accepted, as it is fair and just that we should ensure that a proportion of the money be spent in country areas. I hope the Treasurer will reconsider his decision.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There will be no reconsideration. The General Manager of the trust expects that local government authorities will participate in the \$2 for \$1 housing subsidy. The member for Mitcham believes that 25 per cent of the money I may make available should be spent outside the districts I have mentioned, but who would judge the fairness of the allocation? This provision will assist necessitous widows in this State. I trust the Committee will disagree to the amendments.

Mr. SHANNON: I am happy to know that this money is intended to assist widows.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I can please myself where it is spent: I will not be told by the Legislative Council.

Mr. SHANNON: In my district are three areas that have a higher percentage of widows than have most areas in this State. These women receive a pension, and a big proportion of that pension is taken up in rent. Years ago, \$600,000 was spent on houses for widows in the country, but only two were built at Mount Barker; the rental was \$2 a week.

These people were lucky, because for every cottage flat built in the country 10 were built in the metropolitan area, although the population of the metropolitan area was only double that of the country. The Treasurer was careful to read out the council areas to which he will apply the definition of the metropolitan area, but my district as well as that of others is excluded. Poor people in fringe country areas will miss out on the benefits of this Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This legislation is designed to exclude country areas. In fact, having served in this Chamber since 1933, I believe this is the first time that the Premier and Treasurer has forgotten that he is, in fact, Premier and Treasurer of the State, not merely Premier and Treasurer of the metropolitan area. The Legislative Council's amendments would be responsible for the building of only two and a half houses a year in the country. I believe the amendments are fair and should be supported.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I have never heard such hypocrisy as I have heard tonight from the other side.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't been listening much to your own members, then.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have been listening and I am sick and tired of listening to the honourable member's political gimmicks, and to Opposition members generally, crying crocodile tears and talking tongue in cheek. Not one thing in the Bill specifies that the money shall be spent in any specific area.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you believe what your Leader has said this evening?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I never believed the honourable member and never will.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You'll be sorry you said that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Bill relates to the whole of South Australia: there is no suggestion that country people will be neglected. To specify that the money shall be spent in one area or another is entirely wrong, because the Bill's very purpose is to meet a need where that need is evident. Who knows where the need will be most evident?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The Legislative Council's amendments are a reflection on the Housing Trust.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, and a reflection on the Government. This is a South Australian Government which will look after the welfare of people in South Australia wherever need becomes evident. I am disgusted

to hear such hypocritical remarks from members opposite.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not even indignant: I am disappointed at the remarks of the Minister. I did not think he would ever suggest that I was not genuine in my remarks. I admit that I referred to what had happened in the past, but are we going to repeat the sins of our forbears, or are we going to cure them? I believe that, on reflection, the Minister will withdraw his imputation, at least as far as I am concerned. The need for cottage flats is not confined to any particular area in South Australia.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the amendment.

Mr. Casey: What about Appila?

Mr. HEASLIP: Cottage flats are needed there and they are needed in various places in the honourable member's district: at Peterborough, for instance. I know the conditions there as I know the conditions in Port Augusta, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Wallaroo. However, the members for these districts will vote against the amendments simply because they have been suggested by the Legislative Council. The Premier and Treasurer of this State seems to think only of the metropolitan area. As he is the Premier and Treasurer of the whole of South Australia, he should think of country areas as well. Cottage flats are needed in the country as much as in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hughes: How long have you known about the conditions in Wallaroo?

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope the member for Wallaroo will get up and explain why he will vote against the amendments; I hope he will explain his reasons for so voting to the people in his district. We had a hysterical outburst by the Minister of Works. I am sure that he will be sorry for some of the things he said. He accused Opposition members of crying crocodile tears and of talking tongue in cheek; also, he suggested that country people would not be forgotten. However, if ever people have been forgotten, country people have been forgotten in this Bill.

Mr. Clark: That's not true.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is. People in the country are forgotten when money is allocated for needy people, but they are entitled to 25 per cent of the money available for these houses.

Mr. CLARK: The only restriction in the Bill on where these flats are to be built is governed by the need, but a restriction will be introduced if the amendments are carried.

I have asked for houses for Gawler for many years: I will keep on asking, and I will get them. Under the original Bill more houses would be built in the country than would be built under these silly amendments. I thank the member for Rocky River for referring to the places where the need is so great. The member for Onkaparinga admitted that there had been a gross neglect of many country areas: we are trying to remedy this.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand what is in the Bill, but apparently some Opposition members do not. The amendments, if carried, will cause restrictions. The member for Rocky River professed to know about conditions at Wallaroo, but I do not think he has been to Wallaroo since he lumped superphosphate there 40 years ago. During the life of the previous Government, when money was allocated for country housing, three houses were promised for Wallaroo. The council made land available to the Housing Trust to build houses with some of that money. I am sure the member for Rocky River remembers it too. I received a letter from the Town Clerk of Wallaroo asking me to ascertain why these houses had not been built. Indeed, the vacant block is still there now. The honourable member for Gumeracha, as Minister in charge of housing, replied to my questions and he knows why the houses were not built as well as I do.

Trust homes were built at Wallaroo and some of these would have become vacant over the last six years had it not been for deserted wives who still occupy the houses. The scarcity of applicants who could pay a normal rental is the fault of the previous Government in allowing Wallaroo to stagnate. Many of the people have had to leave the town to seek employment. The Bill does not say money shall not be spent in country areas, and a restriction could be placed on the sum spent in the country if this Committee agrees to the amendments.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you suggesting that the previous Government allowed people from your district to drift to the city in order to win the seat?

Mr. HUGHES: That is exactly what I am suggesting. I challenge any Opposition member to point to a provision in the Bill stating that money cannot be spent in the country. I have every confidence that, if the need exists at any time, the Government will provide this type of accommodation. That may not happen, however, if the Legislative Council's amendments are agreed to. Only last Friday

evening I expressed my sincere thanks to the Returned Services League for its active interest in deciding to build "Darby and Joan" cottages in my district for needy people.

Mr. Nankivell: Come off it!

Mr. HUGHES: Is the member for Albert sneering about what the league is trying to do? He sneers too much when I am advancing a sensible argument. If any member opposite thinks that I will vote against money that may be spent in my district on homes for persons in need, he is mistaken. I know the Government will respond to the need.

Mr. HURST: I oppose the amendments, and I find it most difficult to understand why the Opposition supports them, because they would restrict to 25 per cent the sum authorized to be spent on this type of accommodation in the country. If it is proved that a greater demand for these houses exists in the country than in the city, why should we restrict the proportion for country accommodation to 25 per cent? Actually, I believe the Opposition desires this restriction, because it knows the Government will do the right thing by people in the country. Members opposite know that the legislation will help members on this side at the next election.

It is contrary to the policy set out in the rule book of their Party for members opposite to impose restrictions on certain areas. However, the amendment would definitely restrict the sum available for country areas. Members opposite are not prepared to give the Treasurer authority to determine these matters on their merits. Who is a better authority than the Minister in charge to determine where these cottage flats should be built? Justice should be done wherever necessitous circumstances exist. The amendments unduly restrict the allocation of money from this fund.

Mr. BURDON: I oppose the amendments. The Bill provides that cottage flats shall be built for people in necessitous circumstances irrespective of where they live. Since this Government came into office, I have been able to obtain more houses for Mount Gambier than I ever obtained before. Despite my pleas to the previous Government little was done, but now I am getting something and, if the need exists, I expect to get something under the provisions of this Bill. Throughout this session, we have heard members opposite plead for country people. This Bill gives them an opportunity to do something for country people, but they support the amendments because they come from another place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer referred to council areas in the metropolitan area that most urgently needed cottage flats, but he did not refer to any country area. Government members have spoken of a restriction being introduced by the amendments, but the restriction was in the original Bill. It is impracticable to build cottage flats in the country and, obviously, the purpose of this Bill is to have them built in the metropolitan area. The amendments are designed to ensure that a small portion of the money will be made available for building cottage flats in country areas.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The interpretation of the member for Gumeracha is poppy-cock. I have never heard such a deliberate attempt to mislead the Committee. The amendments are being forced on this Chamber by another place, although the Bill does not refer to the metropolitan area or to country areas.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer made the point that the biggest housing problem in the community is the housing of widows. An elderly widow has to wait 10 years to obtain a cottage flat from the trust. What right has anyone to include a restriction which could mean that the ordinary priorities established in these cases would be upset? I am not saying that this would happen, but the member for Gumeracha and his colleagues in the Legislative Council would not know whether 25 per cent was the correct figure. This is an arbitrary figure for which there is no justification.

If the member for Gumeracha had been Treasurer and an attempt had been made to restrict the Housing Trust, he would have threatened members of the Legislative Council with what would happen if they did not toe the line. The amendments should be rejected because there is a real need in the community, and the trust, with the assistance of the Treasurer, can be relied on to meet that need. If the people in the metropolitan area have been waiting the longest, they should be satisfied first. The Opposition insists that the country should be looked after all the time, but this is playing politics. The old liberal policies that once existed are just about dead. I was surprised when the member for Mitcham supported the Legislative Council's amendments, because he knows that the figure of 25 per cent is arbitrary. He also knows the needs of the community.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to comment on the Treasurer's relying on Mr. Holt's policy?

Mr. HUDSON: It is the Commonwealth Government's policy not to provide the \$2 to \$1

subsidy other than for private organizations, which have been encouraged to sell cottage flats for \$2,400. Elderly people who have that kind of money to spend are being fairly well catered for by the Commonwealth Government's policy at present. Elderly people who need to rent houses are in difficult circumstances because of the policy of the Commonwealth Government.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments was adopted:

Because the amendments impose an unnecessarily restrictive qualification.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 3123.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I am pleased to be able to support this Bill, because the changes envisaged indicate how this branch of the health services of the State has grown and, as honourable members know, we have seen many advances in recent years in this field of medicine. There has always been a Director of Mental Health, who has been responsible to the Director-General of Health, and through him to the Minister. Because of the advances that have been made in the techniques of helping intellectually retarded people and mentally afflicted patients, I believe it is imperative that the Director in charge of this branch of the health service should have direct access to the Minister.

Questions of policy, treatment, and planning are being raised continually, and it is impossible to expect the Director-General of Health to be as closely informed on these subjects as is the person—the Director of Mental Health,

as he is currently termed. Further, in the direct control of them much time will be saved by the Director of Mental Health being able to go directly to the Minister and, for this reason, the change envisaged in title and direct access is a good one. The other provision corrects a technical error in clause 37b of the principal Act, which had the exact opposite effect to that intended. It referred to the admission of a mentally or intellectually retarded person to a training centre on the recommendation of a doctor's certificate more than 10 days old instead of less than 10 days old. These are the two main provisions of this legislation, and I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, because it is in the interests of this division of health in this State.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 3123.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): As the intentions of this legislation are proper, I support the Bill.

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

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 3124.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This Bill is consequential, because of the exclusion under the Mental Health Act of the provisions relating to the appointment of the Director-General of Medical Services. We have just considered the measure that makes the Director of Medical Health Services the senior officer in charge of the department dealing with mental health, instead of his being subject to the Director-General of Medical Services. This Bill deals with another phase of the status of the Director of Mental Health Services because it changes the title of Director of Mental Health Services to that of Deputy Director-General of Medical Services. Clause 5 inserts new section 5a that does this very thing and the succeeding subsection gives effect to the changes that streamline the legislation to meet the needs of the present time. Although I have not been actively associated with the gentlemen who will fill the positions of Director-General and Deputy Director-General, I have learned, since I have been a member of this House, that we are fortunate to have officers who have the

highest qualifications to perform these important duties. As the Bill seems to do what is necessary, I support it.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TOW-TRUCKS).

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 6 (clause 4)—After "road" insert "within the area".

No. 2. Page 2, line 17 (clause 6)—After "sections" insert "69a,".

No. 3. Page 8, lines 24 to 30 (clause 8)—Leave out paragraph (g).

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): As these amendments were moved, unsuccessfully, in this place, any debate on them now would be merely repetition of what was said earlier.

Mr. Hall: Members of the tow-truck trade are not against this amendment.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The word "area" refers to area of a 20-mile radius, and I suggest that the Committee agree to the amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I moved these amendments when the Bill was before the Committee previously. I spoke last evening to someone closely connected with the preparation of the Bill, and I was told that in the minds of those who initiated the measure it was never intended to exclude the use of trader's plates outside the 20-mile radius; only within that radius. As they were happy with the amendments, I support them.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this amendment be disagreed to.

It is most essential that paragraph (g) be retained in new section 83d.

Mr. HALL: True, paragraph (g) is an essential provision, under which it is possible for a person who is not affected by the legislation, and who is situated outside the 20-mile radius, to tow a vehicle into the area for repairs. It is essential that this line of demarcation be crossed; otherwise, all sorts of difficulties may arise.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement with the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 was adopted:

Because the amendment removes a desirable exemption.

Later, the Legislative Council indicated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 3, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

[*Sitting suspended from 3.5 to 3.44 a.m.*]

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 2 p.m. Because I do not wish Parliament to resume sitting after Easter, the sittings will be of short duration. As a result, I request that honourable members consider sitting in the evenings from the date of resumption. I expect that the session will terminate on Easter Thursday.

Although this is not a prorogation, I think I would be amiss if I did not extend my appreciation to the staff of this Parliament, particularly those in the galleries, for their work. I express my appreciation to the Government Printer, who has had to do a tremendous amount of work during this session, which has been almost continuous since the middle of June. The night sittings have made the session strenuous, as honourable members will agree. I include the many other people in this building who take part in the smooth working of this Parliament.

Between now and December 25 much water will flow under the bridge. Without reflecting on him in any way, I know that the member for Mitcham will be working in close association with a certain Mr. McLeay, a candidate in the forthcoming Commonwealth elections. This will be a challenge to him and it will not be a pleasant episode. I would not have mentioned it had the honourable member not looked so eager to go home. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, honourable members and members of the staff, including everybody in this building, a very happy Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is one occasion on which I can certainly agree with the Premier. Although this is not prorogation, I join with the Premier in thanking all those who have assisted us in the working of the House and in the reporting and printing of our debates. I wish them all the compliments of the coming Christmas season.

The SPEAKER: In putting the motion, I acknowledge on behalf of the staff the greetings that have been extended for the festive season and the words of appreciation of their work during this part of the session. I add my personal word of tribute for the assistance all the staff has rendered me and, I believe, all members generally, proving their

efficiency and courtesy at all times. To members, we extend the very best wishes for the festive season and hope that they return in February renewed in health and vigour.

Motion carried.

At 3.53 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 28, 1967, at 2 p.m.