

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, August 2, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS.**HIGH TENSION POLES.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Last week I directed a question to the Minister of Roads in connection with high tension electricity poles, telephone poles—call them what you will—being left out of alignment on Rakes Road and Hampstead Road. The Minister said he would get particulars as to the date when they would be put back into alignment in the interests of safety. Has he any further information on the matter?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. I indicated in my reply that they would be removed. I now have a report that the high tension poles in Rakes Road and Hampstead Road were left in place after widening had been completed and it is expected that the Electricity Trust will, in the near future, remove them completely. It is considered, in the meantime, that as they are well marked with black and white paint and Scotch-lite they present no greater hazard than, for example, a parked car or a tree on the roadway.

ALCOHOLICS CENTRE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A subleader in yesterday's *News* referred to the Government's proposal for building a home in which to treat alcoholics. I read the report with much interest because I understand that Mr. Allen, the Comptroller of Prisons, recently went abroad and has, no doubt, reported to the Government on similar homes he may have seen overseas. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the plans the Government has in mind are in line with what Mr. Allen may have seen or are they an improvement on anything he may have seen?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I read the article referred to by the honourable member and anticipated that I would be asked to make some explanation because previously I had made the claim that what we were setting out to do was not comparable with anything else in the world. I said that it was a most ambitious proposal. Before a final decision

was made on the plans that have now been submitted to the Public Works Committee we sent Mr. Allen abroad to see if he could find anything that would assist him in advising the Government on the final planning of the institution.

Honourable members are aware of the splendid work done by this officer regarding prison reform, for example the farm at Cadell, and he has drawn attention to progressive social steps that have been taken in dealing with unfortunate people. I went to the trouble of asking Mr. Allen this morning whether he would give me a report comparing our proposals with what he may have seen abroad. I have a report in which he sets out what the proposed alcoholics centre will do, and it states:

The scheme proposed for South Australia would be unique and more comprehensive than any project of this kind undertaken elsewhere in the world. The implementation of this plan would mean that the Government of South Australia would take the lead in Australia and the world in this sphere of social reform. The committee prepared legislation as requested by Cabinet. This was submitted to Parliament and after a few minor amendments it passed all stages. The Act known as the "Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act" was assented to on the 16th November, 1961, and will not be brought into operation until the centre has been established and is ready for use. It covers all problems arising from addiction to alcohol. No similar legislation exists in Australia or other parts of the world. Already many inquiries have been received relating to the Government's proposed plans, including some from other States.

I can endorse that statement. Only this morning I received a letter from another State about a proposed visit to South Australia by a person to examine our legislation and our proposals.

CATTLE VACCINATION.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Recently there has been quite a trend towards more dairy production in the Bordertown area. My question is addressed to the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, and relates to perhaps one of the chief scourges in the dairying industry, namely, contagious abortion, or C.A.B. In this State this problem has been overcome by the use of Strain 19 vaccination. When heifers are inoculated with this strain, three holes are punched in the ear, so that when cattle are bought in an area like Bordertown by people wishing to start in the industry, they can see which animals have been

vaccinated. The trouble arising in an area like Bordertown is that just over the border in Victoria there are far more cattle, where this matter of punching round dots in the ear is not adopted. People in the area are anxious that the same arrangement should be adopted in Victoria as that used in this State for the proper identification of these cattle.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I could express some private opinions on this matter, but as it relates to another Minister, I will address the honourable member's question to him and get the information.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Council do now proceed to elect by ballot two members of this Council to be members of the Council of the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to oppose the motion, on behalf of my colleagues, and to put our views before the public as a whole and this Council in particular. For many years it has been the aim of the Australian Labor Party to have a representative from this Council appointed to the council of the university. It is necessary to go back to the University of Adelaide Act, 1935-36, in which section 7 provides:

(1) Of the five members of the council appointed by Parliament two shall be appointed by the Legislative Council, and three by the House of Assembly.

(2) The said members shall be appointed by ballot.

(3) No person shall be eligible for appointment under this section unless he is a member of the House of Parliament by which he is appointed.

Sections 8, 9, 10 and 11 refer to the formula under which members are appointed and how long they may serve. The President of this Chamber and the Speaker of the House of Assembly shall write to the Chancellor of the University certifying that the persons named have been appointed by Parliament, which shall be conclusive evidence of the validity of the appointment. My Party has complained about the matter for many years because the A.L.P. has never been permitted to have one of its representatives from this Chamber appointed to the council, which denies approximately 50 per cent of the metropolitan area from having their point of view put before the University Council. The Act does not provide that the appointments shall be divided between any

particular Parties, but it has been the practice for many years in the House of Assembly for two Government representatives to be appointed and one from the Opposition. That has been accepted, but in this Council my Party has never been able to get it accepted that it shall have a representative on the council of the university.

I stand to be corrected, but I think there has been no appointment of a committee on which our Party has not had a nominee. I refer to such committees as the Standing Orders Committee, the Printing Committee, the Court of Disputed Returns and the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. All these committees are shared by the Parties. I know of no committee having been appointed with the exception of the University Council, on which Labor was not represented, where at least there is one from the Government and one from the Opposition Party. We have attempted over the years to correct that position and have submitted the facts constantly to ascertain where we stand. This session we took up the question on a Party basis and appealed to the Liberal members of this Chamber, with a view to getting one of the positions on the University Council. I understand that the position could have been corrected this session, with one from our Party, without hurting the feelings of any member of this Council. A vacancy has occurred because one of the members is not contesting the position.

Mr. Frank Walsh (Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly) took up the matter officially with you, Mr. President, before you were elected to your present high position, asking that the Council agree that the two positions on the University Council be shared by the Government and the Opposition. You handed the letter to your successor, the Hon. Mr. Story. We have no complaint about any delay that has occurred. In effect the letter leaves no doubt in the expression, "You can take your chance on whether or not we are going to appoint you." Under date June 3, 1962, the Hon. Mr. Story addressed the following letter to the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly:

Dear Mr. Walsh, *re* University Council.

I refer to your letter of 13/4/62 requesting I take up the matter with the members of my party in the Legislative Council to ascertain their views on the proposition contained in your letter. I introduced the subject at a recent meeting of my party, and full debate took place, resulting in the following decision.

My party is of the opinion that the existing arrangement should stand, *i.e.*, that those Members of the Legislative Council prepared

to offer themselves for service on the University Council, shall be nominated on the floor of the Council, and if necessary balloted for by the whole of the members present. I regret the delay in replying to your letter, but please accept my assurance the matter was dealt with at the first opportunity I have had to call the members together since taking over the position of Chairman.

That was the decision in a nutshell. It seems that we are told that we may belong to the Opposition, but we are not wanted as members of the University Council. We have, in effect, been told by the Liberal Party that they are not interested in us as a Party. They put up with us in this House as a necessary evil, but will not share the work with us.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is your own interpretation.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and a very sound one, too.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You were very strong on things being correct before, when you challenged me on that point. I would like you to stick to the letter.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I quoted what the letter said, and I am entitled to place my own interpretation on it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Just read the letter.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall. It states: My Party is of the opinion the existing arrangements with those members of the Legislative Council prepared to offer themselves for service on the University Council shall be nominated on the floor of the Council and if necessary balloted for by the whole of the members present.

That is what the letter states. I am entitled to place my own interpretation on it, and to me it states that the Liberal Party will retain these positions in their own right. If we did nominate anyone or in particular one of the four members of my Party, how many votes would that candidate get? He would get four, irrespective of the merits or otherwise of the candidates. Because of that position we consider that it is not a decision of this Council, but a decision arrived at in the Liberal Party room. That Party has selected the candidates, and its members know who will be elected.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: The candidates have already been told.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, so that it will not be the decision of the Council. It is not a real ballot with each member receiving a paper and voting according to his wish. We are chided about the way the trade union movement conducts its ballots, but those ballots are not conducted in the same way as is the ballot for the election of two University Council members.

I intimate that we as a Party will take no part in the election. It was suggested to the Premier that if the Government felt entitled to two members from this Chamber on the University Council, an amendment to section 7 of the Act could have provided for an extra member, that is, two from the Government and one from the Opposition. However, while the position is as it is at present, we will take no part in the election.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: How do you know you have no chance?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: You told us so.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: What the Leader of the Opposition said is rather interesting. He has indicated that as responsible members of this Chamber he and his colleagues will not take part in a ballot of this House. I can speak, not like the honourable member who meets in caucus, but as a leader and a Minister in a non-Party House who does not meet in any caucus. So far as my Ministerial colleagues are concerned, I know nothing of the communication to which the honourable member referred. It is all news to me, and if he had put the letter up for discussion, then I am afraid I could not agree with the communication. We are here to work under a Statute that governs affairs in this Chamber or by Standing Orders, and in this case the honourable member has read from the legislation governing this matter. There was no mention of "nominees" whatsoever. I do not know where he gets the idea of nomination, because it is a ballot of this House and everyone is eligible. Someone mentioned yesterday about being 23 years in a job and not knowing what he was doing. I have been here 23 years and I know sufficient about what goes on in this House to know that there is no nomination made for these positions. It is a selection of the House and a ballot of the House, and if the Leader of a Party says that his members will not take any part in the decision of the House, it is an extraordinary statement. It means that they are running away from their responsibilities. If the honourable member has any conviction on this matter let him back it up with his vote. If he is not prepared to vote, who is going to help him in his desires? I may wish to support the honourable member.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That will be the day.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member's colleagues are not prepared to vote for their own choice, and it seems they have excluded themselves from the ballot which is to take place.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I support the Leader of the Opposition.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister having replied the debate is closed.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: On a point of order and personal explanation, I take umbrage at the fact that the Leader of the Government did not indicate to the House that he was closing the debate. I thought he was rising to make a personal explanation.

Motion carried.

The Council proceeded to elect by ballot two members of the Council to be members of the Council of the University of Adelaide.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 1. Page 331.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): I join with other members in expressing condolences to the families of deceased former members of the Council. I do not intend to recount in detail their Parliamentary activities, because that has been done by previous speakers in this debate. For the information of members, records show that since 1941 six members of Parliament died during sessions of this Council.

Together with Mr. Peake, Clerk of the Legislative Council; Mr. Redman, who became Clerk of the Legislative Council; Mr. Buder; and Mr. Ron West, who was killed in action with the R.A.A.F. in 1944. In this House now there are three senior members. They are Sir Lyell McEwin, Chief Secretary, with over 23 years of Parliamentary service; the Hon. A. J. Melrose with 21 years to his credit; and myself also with 21 years.

I congratulate you, Mr. President, on being elevated to the high office of President of this Council. You entered this place three years after I was elected and after having gone through the various stages of elevation within your own Party to that of the President of the Council, following in the footsteps of Sir Walter Duncan. The impartiality you displayed as Leader of the Liberal and Country League in this Council, and your genial and courteous manner, indicate that you are a fitting occupant of the Chair. I know I express the opinion of all members when I say that no President or presiding officer, whether in this place or another place, can be a success unless he has the confidence of all the members over whom he presides. I say that you have that confidence and may you be long spared to preside over the Chamber in the manner indicated by your attributes.

I join with other members in expressing goodwill to his Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan. South Australia is proud of the long line of Governors she has had since representative government. Our present Governor is following in the footsteps of many notable Governors, and his interests in South Australian affairs coupled with his military service amply demonstrate that he will be a worthy successor to his illustrious predecessors.

With other members I join in extending felicitations to Her Majesty the Queen. In 1954 she came to South Australia and was entertained in this very building, where she opened a session of Parliament. It is a great tradition amongst British speaking people that no matter what the exultation of the public mind may be, or the people's strife, there is always something around which all classes can rally. That something is the British monarchy. It is considered that our system of representative government, which was handed down to us over 300 years ago, has been emulated but not exceeded by other countries in the world.

I do not intend to review what members have said in this debate. As a member of Her Majesty's Opposition I believe it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize Government action, to watch the expenditure of public money, and to put forward alternatives when criticism is made. In this way I hope to add a contribution to the non-progressive proposals put forward by the Government. The Playford Government reminds me of a mediocre cricket team batting on a sticky wicket. As cricket fans know, anything can happen in a cricket match and it is possible for anything to happen politically against the present Government in power. The Government is fortunate to have for its advisers men of high standing in their respective spheres in the various departments. The Hon. Mr. Story might well say that if the Labor Party were in power it would have the same officers to advise it. However, the difference then would be that they would be advising the Government in the implementation of the Labor Policy and using their acumen to bring in a policy acceptable to the people. The Labor Party is in the undeniable position of being able to claim that it received the majority of the votes of the South Australian electors. It is poor consolation to the electors that the Liberal and Country League in their smug parochial way remain in office claiming to represent the people as a minority Government when they depend on the support of two Independents who are not responsible to only one section of the people. This minority Government is attempting to

thwart the wishes of the people who voted at the last election. I shall say nothing more about that phase because enough has already been said.

The Government is most fortunate in having Dr. Rollison as Director-General of Medical Services. The Government is also fortunate in having as Under Treasurer Mr. Seaman, and also his associates, and the Government is happy in the knowledge that it has other departmental heads capable of giving the best administrative service to the community. The Government was also fortunate during the war years because it had the support of two Commonwealth Labor Governments and was able to do many things that it now claims it was responsible for, but which were actually the result of help given by the two Commonwealth Governments.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: How long ago was that?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I know the Chief Secretary does not have a short memory. I know he does remember the beneficence of the Commonwealth Labor Government and he agreed with the praises sung about the late Ben Chifley, who always regarded South Australia favourably. The Chief Secretary always echoed those sentiments.

I wish to refer to Mr. Manning, who retired as General Manager of the State Bank. I do not need to eulogize Mr. Manning, because his work as a banker and his guidance of the State Bank during troublesome periods—the war years and the postwar period—stand renowned. I am pleased that the Government saw fit to appoint him to the State Bank Board on his retirement, thereby retaining his services and making use of his knowledge which had done so much in the past to build up the State Bank, together with one or two private banks, which financed some of our major industries.

Housing is one of the most important phases of our economic and social existence. I do not wish my remarks to be misconstrued. I say at the outset that I am not attacking the South Australian Housing Trust. On the floor of this House, on public platforms and wherever I have gone, I have always paid the highest compliments to the Housing Trust for its work and achievements. The major portion of the money allocated to South Australia by the Commonwealth Government under the housing agreement is directed to the Housing Trust. The housing shortage in Australia is estimated at 90,000 houses. We find that in every other State the respective Governments, irrespective of the housing agreement, are sub-

sidizing or guaranteeing building societies in an endeavour to overtake the housing lag. However, this Government for some unknown reason is losing thousands of pounds each year that could be directed towards house building, because South Australia has no building societies assisted by this Government. This money would not represent a drain on the moneys received from the Loan Council. It could be done by an amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank, because much of the security of the Savings Bank is invested in other States in securities under the Trustee Act. I submit that it is just as important for this Government to solve the housing problem as it is for other States to solve it.

I suggest that the Government should consider fostering and formulating building societies in an endeavour to overtake the housing shortage. I have obtained figures relating to building societies in other States. Private building has now gone out of fashion and it is essential for the Government and building societies to provide the necessary houses for renting or purchase. The Governments of other States are channelling millions of pounds every year into the housing field in addition to the funds made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Under that agreement 30 per cent of the money granted by the Commonwealth to the States may be channelled into building society funds. That is part of the agreement. We are told that it would require an amendment of the legislation or a Bill to be brought down before we could use that money. Some years ago legislation was amended by Labor under which loans to building societies could be guaranteed or for the purpose of establishing societies or assisting those already established in an attempt to overtake the building lag.

We have one major building society in South Australia and two smaller societies. The amount they received from Loan funds is infinitesimal. Therefore, if this Government is anxious to improve the position it must realize, as the Labor Party does, that the building industry is in the doldrums, and that a buoyant building industry helps to lift other industries. The economy of any State or country is reflected in the demand for essential things associated with the erection of buildings. Home building is of such national importance that there should be a national authority established on a Commonwealth-wide basis to provide the necessary finance and to enable essential buildings to be erected at controlled rates of interest, instead of the exorbitant rates now charged by some institutions, often at 6½ to 7 per cent. Then

our young people, our future citizens, could get homes without being compelled to pay interest at the rate of seven, eight or nine per cent to hire-purchase companies for a second mortgage. This places a millstone around their necks for the first 10 or 15 years of their married life.

Since the inception of the housing scheme in New South Wales in 1937 the Government there has given guarantees to the extent of £153,000,000, and the guarantees in the last few years have averaged about £8,000,000 a year. Comparable figures for Government guarantees in Victoria are just over £66,000,000, a total of £4,000,000 being for last year. Since 1958 Queensland has participated in a similar scheme and building societies obtained finance from lending institutions to the extent of nearly £5,000,000, of which £2,050,000 was obtained during 1961, and of this latter figure £1,450,000 was subject to guarantee by the State Government there.

I mention that so that I may place before members some alternative proposal to the Government's scheme to provide homes. The Housing Trust was created to build homes for

renting for those in receipt of the basic wage or less. Homes were to be let to them at low rates. Later the trust largely discarded the field of building houses for letting and undertook the building of houses for sale. I shall not attempt to tell the trust how to run its own business, but I have an alternative which would enable homes to be built on money lent at a lower rate of interest and with a low deposit. I know that the Government has announced a scheme, with certain strings attached, for the building of homes on a deposit of £50.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: No-one now receives less than the basic wage.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member may have something there. The total allocation, under a new agreement to building societies and other institutions for home ownership for 1961-62, is estimated at £17,115,000 compared with £11,170,000 last year. Under the Commonwealth scheme providing the States with money for housing, a total amount of £50,400,000 was distributed to the States as follows:

	1961 Act. £	1962 Act. £	Total. £
New South Wales	14,600,000	2,403,000	17,003,000
Victoria	11,600,000	1,927,000	13,527,000
Queensland	3,300,000	900,000	4,200,000
South Australia	8,000,000	1,036,000	9,036,000
Western Australia	3,000,000	706,000	3,706,000
Tasmania	2,400,000	528,000	2,928,000
	42,900,000	7,500,000	50,400,000

That money has been allotted by the Loan Council on a percentage basis. Thousands of pounds could be used by building societies without draining on the money provided by the Commonwealth Government in order to increase the erection of houses and other buildings necessary for the economic development of South Australia.

We have several primary producers in this Council and during the debate they gave much advice as to how the Labor Party should run its business. Some of them seem to know more about the working of the Labor Party than members of the Party itself. I have not heard Liberal members either in this Council, the House of Assembly, or in the Commonwealth Parliament say anything in connection with the European Common Market and the shipping freights charged primary producers. The latest move of overseas shipping companies has been to increase

freight rates, which Australians must pay. It may be of interest to honourable members to know that Australia pays nearly £250,000,000 a year to foreign shipping and insurance companies. This exceeds the value of the British and European trade that we may lose because of the Common Market. Australia is charged £170 a ton freight on steel to Singapore; yet, freight from Singapore to Britain—twice the distance—is only £120 a ton. To Indonesia, we pay £173 a ton, and yet for the tremendously greater distance from Britain to Indonesia the cost is only £163 a ton.

The Australian Meat Board states that since 1955 freight rates for beef have gone up 62 per cent, for lamb 44 per cent and for mutton 34 per cent. We are an island continent entirely surrounded by sea, yet we depend on foreign shipping to take our products overseas. The Australian shipping line

was a great boon to primary producers, who are now being mulcted because of increased charges made by these foreign shipping lines, and yet primary producers are expected to be able to sell their goods overseas at a profit. What will be the position if Great Britain enters the Common Market, with the price of our products at a rate comparable with those of other countries? I suggest to my friends opposite that instead of busying themselves with the working of the Labor Party, they should look after the interests of our primary producers. They should make some attempt to rectify the position.

I was pleased to hear my friend, the Hon. Mr. Giles, mention the trade union movement during his speech. I compliment him on his reasoned speech. He does not need to shake his head on this issue, because I have some very illuminating facts. We have heard much from time to time of rising prices and lowering of costs. The costs of primary production should be reduced. Harry Douglass, leader of the powerful union, the Iron and Steel Trades Federation, and the Chairman of the Economic Committee of the Trades Union Congress, is the Chairman of the organizing committee of the campaign, which is being run under the title of National Productivity Year and is to be inaugurated by the Duke of Edinburgh on November 14. Anne Goodwin, this year's president of the T.U.C., is among the campaign's prominent patrons.

Britain's National Productivity Year is the outcome of the initiative of unions and employers' federations, but they have enlisted the help of all the bodies capable of giving practical assistance. Sponsoring the year is the British Productivity Council which for 10 years has been spreading information about the need for higher industrial efficiency and ways of achieving it. Although this council draws most of its revenue from the Government, it is self-governing. Its constituents are the Trades Union Congress, the publicly-owned industries, and the four principal national federations of employers. For the National Productivity Year they are being reinforced by all the universities and more than 80 professional and research institutions specializing in subjects as varied as work study, costing, ergonomics, refrigeration, design psychology, engineering inspection and accident prevention.

It is obvious that professional men, skilled artisans and employers have combined on this

council for the purpose of increasing productivity, which will assist Britain's economic welfare. More than 100 local committees have been set up to make sure that the campaign reaches every level. Trade unions are strongly represented on these committees, most of which are already well advanced with the preparation of their programmes, and are making a point of bringing experts to demonstrate and talk on their specialist techniques of quality control, human relations, fuel economy, supervision and the like.

Britain is high among the world's leaders in its real production per head. The national level of output is still climbing, though not as fast as in some other countries in the past few years. There is dispute, in which union leaders have been vigorously outspoken, about the causes of this and the extent to which Government policies have hampered or helped the process of economic expansion. What is not in dispute anywhere is the need to make industry efficient.

In the Second World War the trade union movement in Australia was asked for its assistance during the economic emergency caused by the war. In Great Britain for the past 10 years this committee has been established with funds from the Government and assistance from the trade union movement. This assistance plays a prominent part in the economic development of every country where the movement is recognized by the authorities.

Under the auspices of the Loan Council the powers of the States are being frittered away. There is an agreement between all States and the Commonwealth, but at the Premiers' Conference there is a formula used which will remain in operation for six years. The Commonwealth Government in order to gain further powers over the sovereign powers of the States offers them various interest-free, non-repayable amounts, but directs how the money shall be spent, so that the States have no control over this spending. Recently, £10,000,000 was given to the States—Queensland received £3,340,000, New South Wales £2,240,000, and Victoria £1,800,000. It is obvious that Queensland, for political reasons, was favoured with the larger amount. At the last Commonwealth elections the Menzies Government suffered a defeat in Queensland and now gives that State the lion's share of any hand-outs. The same thing has happened in Victoria.

The works being carried out in those States are almost under the direct control of the Commonwealth Government, which by lending this money determines what major projects shall be carried out.

The Labor Party has always had a policy regarding aborigines. It believes that these natives of Australia should have more humane treatment; they have been regarded as the lost legion. The Commonwealth Government has passed legislation for the Northern Territory, giving the natives full rights there. It is interesting to read the comment of Mr. Davis Daniels, who is a full-blooded aborigine, and the increasingly-vocal secretary of the Northern Territory Council for Aboriginal Rights. Commenting on the Bill passed by the House of Representatives earlier this year to give all full-blooded aborigines the vote, Mr. Daniels said:

The right to vote doesn't really mean much without other rights. What we need is the right to equal education, equality in wages, the right to travel where we want to, like anybody else, and the right to own land. Mr. Daniels then resurrected an old grievance. He and others of the small band of aborigines who have been granted citizenship have "full rights" in the Northern Territory. But he loses them if he crosses the border to South Australia, Western Australia or Queensland, where other laws prevail. He said, "This makes my so-called citizenship meaningless." That seems to sum up the position, until such time as there is a more determined attempt made by Governments to see that these natives receive the same treatment as other ordinary human beings, such as having their own land, receiving education, and being assimilated into the white way of life.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins; both gentlemen spoke lucidly. I had a sort of fellow-feeling for them making their first speech in this Chamber, but they displayed commendable sangfroid. They told their story, explained their policy, and did not raise any side issues to which exception could be taken. I compliment them on their speeches, but point out that this Council is different from another place. While we may get high blood pressure at times during discussions, every honourable member as soon as discussions are over leaves the Chamber as he entered it, bearing no personal grudge against any honourable member who opposed him in debate. I hope the few suggestions I have made will be noted by the Government

so that there may be some amelioration of the conditions I have mentioned.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is an honour to be associated with the message of congratulation that you, Mr. President, conveyed on behalf of members to His Excellency the Governor on the occasion of his elevation to the high rank of K.C.M.G. by Her Majesty the Queen. It is fitting that the services of Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan should be recognized in this way, not only as the Queen's representatives in this State at present, but as two people who have devoted their adult lives to the services of the Queen in the interests of the democratic way of life. As the representative of Her Majesty, the Governor in Council, acting jointly with the two Houses of Parliament within the framework of the Constitution, comprises the law making and governing authority in this State. Our Vice-Regal couple are well equipped to undertake the responsibility of acting as hosts to our beloved Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh when they visit South Australia early next year. It will be an event that I am sure we all look forward to with eagerness.

I also mention the impending visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand. I am sure the people will give them an enthusiastic welcome befitting the Sovereign of an independent pro-Western and friendly member of the South-East Asia Treaty Organization.

Mr. President, mention has been made of your elevation to the important position of President of this Council, and I entirely endorse all the sentiments expressed. Like other members I regret the passing of a number of previous members of this Chamber and another place. I offer my condolences to the bereaved relatives. I congratulate all the recipients of honours during this year for work done in fields of community service. They have received a fitting reward.

I add my best wishes to the Hon. Mrs Cooper, who has been selected to represent this Parliament at the General Council Meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at Lagos, Nigeria, in the near future. As one who has been privileged to represent this Parliament at a similar conference to deal with matters of good relationship at a time when history is being made, not on a yearly but a daily basis, I feel confident that a good impression of Australia will be gained if all the representatives to the meetings are up to the calibre of Mrs. Cooper.

I thank the mover and seconder of the motion for the way in which they performed their task. The Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, the mover, has a wealth of experience behind him in the sphere of local government. He is a successful businessman in his own right, and will be an asset to his district as well as to the State. The Hon. Boyd Dawkins, the seconder of the motion, comes to us with a good record in local government, as an organizer, and as a most successful stockbreeder and farmer. I am pleased to welcome them as members of this Chamber, and I think we can look forward with great interest to their future as useful members of this Parliament. I congratulate them both most sincerely on a job well done, not only in moving and seconding the motion, but on being elected to Parliament despite the prediction of many of our friends in the Labor Party, who said it could not be done.

The subject matter of His Excellency's Speech is further proof of the fact that the Government has the interests of all sections of the community at heart and is planning for a balanced economy on sound business lines. In the last 12 months it has not been easy for most of us, especially those depending on manufacture and some forms of primary production. However, as a whole, this State has suffered less, as the result of good government, than would normally have been expected.

Paragraph 4 of the Opening Speech deals with seasonal conditions, production, etc., and I want to comment on one or two aspects under these headings. Many people do not realize that although seasonal conditions may be conducive to increased yields it does not necessarily follow that the primary producers reap the full benefit of Nature's bounty. Let me give an example. The citrus crop in South Australia this year is a healthy one. About 1,540,000 cases will be harvested, but the fruit is larger than is normally expected. Over a long time a voluntary marketing organization has been evolved and has worked successfully. A quality export market to New Zealand has been established on a fixed price basis, as well as trade with Singapore, Malaya and Hong Kong. Unfortunately the markets in South-East Asia prefer a small sized fruit, and in a year like this with over-production and large oranges it will be difficult to satisfy the markets in Singapore, Malaya, and Hong Kong. Added to this, a very large crop of fruit exists in California, and it is small fruit. Most of the River Murray production finds its way into export markets, as well as markets in Mel-

bourne and Sydney. Adelaide is the traditional market normally of the private packers mainly located at the southern end of the River Murray, and nearer to the Adelaide metropolitan area. In a normal year all is well, but in years such as this glut conditions occur, with subsequent falls in prices. The financial return to the producers this season is most disappointing and presents a great challenge to the industry to find new outlets for the production.

The position in the wine grape industry is likewise causing concern. It would appear that a record crop has been processed in South Australia this season. It has been done by South Australian wineries, both co-operative and proprietary, and, to put it crudely, they are bursting at their seams with juice. I think only a small quantity of fruit was left on the vines at the end of the recent vintage. The growers who delivered to co-operative wineries have received the agreed intake price and will receive in addition bonuses as the wine is sold. Those who disposed of their fruit to proprietary wineries are, in some cases, not so fortunate. For many years a verbal understanding has existed between winemakers and growers that grapes would be paid for in full before June 30 of each year. It is true to say that some proprietary winemakers have paid half of the agreed price. Some have paid one-third and some have paid as little as 20 per cent with no guarantee as to when they will finalize their payments.

I wish, very briefly, to trace the history of the wine industry over the last few years in order to get the record straight. There has been much misunderstanding or misrepresentation about the events leading up to the present position and the public should know the true facts. On Tuesday, August 18, 1959, Messrs. King, Hambour and Laucke, members of Parliament, presented petitions in another place from grapegrowers in the districts of Chaffey, Alexandra, Light, Barossa and Angas praying that the petitions be granted by the House for an inquiry into the wine industry. These petitions were signed by 11 growers, but were supported by letters covering another 650 growers who had signed an earlier petition, but were ruled out of order because the petition was not drafted in proper form. The members of Parliament concerned handed the lists of names to the Minister of Agriculture and asked that the position be investigated.

On Wednesday, October 21, 1959, the Hon. T. C. Stott, the member for Ridley, presented

a petition from 31 electors in his district again asking for an inquiry to be held. Several questions were asked in the intervening months by the members who had presented the original petitions. On December 3, 1959, Mr. King, the member for Chaffey, asked a question of the Premier in the following terms:

Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made with investigations now being conducted into the wine industry in South Australia?

The Premier replied in the following terms:

The Government has received requests from producers and producers' organizations regarding an inquiry into the wine industry, and it has also received requests on the same matter, but in a slightly different way, from the winemakers themselves. With the best of goodwill from both sides of the industry, an investigation is being made. The Director of Agriculture made a preliminary report upon the matter, but more recently—some time last week, actually—the Prices Commissioner was instructed to make a full-scale inquiry into the wine industry, both from the point of view of the price to growers and selling problems in the industry. I think all interested parties have expressed their approval of the arrangements and, so far as I know, they are co-operating to the fullest extent to make information available to the Prices Commissioner, and I do not doubt that in due course a very useful report will be available.

From this it can be seen that, at this point, an investigation was being carried out. The investigation was well under way. An assurance had been given by the Premier that the Prices Commissioner was carrying out an investigation and that was precisely what the petitions asked should be done. On the night of the same day—at midnight—Mr. Bywaters, the member for Murray, moved "that notices of motion be now resumed", but the motion was lost. The Prices Commissioner, Mr. Murphy, carried out his investigation in a most competent manner, receiving co-operation from all sections of the industry.

His recommendations were circulated to the interested bodies in April 1960. April is on the eve of the vintage. I will not weary the House with all his recommendations but in the first year growers benefited substantially by price increases, which, although less than the sum recommended by the Prices Commissioner, were a voluntary increase on the part of the winemakers. In the same report the Prices Commissioner recommended to the winemakers that they increase the price of wine to offset the suggested increases in the prices of grapes. Some winemakers contended that they should not pay the whole of the increased prices recommended until they had received the benefit

of the proposed increase in wine prices. This is interesting! In 1961, the Prices Commissioner recommended further increases in the prices of grapes sufficient, he claimed, to cover the normal increase plus the amount short-paid in 1960.

To the best of my knowledge, all the wine-makers honoured their promises and paid accordingly in the 1961 season. In the 1962 season the Prices Commissioner, after consultation with all sections of the industry, recommended a small increase in the prices of grapes, which was agreed to by the winemakers and will, I am confident, be honoured in the long run although payments are delayed, as I have previously stated. The question may well be asked, "How much in pounds, shillings and pence has the grapegrower benefited by increased payments since the vintage of 1960 when Mr. Murphy made his first recommendation for the three seasons?" These are the amounts in actual detail. In the 1960, 1961 and 1962 seasons the growers will have benefited, when final payments are made, to the extent of £1,251,342 in excess of the 1959 price. All my figures relate to grapes sold to proprietary winemakers only, co-operatives being excluded.

In the dry areas the three vintage advantage ranges from £4 a ton, with a weighted average increase of £5 7s. 6d. a ton. Expressed as a percentage increase that is 22.3 per cent over the 1959 prices. Dealing with the irrigated areas for the same period the varietal increase was from £2 10s. a ton to as high as £6 10s. a ton, with a weighted average increase of £3 6s. 3d. a ton, or a percentage increase of 19.2 per cent over 1959. I have endeavoured to set out fairly and squarely the position in the wine industry over the last three seasons, because I believe the position has been clouded by far too many side issues introduced in the main for political purposes.

On November 16, 1960, the Hon. T. C. Stott, M.P. moved:

That the prayer contained in petition No. 1 from the commercial grape growers of wine grapes in the electorates of Ridley and Chaffey for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the wine industry, be granted. Previously they had asked for an inquiry. Twelve months later growers were asking for a Royal Commission to inquire into the wine industry. During the course of his remarks Mr. Stott pointed out that although he had moved the motion, he could see grave difficulties in the appointment of a Royal Commission,

which would automatically cause the withdrawal of the Prices Commissioner from the inquiry he was making at that time; and at a period just prior to the vintage when there was no possibility of a Royal Commission being able to bring in a finding prior to the intake of crops in March and April. The motion was lost.

One or two interesting thoughts emerged. Irrespective of any finding of a Royal Commission or any other kind of inquiry, there is one insurmountable difficulty, and it always crops up when this subject is discussed. No-one can force the winemakers to buy grapes against their will. That is one of the undeniable rights of the individual. It is one of the points which a former member for Chaffey so rightly pointed out during his 18 years of representation for this district. What has been accomplished to date in the matter of increased prices has been by mutual agreement. There can be no compulsion on winemakers to buy grapes, irrespective of what legislation is put forward. There is only a verbal agreement among the winemakers that they will pay the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner. To the best of my knowledge, the agreement was honoured in 1961, and we hope it will be honoured in 1962. It is interesting to note that some proprietary companies met their demands in full last season, and these wineries are located the greatest distance from the Murray irrigation areas, from which they buy a large proportion of their supplies. They consider it economic to pay £3 10s. for cartage, which works out at 6d. a gallon on a 150 gallon a ton recovery rate. In summing up, I think that growers and winemakers need to do some fairly deep thinking on the future of the industry. If the European Common Market materializes, we can all really be in trouble. If the time comes when winemakers say that even for one year they do not require grapes they cannot be compelled to buy them because it would be against the Australian Constitution, and therefore outside the jurisdiction of Parliament. I think that too much industry money is being frittered away in costly individual selling organizations, in unnecessary price-cutting wars in the other States and in individual sales promotion schemes, particularly on export markets.

The co-operative wineries should give a lead to the industry by establishing a genuine one-brand sales promotion scheme in South-East Asia. Growers and proprietary winemakers should enter into firm contracts for the supply and the payment for goods, as is done in practically every other business of this type.

After much research and investigation I am more than ever convinced that the wine grape-growers in particular and the industry as a whole are most fortunate to have a negotiator, arbitrator and adviser of the calibre of Mr. Emmett Murphy, the South Australian Prices Commissioner, and if he is given the support of genuine grape-growers' organizations in this State and not made a political football by a few individuals, then I can still see a ray of hope for us all. I have had the co-operation of the State executive committees of both grape-grower organizations and winemakers over the years that I have represented them in this Parliament, and I will continue to advocate on their behalf in the way I believe their interests may best be served.

Time does not permit me to develop fully my comments on certain shortcomings in the canning industry, but honourable members can be assured that I shall have plenty to say when the opportunity presents itself in the near future.

Last year I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Agriculture of most of the growers' organizations dealing with fruit and vegetables, seeking legislation to establish a pest board to deal with existing pests and those which may from time to time be introduced into this State. There is an urgent need for legislation at this moment as a result of a decision by the Minister of Agriculture not to continue financial assistance for the attempted eradication of a plague known as Oriental Peach Moth in certain areas of the Murray districts. Legislation is necessary to enable producers to organize finance from among themselves on an equitable basis, and unless this legislation is introduced and, if acceptable, passed quickly, this pest will get completely out of hand in the same way as Codling Moth did.

Paragraph 6 of the Governor's Speech deals with exploring and developing the national resources of South Australia, particularly in the field of forestry and mining. With the forests we have in South Australia of both soft and hardwoods, it should be practically unnecessary to go outside the State for our supplies of timber for most purposes. I was rather shocked to find that the Railways Department, for one, bought timber recently from Western Australia. This is a matter that should be watched and priority given to locally produced timbers. In the area which will be affected if the proposed Chowilla Dam is proceeded with, there are thousands upon thousands of wonderful red gum trees on a reserve, but when the water gets over them they will die. Every effort should be made to

make use of these red gums. Milling facilities are available almost on the spot to deal with about 500,000 super feet a year, and I believe that they should be recovered and the timber stored if necessary rather than just allowed to die. I am referring to the area between the South Australian border and the new dam site wall.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Is not that land in Victoria?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, in South Australia. There is about 12 miles of it. I think the Woods and Forests Department should be doing more in the field of experiment on such trees as "deltoides", of the Poplar family, used extensively in the match-making industry. On the Murray River at Cobram, in Victoria, an experimental stand of this variety is making excellent progress, and I see no reason why it should not do well in parts of South Australia. I believe that we have the right conditions to enable this timber to be grown, and it could be used not only for matchwood, but for other purposes. It is a white pine type, and I believe it could be used around the new proposed dam site, which would be an ideal spot to plant this variety of Poplar. It could be a useful commercial proposition, but it needs the encouragement of the Woods and Forests Department.

I am pleased to see private enterprise and the Government working closely together in the field of mining, particularly in mineral survey work. Seismic surveys are being carried out at present by the Mines Department for private companies, and this is how Government departments should work. I do not like to see Government departments taking over the full responsibility of this work. I believe they can best serve their interests and those of the State by working as closely as possible with private enterprise.

I refer to paragraph 2 of His Excellency's Speech which states, "My Ministers have advised me to call you together at this early date in order to afford an opportunity for discussion and determination of any matters that may arise in consequence of the recent election." We have been told many times what should have happened following the last election. We have heard how some people wanted to buy a tommyhawk. I believe the Government took the only constitutional course possible in remaining in office until such time as Parliament could be called together. There was no clear-cut decision: neither Party had a majority, and it was merely a matter of calling the House together and then deciding

the position. Certain suggestions have been made in newspapers, by important people and by leaders of political Parties, that the Government has done something dreadful, extremely dastardly, unconstitutional, and gerrymander-like. Getting down to fundamentals, and now that the time for window-dressing has passed, we do not hear much of the way the Government went about continuing in office. It remained as a caretaker. Not a docket was signed during the period it was acting as caretaker. Government works were at a standstill except for one or two essential projects. The Premier sought permission from the Leader of the Opposition in another place, which was granted, for these works to continue. It is fortunate for the people of this State that the Government remained in office, and that it obtained the support of the two Independent members, because the performance of the Opposition at about that time was not that of people of mature thought. There was a television camera in this building, which is a place of dignity, and in which there should be responsible people. Those who walked around with placards, holding them behind their backs, acted like juveniles. The people of South Australia had a lucky escape when the Independent members decided to support this Government.

I believe this State has been extremely well served for a long period and has progressed mainly because the Government has followed Liberal principles. People's thinking is becoming more and more socialistic. All people who own their own business are dyed-in-the-wool conservatives. When dealing with someone else's money one is socialistic, but when dealing with one's own, one is conservative. We cannot live in the best of two worlds. We have to make up our mind whether we are prepared to pay for all the wonderful socialistic promises given at elections and at other times, or whether we are prepared to pay for it with our own sweat, which was done in the pioneering of this State and country.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What about your own Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the honourable member had paid attention he would have understood me. This State has prospered under the principles of Liberalism. Its people had an extremely lucky escape at the last election, and I am sure they have learnt their lesson.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): In closing the debate, may I join with previous speakers in their remarks concerning your appointment, Sir, to the office of President. I welcome the advance which you have made through this House from private

member, to Leader of the Party, and now to President, an office which you are well equipped to occupy. I know you will conduct the affairs of this House on the same high plane as in the past.

I join in the congratulations which have been extended by previous speakers to His Excellency the Governor on the further honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty. I am sure that those who have been closely associated with His Excellency, and that includes a large number of the people in South Australia because of the activities of His Excellency and Lady Bastyan in the metropolitan area and country, will join in my sincere congratulations.

I add my tribute to those paid to our representative at the forthcoming Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, the Hon. Mrs. Cooper. We know she will represent us in a proper manner, because she has the tact and judgment which are necessary at these gatherings. I am confident she will be a worthy representative and I hope she may gain much experience during the trip. We know her capacity for absorbing things of importance wherever she goes, and we look forward to some interesting stories from her on her return.

As to the mover and seconder of the motion, all of us know what it means to make one's first speech in Parliament. It is something quite different from any previous experience. It may be all right to get up amongst a crowd of people in a hall, knowing that they are either for you or against you, where there are no Standing Orders to worry about, and where your remarks are not received in absolute silence, but there is a difference when one's first speech is made here. I feel sure that many fine contributions will come from these two members, to assist greatly in the deliberations of the Council.

I add my congratulations to all speakers in this debate, which, I think, has been well up to the standard of previous Address in Reply debates. I offer my special congratulations to the members who spoke on behalf of the Opposition. I thought their speeches were well prepared from their point of view, and they displayed an atmosphere of tolerance in the matters they raised. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone spoke after his Leader and raised one or two points that interested everybody. He first referred to full employment, which is something that is constantly in the mind of the Government. If that were not so we would not be enjoying the position referred to by the honourable member, which is that our employment figures are good, compared with

those of the rest of Australia. This has not been achieved without some planning. Particularly last year we had to plan because certain things took place that affected one of our major industries seriously, and it brought about a large number of dismissals. Had it not been for the Government's action in making special funds available for employment purposes we would not be in the present good position, compared with that in other States. I support the honourable member when he says that there is no room for complacency. There never has been, and there never will be, any complacency in the mind of the Government. The establishment of a special department to cater for industry is a sufficient guarantee of the Government's interest in the matter.

It is difficult to get the complete answer to the approach to the employment problem. Only recently an employer approached me and said, "What is all this talk about unemployment?" He said that he had advertised for a junior clerk, but had received only one application—from a person without any qualifications. He then contacted various organizations and city schools, with a negative result. He then advertised for a retired person, and received replies from 40 applicants, some over 60 years of age and some over 65 from whom an appointment was made. He said that he preferred to appoint a person to the junior job because of the opportunities for advancement. The one original application had come from a Scottish migrant of a few weeks' standing. He said, "Well, laddie, I admire your ambition. I am prepared to offer you a job in the workshop. Will you take it?" The reply was, "Yes," and the man who took the job is doing well. Comparing the position, he is now getting £10 a week as against £3 a week in Scotland. He was the only applicant and he got the job. Although there may be some unemployment in this State, there are jobs that are waiting to be filled. How the position is to be balanced, I do not know.

Another matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone was related to the visit that he and others made to the Parkside Mental Hospital. Again I congratulate him on his approach to the question, because he did not approach it like other critics, either in an irresponsible way or for the purpose of using these unfortunate people as a political football. His remarks were fair. He said he saw some conditions that were good and some that were not so good. That is admitted, but it applies in any walk of life. It applies in our homes. We do not all have modern homes. It applies in our factories, because we do not have all

modern factories. We have not all got air-conditioning in our factories and in our homes. At the hospital we have some of the best conditions and some not so good. That is realized, and that is why we have sent the Director of Mental Health, with two architects from the Public Buildings Department, to another country for the purpose of seeing what there is in the way of new buildings, so that when we have our new buildings erected they will be something rather better than exist elsewhere.

To those who say that what we do is too little and too late, I suggest that they point out where we could have withheld the expenditure of public money in the past in order to make progress in this hospital activity. I do not think anyone can show where the Government has spent money needlessly, or where the expenditure should have been given a different priority. Money has been spent on useful work. We must give employment a high priority. Our hospitals, water supplies, electricity supplies and sewerage schemes are associated with health, and that is why there has been large expenditure on them. Any suggestion that the Government has been niggardly in its expenditure in these directions is without foundation. The honourable member referred to Dr. Shea going to a position in New South Wales, and asked what was wrong, and whether we did not pay him enough salary. It is interesting to note that Dr. Shea will be going to New South Wales. I spoke to the Public Service Commissioner regarding that and was told that he had spoken to Dr. Shea and was assured that the salary Dr. Shea was to receive had nothing to do with his decision to accept the appointment, but the deciding factor was that it represented an opportunity in a bigger field of work. New South Wales has improved its position regarding the appointment of psychiatrists. We have vacancies in that field and have endeavoured to recruit psychiatrists, but as far as money is concerned South Australia spends more per patient each year than does New South Wales.

Many irresponsible statements have been made without any foundation, but my figures do not represent guesses. They are taken from the Auditor-Generals' reports in the various States and from the *Commonwealth Statistical Register* on population figures. It stands to reason that in the short period since the Stoller report South Australia could not have sunk to the position suggested. At the time of the report we were nowhere near the bottom drawer in that gentleman's criticism, although I am not suggesting that he inquired into the

position any more closely than some other people have.

The Chair of Psychiatry or Mental Health was also mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone and I recollect that something was done about that. Facilities are provided at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for professional occupation. I asked my colleague, the Minister of Works, to obtain information for me and the answer I received this afternoon is that the university has twice tried to fill that position and has advertised throughout the whole of the English speaking world. At first an appointment was made of a gentleman from Sydney, but he was later offered a Chair in Sydney and asked to be relieved of the appointment here. Further efforts were made. In response to an advertisement last year several applications were received, but the university was not prepared to appoint any of the applicants, apparently considering they had insufficient qualifications for the position. The university is still trying to fill the position. That is the answer relating to the Chair of Mental Health. This is a university matter and the university is apparently trying to fill the position, but this type of person is not to be found hanging on a tree and we have difficulty in obtaining psychiatrists to work in the hospital.

I am as concerned as, or probably more concerned than, others, because our inability to fill this position affects not only our mental institutions but also the standard of training of our general medical profession, who should have certain psychological training. We are losing, not only in the mental sphere, but in our general standard of medical training. I hope the university will soon be able to fill that Chair, because the appointment will serve two purposes—it will result in better teaching in the medical profession and will also offer some fillip to our chances of obtaining qualified people in mental hygiene. In the meantime, everything that can be done will be done. We are not seriously deficient in staff, comparatively speaking. New South Wales is in a rather better position with psychiatric staff, but we are not dangerously short of staff, and I pay a tribute to the staff we have, including nurses and attendants, because they are all conscientious people who are doing their best. We shall certainly do our best as far as is humanly possible to support them.

The House may be interested to know something of what is being done on the structural side to improve conditions. Replying to a question during this session I said that whilst we were waiting to get newer buildings every-thing possible would be done to maintain the

older buildings in a hygienic and satisfactory condition for the benefit of the patients. I asked recently for a progress report from the Minister of Works and information was supplied to him by the Director of the Public Buildings Department. Dealing with the question of work in hand the Director reports:

Broadly, the present proposals are as follows:

1. The construction of new major institutional buildings as under:
 - (a) An institution for intellectually sub-normal patients.
 - (b) Two institutions for mentally retarded children.
 - (c) A security institution.
2. When the new buildings are constructed and in use, to demolish certain old buildings at Parkside including the original main block.
3. To meet the immediate position and while the new buildings are under investigation, planning and construction, to improve conditions in existing buildings to make the facilities reasonable without excessive cost where the buildings are ultimately to be demolished.

The matter of the new institutional buildings to be erected will be the subject of a report to be submitted to the Minister of Health by the Director of Mental Health.

The last paragraph results from a recent visit to other States and to New Zealand. The report is not yet in my hands. The Director said that he could give me rough notes if I desired them, but I told him I preferred to await his complete report. The report proceeds:

To provide improved conditions as early as possible arrangements were made for a small staff of architectural officers of this department to work overtime for a period of six weeks as from May 15 last to bring to fruition work which was being investigated or planned or for which specifications were being prepared, and also to engage private architects to carry out any planning for which this department did not have available staff. These moves have resulted in a material improvement in the position.

Attached are statements which, in brief, show the following:

Major new works completed for the six years from July 1st, 1957 to June 30th, 1962: This statement will show that during that period of six years 29 major projects were completed to a total of £1,810,000.

Position of current works: (1) Work in hand on site or contracts let embrace 11 projects at Parkside, 10 at Northfield and one at Enfield.

(2) Further contracts just recommended for acceptance or works under tender call at present cover seven projects at Parkside, three at Northfield and one at Enfield.

(3) Tenders to be called during the next few weeks on works to be commenced with departmental labor during the next few weeks embrace 10 at Parkside and six at Northfield.

(4) Work at present being undertaken by private architects embraces five at Parkside, six at Northfield and one at Enfield.

(5) Plans or estimates at present being prepared for investigations proceeding embrace seven at Parkside and five at Northfield.

(6) Sketch plans sent to the Hospitals Department for approval embrace two at Parkside and one at Enfield.

(7) Planning not yet commenced is for only two items of work and these are at Parkside. Without going into much detail, that is a summary of the efforts the Public Buildings Department is making with a rather depleted staff. It is much below staff establishment for architects.

Among other things, the Hon. Mr. Bardolph mentioned housing. I could speak for an hour on housing, but I think that the honourable member really knows the answers. The South Australian housing position compares very favourably with that in other States. He also mentioned shipping in relation to the Common Market and suggested that freight costs could be reduced on exports of our primary produce overseas. I take it that he meant that the Commonwealth Government should establish a shipping line. In the past the Commonwealth has done an excellent job in the construction of ships, with up-to-date appointments for the crews. Even with these modern ships and equipment we could not compete with overseas shipping. I do not think that Australian companies are in a position today to compete with road and rail transport. In my electorate there is a large area, with water in between, and I know some of the people's transport problems, and the efforts that we must make to try to retain some type of shipping for them. The latest type is the roll-on-roll-off ship, but even that is not sufficient to enable us to compete with the longer transport by road and rail. We shall have to look more deeply into our problems to get a solution. It goes further than the problem of water transport.

The question of the treatment of our aborigines is a rather live one at the moment. The Hon. Mr. Bardolph said that the Labor Party had a policy on this subject, but considering what is going on in one of the towns in my electorate, it does not seem to have complete unity in accepting the policy, whatever it is. I do not know what his policy is, but I gather that he favours assimilation. I pay a tribute to my colleague, the Minister of Works (Mr. Pearson). I do not think anyone has worked harder or done more to encourage a proper approach to the question. Quite a number of the better type aboriginal families have been housed in various areas among white people, and I

believe that some progress is being made. It was stated in the Governor's Speech that legislation on the subject was under consideration. I am encouraged this afternoon to think that Mr. Bardolph will be very pleased to give the Government complete support when it is introduced.

I thank honourable members for their attention to the debate, and if I have failed to reply to any question raised by any honourable member I do not wish it to be understood that I have ignored him. As I have indicated previously, anything mentioned in this debate is studied by the Government, regardless whence it came.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to advise honourable members that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive them for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 14.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Act, 1937-48. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to make a necessary amendment to the principal Act to enable the pooling of resources between the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Department of Medicine of the University in the creation of an isotope laboratory. There is inherent danger in the storage, disposal and misuse of radioactive isotopes and the equipment involved is expensive. The council of the institute desires therefore to create an isotope laboratory in the Department of Medicine at the university for the use of both institutions. This will clearly enable the avoidance of the duplication of expensive equipment, the availability of a wider range of equipment and proper control of isotopes and staff required for handling them.

However, while section 17 (1) (e) enables the institute to provide the university with the use of the institute's equipment in accordance with any agreement or arrangement made under the Act, section 18 limits the power of the institute by expressly excluding scientific equipment. There is of course no doubt that isotopic equipment is scientific equipment, and the council of the institute

thus finds itself unable to enter into the proposed arrangements with the university. Accordingly this Bill will strike out the exclusion and will, additionally, enable the institute to agree to permit the university to use plant or equipment of the institute at such places as the institute itself decides. I am sure that honourable members will agree that an administrative amendment of this kind is desirable in the interests of efficiency and economy, and the Bill is submitted for their consideration.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1954. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Food and Drugs Act by inserting into section 61 (which covers the making of regulations) power to make regulations providing for the inspection and analysis of drugs by the Central Board of Health before the sale thereof, and power to prohibit, regulate, restrict or control the sale of drugs unless they have been inspected and analysed. Section 61 of the Act already provides for extensive regulation-making powers for the purposes of the Act, but the Government has been advised that these powers are not sufficiently wide to provide for the inspection and analysis of new drugs before they are put on sale.

The advisory committee appointed under the Act has recently considered a recommendation of the National Health and Medical Research Council for the control of new drugs—a recommendation that, before any new drug is marketed, it should be submitted to State authorities for examination and decision whether it should be freely available to the public or be restricted in any way, for example, saleable only upon prescription. The proposal is intended to lessen the dangers which can arise with new drugs when first put out on sale. With the constant issue of new drugs it is difficult for health authorities to be aware of all of them when they first come on the market, and any restrictions which may become necessary are invariably somewhat delayed. During the intervening period it is considered that there is a distinct possibility of danger to the general public. Inspection

before sale would not only enable consideration to be given to the question of restriction but also enable advertising claims to be checked before publication.

I mention incidentally that a registration system prior to sale applies already to stock medicines and agricultural chemicals in the State but not to human medicines. A registration system for human medicines operates in Victoria while in Canada and the United States of America new drugs may not be sold until they have been submitted to health authorities. In the United Kingdom medical and pharmaceutical authorities are, I am informed, pressing for similar provisions to be made. The present Bill is designed to extend the regulation-making power to enable appropriate regulations to be made on the subject and I am confident that the Bill will commend itself to honourable members.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

CIVIL AVIATION (CARRIERS' LIABILITY) BILL.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Roads) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the carriage of passengers by air. Read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to give effect in this State to the provisions of the Commonwealth Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Act, 1959. The Commonwealth Act was passed primarily to approve ratification and give effect to an international convention establishing uniform international rules governing the liability of international air carriers to passengers in respect of death or injury and loss of baggage and goods. The Act, however, went further in that it applied the international rules with some modifications to domestic airline operators in so far as they were engaged in interstate or interterritorial carriage. It did not, as it could not, apply to intra-state carriage.

Following upon discussions between the Commonwealth and the States a draft uniform Bill was prepared for enactment by the several States with a view to applying the general principles of the convention and the rules governing interstate carriage to intra-state carriage. The desirability of having uniform rules applying to all classes of carriage within Australia will, I believe, be obvious, especially since the one aircraft frequently carries passengers in the course of interstate

and intra-state journeys. This Bill is based upon the uniform Bill which has already been enacted in Victoria and Western Australia and is under consideration in the other States. The passage of the Bill by all of the States would result in uniform treatment in regard to international, interstate and intra-state air carriage.

It will be noted that clause 2 of the Bill provides for its commencement on a date to be proclaimed—the intention would be to proclaim the Act as soon as a sufficient number of States have passed their legislation. Clause 3 concerns interpretation and clause 4 provides that the Act shall bind the Crown. Clause 5 provides that the Act is to apply to intra-state carriage, not being part of an interstate journey or an international journey, in which cases of course the Commonwealth provisions or the provisions of the international convention would apply. The main operative part of the Bill is contained in clause 6 which applies Part IV of the Commonwealth Act and regulations as if the Commonwealth Act referred to this Act—in other words the effect of clause 6 is to make applicable, by reference, the provisions of Commonwealth law but of course not as Commonwealth law but as law enacted by this Parliament. Similarly clause 7 in its reference to stowaways applies to section 42 of the Commonwealth Act.

It will be necessary for me to refer in great detail to the provisions of Part IV of the Commonwealth Act so that honourable members will know what the effect of the Bill is. I may state now, however, that in short terms the effect of the Bill will be to provide for a limitation of carriers' liability to £7,500 per passenger or such higher amount as may be agreed; liability for baggage and goods will be limited to £100 or a higher agreed sum. A carrier by air will be unable to contract out of his liability or to fix liability lower than that referred to. Actions must be brought within two years and there are special provisions covering death where members of a deceased passenger's family can sue. There are other provisions regarding the ascertainment of damages and incidental matters.

I would refer at this stage to two alterations which enactment of this Bill will make to the general law in this State. The first is that while in the ordinary course an action for damages can be brought within three years, the period will be two years in the case of carriage by air. Secondly, there is no limitation of liability for damages under the general law of this State, while this Bill will limit the

possible damages to £7,500 where the action arises out of carriage by air. I mention these two points at this stage because they are important, and while I believe that the first, relating to the time for bringing an action, is not perhaps as important as the second I would point out that the effect of the Bill while it does limit the recoverable damages does make the liability of an air carrier almost absolute. Under the general law it is necessary to prove actual negligence. Under the Bill the right to recover does not depend upon the proof of negligence, which would be a difficult thing to establish in the case of an air accident.

I come now to those sections of the Commonwealth Act to which this Bill will apply in this State, that is, the provisions of Part IV of the Commonwealth Act (other than sections 27, 40 and 41, which concern the application of the Commonwealth Act to interstate carriage and certain specified regulations). Section 28 of the Commonwealth Act makes a carrier liable for damage for death or personal injury of a passenger resulting from an accident on board an aircraft or in the course of any of the operations of embarking or disembarking. Section 31 limits the liability of the carrier to £7,500 or any higher agreed amount, subject to any regulations on the subject. Section 32 prohibits and makes ineffective any provision for contracting out of liability. Section 33 provides that a servant or agent of a carrier may have the benefit of the limits of liability, while section 34 fixes the time for bringing action at two years. Section 36 provides that liability for injury is in substitution for any civil liability under any other law, subject, however, to the right of contribution or workmen's compensation indemnity. Section 35 covers liability in respect of a passenger's death. It gives a right of action to members of the deceased passenger's family and provides that loss of earnings to date of death and funeral, medical or hospital expenses incurred before death may be recovered for the benefit of the deceased's estate. "Member of family" embraces a very wide range of persons, all, I believe, already embraced in the general law of this State in the case of ordinary accidents. The section provides how the action is to be brought and how damages are to be assessed.

Section 38 provides that any damages assessed shall not be reduced by any insurance moneys payable to a passenger, any super-annuation or friendly society benefits, any pensions payable on death or injury, any acquisition of a dwellinghouse by a spouse or child consequent upon the death, or any premium payable under an insurance contract

on the life of the deceased. Section 39 provides for a reduction of damages where a passenger has been guilty of contributory negligence.

Sections 29 and 30 deal with baggage. They provide for liability for destruction, loss or damage to baggage at any time during the period of the carriage unless the carrier proves that all necessary measures were taken or were impossible. Various provisions, regarding which I do not intend to go into detail, cover the way in which actions are to be brought and exceptions to liability in respect of baggage.

It will be seen that Part IV of the Commonwealth Act, which is applied by this Bill, sets out in some detail what may be recovered for personal death or injury or loss or damage to baggage arising out of air accidents.

I refer now to clause 8. Under the Commonwealth Act there is power to make regulations and this Bill will apply such regulations within this State as if they had been made by the Governor-in-Council. Clause 8 (which is modelled on a similar section in the Victorian Act) provides for any Commonwealth regulations that are made to be laid before Parliament where they can be disallowed, thus importing in relation to such regulations the general principles and procedure which apply in this State to regulations made by the Governor-in-Council. Without this provision the Commonwealth regulations would be applicable in their entirety without any reference to this Parliament. Subclause 4 of clause 8 empowers our own Governor-in-Council to make regulations which will prevail over any inconsistent regulations which have been made by the Commonwealth in their application within this State.

As I have pointed out, the object of the Bill is to secure uniformity of rules governing the liability of air carriers in interstate and intrastate carriage. Although the amount of damages recoverable is limited, passengers or their dependants are given a right to recover all damage suffered up to the limit without proving negligence on the part of the operator. More especially, the Bill deprives carriers of their present right to contract out of liability however caused, thus substituting a system of absolute liability for a voluntary system under which an operator can vary or limit his liability as part of his contract of carriage.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.51 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 14, at 2.15 p.m.