LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, October 31, 1963.

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

QUESTION.

CULTURAL NEEDS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: An article in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

The State Government may be asked to endorse a special civic committee formed under the Lord Mayor (Mr. Irwin) as an official board of inquiry into Adelaide's cultural needs.

The Premier, as honourable members will remember, indicated on October 16 that £800,000 would be made available by the Government—£400,000 as a grant and £400,000 as a long-term loan—conditionally upon the Adelaide City Council's providing £100,000. The Lord Mayor, in the statement in this morning's *Advertiser*, indicated that a special committee with authoritative powers would be sought from the Government—I think it was a committee of five—for the purpose of carrying on this laudable work. I wish to compliment the Lord Mayor on the action he has taken. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to seek Parliamentary representation on the committee from both Houses of Parliament in view of the public funds being granted for this worthy project?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I, too, read the report, which said that the Lord Mayor and a delegation would wait upon the Premier and I have no doubt when this is done a proper announcement will be made regarding what the Government intends to do.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

In Committee.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1349.)

Clause 50 and title passed.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government) moved:

That clauses 4, 9, 10, 45 and 46 be reconsidered.

Motion carried.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 5"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: During the second reading stage I raised a question as to when clause 4 would come into operation because it appeared to me that it was rather doubtful as at present drafted, and could apply either proportionately from the date of proclamation or to the next municipal year. Since I raised this question I have been in touch with the Town Clerk of Adelaide, who, to my relief, informs me that the Adelaide Children's Hospital has not been rated this year because, fortunately, it was already exempt under the present section. I am very happy about this because I was in a dual position and did not know what would be justice between the parties nor did I know what was actually intended. However, the Adelaide Children's Hospital is not the only hospital involved; a number of other hospitals throughout the State could well be concerned. Therefore, I shall pursue my question in relation to the other hospitals that may come within this clause. Has the Minister any information as to what the legal construction of this clause is likely to be and as to when it will operate?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I was not certain about the actual status of the Adelaide Children's Hospital this year and I am glad to receive the information the honourable member has given. He is aware, by correspondence, that the Government intended moving an amendment remitting half the income instead of one quarter and I think as soon as possible the position should be clarified. Therefore, I move:

Before "subsection (1)" to insert "(1)"; and to insert the following new subsection:

(2) The amendment effected by paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of this section shall apply in respect of any assessment made or rate declared by any council for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four, and any subsequent year.

In simple language this means that the amendment shall apply to this year's rate.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I understand now that the provision does not apply to the institution I had in mind, but there are councils that could be embarrassed by it because they could have made up their budgets believing that hospitals in their districts would be rated, only to find that the money would not be coming in. I have had no representations about this matter from other hospitals. I do not know whether it would have general application within the district I represent.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Have you any other hospital in mind?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I cannot think of any, but I thought I should pursue the matter in case it could apply to other hospitals. I am pleased that the Adelaide Children's Hospital is to be exempt, but I think it is more the prerogative of country members to pursue the question, because there may be country hospitals coming within the category. Perhaps the Minister of Health could enlighten us on the matter.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I draw the attention of members to section 5 (*c*1) and section 5 (*d*1) of the principal Act. They refer to the rating of land, and section 5 (*c*1) states:

Any hospital partly used for the purpose of affording gratuitous assistance or relief to poor or helpless persons if more than one quarter of the annual income of the hospital is derived from charges made to patients for treatment in the hospital.

I trust that the position has now been clarified. The amendment provides for not more than one-half of the annual income, and not one-quarter.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): I have had inquiries on this matter from hospitals operating in the metropolitan area, such as church and community hospitals. It is obvious that the amount of fees collected from patients by them would not exceed one-half of the hospital income, and I am informed that the provision would not apply to them. I imagine that at one time the Queen Victoria Hospital came within the category, but today the hospital relies greatly on Government finance and not only on fees from patients. It would probably not come under this provision. Private hospitals would not qualify, nor do I think community hospitals would get sufficient income to qualify, so the provision would be fairly restricted in its application.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Minister of Health for his explanation. It now appears that the matter has become more or less academic and I do not propose to pursue it further.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—"Amendment of principal Act, section 173a."—reconsidered.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Before the Hon. Mr. Bevan speaks on this clause, I want to try to clarify the position that we reached yesterday. This is a waterworks assessment and it applies entirely to annual values. Let us keep these two clauses in their respective places. In the case of the waterworks assessment there is no obligation upon the Engineering and Water Supply Department to notify the clerk of the council of such alteration in the assessment. Consequently, as it is not mandatory on the clerk to ask for a copy of any amendment (already the Act says that the council "may" ask for an amendment from time to time), the councils feel that they should not be forced to alter their assessment forthwith but should be able to alter it in their own time, because it is possible under the annual values method for a council to adopt its own assessment instead of taking the waterworks assessment. It is not compulsory.

The other clause relates to land tax values and it is obligatory for the Land Tax Commissioner to notify the clerk in writing of an alteration of an assessment. Having done so, it is considered reasonable that then the clerk shall notify the person, who will probably already know, if there has been an appeal, that his assessment has been reduced. The clerk shall notify him of an alteration in the rates.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is on appeal?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: No; it is only on land tax assessment that it is automatic. Clause 10 proposes that a practice that has been followed for a couple of years should be legalized, but there is an enactment that overlooks a council having made a legitimate charge at the time and is not attachable therefor. I find myself in agreement with the Hon. Mr. Bevan that it is probably not desirable, because of that fact, to make it retrospective to 1961. I think that is the point he made yesterday in that connection. I am prepared to accept an amendment if he cares to move it or I will move it along those lines. The sole object of any amendment is to bring this retrospectivity into adjusted rates for annual values in clause 9.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In view of what the Minister has just said, I am happy to accept an amendment moved by him and have nothing further to say.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: In those circumstances, I move:

In new subsection (6) to strike out "sixty-one" and insert "sixty-three".

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am afraid the Minister's explanation still does not answer my query and at the risk of appearing completely dumb, which I probably am, I say I still do not understand what this new clause, quite apart from the amendment, means. The first part of it says:

If the waterworks assessment is adopted by the council, whenever any alteration or reduction is made in the waterworks assessment . . . the council shall alter its assessment thereof so as to accord with such alteration . . .

That is all right up to that stage; I can understand that. The next new subsection reads:

When an assessment is altered in accordance with subsection (5) of this section the council shall adjust the amount of any rates paid or payable by any ratepayer to accord with the fresh assessment.

That seems perfectly all right if the adjustment is made after an assessment of rates has been made on an old assessment during a current municipal year and an adjustment of the assessment is made during the municipal year and after the rates have been nominated and assessed; but it does not apply only to that, as I read it. If the council makes this adjustment at the beginning of the municipal year, the construction of this, as I read it, could be that the council is bound to levy the same total rate as it levied the year before, which would be taking it entirely out of the hands of the council. Can the Minister explain that aspect of it?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I shall endeavour to. New subsection (5) reads:

The council shall alter its assessment . .

I am proposing to alter the word "shall" to "may", because in annual values the Engineering and Water Supply Department is not forced to notify the council of a change in assessment, but it seems to me, notwithstanding the honourable member's broad suggestion (it is in respect of individual property), it is thinking not in terms of the whole assessment of the council but in terms of the individual ratable property. If the council alters the assessment at that time it should be allowed within its wisdom, sitting as a rating or assessment committee, to alter the rates payable for that year. Rates are payable for the whole of a year and, if the council makes an adjustment, I do not see that it should be *pro rata* for the time being. A person appeals as there has been an alteration in the water rating, and he finds that he has got a 50 per cent reduction.

It is reasonable that, if the council alters his assessment for that year, it should alter his bill for rates by the annual total. I cannot see why it should be for less or for any *pro rata* payment. These appeals take some time to be heard. Having appealed at the beginning of the year, when a ratepayer gets his assessment and it is found in three or four months' time that he has a good case, I would expect his rates to be reduced. I suggest that "shall" be altered to "may" because there should be no compulsion. The Corporation of the City of Unley has written to me firmly along those lines. New subsection (6) reads:

the council shall adjust the amount of any rates . . .

That should not be "may": it needs to be "shall" because, if a council does alter the assessment, it is obvious that it "shall" alter the person's rates to meet the assessment it has deemed fit to make. I think the position is clear now.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I did not hear the Minister say, in his last statement, that he was proposing to move this amendment to alter the word "shall" to the word "may". Perhaps I missed that, but that does alter it completely. I agree with him about not altering "shall" in new subsection (6) but "may" would be more appropriate in new subsection (5). I agree with the Minister to that extent. However, I am concerned with the position where a totally new assessment is made at the beginning of a municipal year. This is a clause indicating that the council cannot alter the rate that has previously been struck because it says:

. . . the council shall adjust the amount of any rates paid or payable by any ratepayer to accord with the fresh assessment.

If the Minister could give me an assurance that this does not apply to a completely fresh assessment of the whole area then I should be happy to support the clause, because I think the general clause is quite a good one. I did query the draftsmanship of it in this respect.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I am in agreement with the honourable member that "may" is a key word and I hope that I have the Committee's support to insert it in place of "shall".

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has not moved that.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: In addition to my earlier amendment I now move:

In new subsection (5) to strike out "shall" first occurring and insert "may".

The point that I have made is that this is a waterworks rating and the councils do not have to follow it. Having made their assessment for the year they certainly would not change it. There is no obligation under the annual value method to change the assessment. It would be most extraordinary if a council upset its own mechanism having once settled its rate and its assessment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I find myself at a complete loss, although I have tried hard to understand what is going on. We have been given an explanation in the second reading speech why it is vital that we should have "1961" included in the amendment. However, somewhere along the line we seem to have lost that point and the problems concerning things which appear to be illegal and which councils are apparently doing have been cleared up. It seems also that Mr. Bevan's amendment is acceptable now to the Government. I presume, as a consequence, that we are now to consider striking out "shall" and inserting "may", but I am quite hazy on this and should like to find out why we have had this sudden change of heart.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I can only reiterate what I said previously: that this clause is not mandatory. The Waterworks Department is not compelled to notify variations of assessments to the council. Therefore, it is rather unreasonable that the council should have to find these variations and act on them accordingly. Consequently, we have altered the word "shall" to "may". With regard to "1961" being altered to "1963", someone in the earlier stages was under the impression that the councils were doing something illegally but, of course, ordinary common law would protect the council against making what it thought was a perfectly *bona fide* and legitimate charge. That is why, firstly, we do not think it is necessary to make the provision retrospective; and, secondly, we insert a conditional "may" and not "shall". Councils do not have to be notified by the Waterworks Department when they work on the annual value system.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am also a trifle bewildered by this change from "1961" to "1963". If what the Attorney-General took the trouble to explain yesterday is correct and the wording of this clause should be "1961" in order to allow rebates to be given to landholders where rates are being lowered by the adoption of the waterworks assessment, we are now faced with the proposition: is it now considered unnecessary to give rebates of rates to ratepayers who are entitled to them under a differentiation in assessment, or not?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: No. The position is that in the case of clause 9 the council is under no obligation to vary the rate. Under clause 10 it is.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What if it has varied the rate?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: In that case it has already paid the rebate. The honourable member may be thinking that the council ought to pay it for 1961, 1962 and 1963. I point out that if the rate were adjusted in 1961 it would automatically be correct in 1962 and 1963.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What happens if it was done last year?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The ratepayer would pay only once.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: If we alter the year to 1963 instead of 1961 I wonder whether the rebate is legally bound to be paid to property holders, because if I remember rightly exactly the converse was said by the Attorney-General yesterday.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I want clarification of this point that I am not happy about. Subsection (6) states:

> When any assessment is altered in accordance with subsection (5) of this section the council shall adjust the amount of any rates paid or payable by any ratepayer to accord with the fresh assessment.

I should like to have some words included after the word "rates" making it clear that those are the rates already assessed and not to be assessed, because the word "payable" could mean that it might operate subsequently. The sort of words I should like included are "a council shall adjust the amount of any rates currently assessed and paid or payable by any ratepayer". This would be purely to clarify the draftsmanship so that the ordinary mortal such as I could understand what it meant. I am not wedded to those particular words, but I should like some such words inserted so that the attention of the person trying to construe this clause is drawn to the fact that they are current rates and not future rates.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The Parliamentary Draftsman says that he does not see any reason for adding the words to the amendment on the grounds that the currently assessed rate is applicable for adjustment. The rate the following year will be automatic again over the whole of the council and in respect to each individual as well. The only adjustment is in the first case and that is allowed for.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is right on my point and if I am satisfied that that is right it will be quite satisfactory. But the words "the amount of any rates paid or payable by the ratepayer" seem to be rather wide to me. I do not know what "rates payable" means. I would have thought it could mean future rates as well as current

rates. If we insert the words "the amount of any current rates paid or payable" that would satisfy me. I only want clarification.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I can only assure the honourable member that I have conferred with the Parliamentary Draftsman.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—"Amendment of principal Act, section 188"—reconsidered.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

To strike out "sixty-one" and insert "sixty-three".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 45—"Amendment of principal Act, section 783"—reconsidered.

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

In subclause (1) after "amended" to insert "—(*a*)" and at the end of the subclause to insert:

(*b*) by striking out "filth, dung, ashes, debris, waste, refuse, rubbish or dead animal or bird or earth, building spoil, road metal, bricks, stones, gravel or substance," therein and inserting "goods, materials, substance, liquid, animal, bird or thing.".

Clause 45 has apparently caused some doubts in various councils as to what can be dropped on the roads and whether it is dropped deliberately. My amendment should clear up this problem.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The word "liquid" could cause problems in areas where it is necessary to carry water. It may be difficult to prevent water from falling on the road. I want to know whether the water I am referring to comes within the definition of "liquid" in the amendment.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This word includes the general type of liquid; but one must guard against such things as a person emptying half a dozen gallons of sump oil on the road.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not see how the amendment fits in.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The amendment simplifies the rather long definition in the Act. The second reading explanation said:

Clause 45 widens the extent of section 783 of the principal Act penalizing the depositing or dropping from vehicles of rubbish of specified kinds on streets and roads. In the case of at least one council difficulties have been encountered from the dropping of material not specifically mentioned. Clause 45 removes the specific references and substitutes a more general definition.

The material concerned is scrap iron.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I can understand perfectly the clause as originally drawn, but I cannot understand how the Minister's amendment fits in. It seems to me to be repeating words without a reference to any part of the section.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The Parliamentary Draftsman says that it is a consequential amendment to straighten up the present provision. It is the same, but in a shorter form.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: There is no reference to the part of the section amended.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Section 783.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That applies to subparagraph (*a*). I still don't understand how the Minister's amendment is to apply.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have been trying to follow the matter but cannot do so. I cannot refer the amendment to anything in the section. It seems to me like repeating words and it is difficult to follow. Where is (*b*) to go in? There is no mention of that.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The printed amendment says "After line 9 insert (*b*)".

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I still think it does not make sense. It is not referable to any part of the section.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill. I have the principal Act in front of me and I have tried to follow the section as proposed to be amended, but it does not make sense. Perhaps the Parliamentary Draftsman is attempting to alter the position regarding the use of the phrase "filth, dung, ashes, etc", which phrase is repeated. I do not think the amendment can be made in the way the Minister is trying to do it, but at the moment I cannot suggest how it can be done. In some way the second part of the Minister's amendment must refer to a part of the section.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): As I understand it, the position will be difficult to follow unless members have before them the reprinted copy of the principal Act. If they have it in front of them they will be able to follow what is proposed. The clause inserts a reference to subparagraph (*a*), and now we are proposing to insert subparagraph (*b*). I am satisfied that what is proposed by the Minister does what is intended.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: While the Attorney-General has been speaking I have been looking at the matter again, and I agree with what he said. The matter was difficult to follow at first, but I now think that the Parliamentary Draftsman has done what he intended to do.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I still cannot see that, but there may be another place where this can be put in order.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 46—"Enactment of section 832a of principal Act"—reconsidered.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I now propose to move several small amendments *en bloc.* I move:

After "832a" to insert "(1)"; in paragraph (*a*) to strike out "show" and insert "be followed by"; after paragraph (*b*) to strike out "no" and insert "(2) No"; and to strike out the last two lines of new subsection (2) and insert "unless it complies with the requirements of this section."

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1274.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to speak on this Bill, on which the Hon. Mrs. Cooper spoke last Thursday and the Hon. Mr. Potter last Tuesday, both raising interesting points and expressing their respective opinions. As I see it, the Bill is designed to provide more protection for young children who may be engaged in the newer forms of public entertainment. It seems to me that, having read the Bill in conjunction with the principal Act and having read the Minister's speech, a number of its provisions are very good indeed. The substance of the Bill conforms very closely to the existing Act. There are two principal amendments involved, one dealing with the definition of "public entertainment" contained in clause 3, and the other dealing with section 12 concerning an increase in the age of children who are to be protected.

The Bill also raises the age limit of a boy or girl who wishes to go into acrobatics or a circus—commercially, of course. I do not know whether this applies to boys who may desire to run away after a disagreement with father (because I think it is the ambition of many boys at about the age of 12 or 13 to run away to join a circus) but they will now have to wait until they are 15. I do not think that is a very harsh provision because the school-leaving age has been raised recently to that age and I should think that while a boy should go to school he should not run away to a circus.

The main points in section 12 of the principal Act deal with some protection of boys or girls who are likely to be prejudiced or endangered in respect of their health or life, and this seems a wise provision. The other amendment to section 12 increases the age from six to seven for children to be engaged in public entertainment. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper raised several points which I think the Minister might answer in closing the debate or in Committee. I have some doubts about one or two matters, particularly in relation to the taking of pictures for television where the child probably does not know the picture is being taken. I do not know whether we should go the whole distance, although I am in complete sympathy with the view that we do not want six- or seven-year old children exposed to commercial television, for it could breed another race of Shirley Temples.

The whole object of the Bill is different from that of the New South Wales legislation where there is a licensing system for all children who can receive—or must receive—remuneration from sponsors or television stations. Another feature is that this legislation is not an attempt to control television stations but is a plan to protect young children, and I think that is fairly important. The New South Wales legislation has had the reverse effect. I hope we shall still be able to see on television stations children of five or six years, or younger children who have had their pictures taken in other States or in America or some other country. I should like the Minister to explain whether this clause places a ban upon those films. We certainly will not have children of that age televised and shown on television stations in South Australia. Mrs. Cooper made a point in regard to pageants, and I cannot find anything in the principal Act or in the Minister's explanation that would exclude them. I think they definitely come within this category, but it would be wrong for a child of, say, seven years to be denied taking part in the pageant that we have in South Australia just before Christmas.

I think section 12 (3) allows the employment of young children in public entertainment. This relates to various charitable, religious, educational and patriotic projects, provided that the children's services are gratuitous. It does not seem to me that there is anything in the amendments inconsistent with the principal Act, except for the matter of television.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The difficulties, if any, are in the existing Act.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, I agree with that. I do not wish to delay the Chamber, but I ask the Chief Secretary whether he would make one or two explanations upon the points that have been raised during the debate. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): The Hon. Mr. Story has given what might be called an answer to the things he seeks. I might enlarge a little on what he has said and confirm, in the first place, that this Bill introduces no new principle regarding the protection of children other than that the school-going age has been extended and, because some children do not enrol until seven years in some cases, the age has been lifted. That is the only alteration except that the legislation has been brought into conformity with modern types of entertainment, namely, that mentioned by the honourable member—television. We have two differing legal opinions concerning what is covered in the present Act. One is that sound broadcasting (radio) is "public entertainment" for the purpose of the Children's Protection Act. So far as radio is concerned the old Act has applied. However, the other opinion is that telecasting, or television, is not a public entertainment within the meaning of the Act. If both these opinions are valid young children may appear in a telecast provided there is no studio audience, but not in radio broadcasts.

This Bill brings some of the more modern activities within the scope of public entertainment. South Australia has always had legislation for the protection of children. I do not suppose it could ever be said that our legislation is uniform with that of other States. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper mentioned that in New South Wales there is a rather cumbersome licensing system and that she did not favour it. I am informed by the board that even in other States there is the opinion that young children should have some protection to prevent their abuse by commercial television stations. Our legislation provides this protection. John Martin's Christmas Pageant has been mentioned. I do not know the age of the little tots who ride Nimble in that pageant and I do not suppose anybody has ever troubled to find out.

The increase in the age from six years to seven would not spoil John Martin's Pageant and the child itself would be safer when sitting on the horse because it would be a year older. The point I make is that this Bill does not introduce any new principle but merely brings the present Act into line with modern entertainment. It also makes a slight difference from six to seven years and provides for an increase from 13 to 15 years before an adolescent can take part in such entertainments as circuses. I do not believe anybody would be anxious to see children in the early years of adolescence living in the environment of a circus. If they come here from somewhere else, well and good. However, it is not good to see these children doing tumbling acts and performing, perhaps, on a trapeze and so on. I believe all honourable members have a fairly clear idea of the purpose of this legislation, which is designed to bring modern entertainment within the scope of the Act. It embodies the new approach to education and the child life of the community. In these circumstances, I hope the Bill will receive the support of honourable members.

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

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1258.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. As the Minister indicated in his speech on the second reading, it is for the purpose of extending the operation of the Land Settlement Act for a further two years. Normally it would expire on December 1 next. The Land Settlement Committee was appointed in 1945. Prior to that there was reference to ex-service personnel from 1934-1945 when the Commonwealth Government came to an agreement with the State Government in the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act and since then the committee has been functioning. It is interesting to recall that when the original measure was introduced the late Hon. R. J. Rudall (then Minister of Lands) said:

The State will administer the scheme as agent of the Commonwealth. It will select the land for settlement, furnish full information to the Commonwealth, and conduct any surveys which are required, with the assistance, if necessary, of any Commonwealth authorities. The State will work out the detailed plans for settlement, allot holdings and generally act as the landlord under the leases which will be issued . . .

Finance.—The Commonwealth shall provide capital moneys required for the purpose of acquiring, developing, and improving land for settlement. The State and the Commonwealth will each bear their own costs of administration. Apart from administrative costs, the main financial problem is the apportionment of

losses. It is expected that in some cases the cost of acquiring land plus the cost of development to a stage where it can be allotted to provide a reasonable labour income will exceed the productive value of the holding.

When the Land Settlement Committee was inaugurated there was a Commonwealth Labour Government. I think that honourable members will agree that since the agreement was entered into and the settlement of ex-servicemen on the land was undertaken the work of that committee has never been excelled in any other State. It has no authoritative power and merely reports to the Government, which, in its wisdom, can either accept the reports or pigeonhole them, and there the issue ceases. It is interesting to note that since the committee's appointment it has presented the following reports:

1945	16
1946	14
1947	3
1948	2
1949	9
1950	3
1951	3
1952	4
1953	3
1954	3
1955	3
1956	3
1957	2
1958	2
1959	2

In the years 1960, 1961 and 1962 no reports were submitted, because no references were made to the committee. This year a report has been furnished dealing with development in the Counties of Buckingham and Chandos. I do not blame the committee in any way for the lack of reports from it. A member of this place (the late Hon. E. A. Oates) was one of the first members appointed to the committee. Sir Collier Cudmore, who was leader of the Liberal Party in this place, was its first chairman. Down through the years its members have always had the ability to investigate and report on matters referred to it by the Government. It is unfortunate that it has had no authoritative power, like other joint Parliamentary committees, such as the Industries Development Committee and the Public Works Committee.

The Bill provides that section 27a of the principal Act be amended to enable the acquisition of lands in that portion of the Western Division of the South-East, which is south of drains K and L, up to December, 1965. I believe that a measure to give effect to this matter will be introduced in another place; consequently the committee's work, instead of being somewhat nebulous as it has been over the last few years, will be more clearly defined because it will be able to investigate this matter and perhaps recommend the acquisition of more land for settlement purposes. I support the Bill, which is on good and sound lines. I commend the committee for its work in the past and, with other members, I look forward to its doing further good work.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern): I support the Bill, which will extend the life of the Land Settlement Committee until December 31, 1965. I have been a member of it since the retirement of the late Hon. E. H. Edmonds. After a period of inactivity the committee had a busy time this year and it gave members satisfaction to know that they were doing a worthwhile job. I congratulate the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) on his recent appointment as Chairman of the committee, following the sudden death of Mr. W. W. Jenkins, who was an excellent chairman. I believe that Mr. Nankivell will also prove to be a good chairman. He had outstanding success after studying at the Roseworthy College, where he obtained the degree of Bachelor of Agricultural Science. He has made a success of his property in the Upper South-East. During this year the committee made two visits to the Upper South-East, each for a full week, for the purpose of inspecting and taking evidence about the possibility of settlement on land in the Counties of Buckingham and Chandos. On that same matter the committee held several meetings at Parliament House, for the purpose of taking evidence from departmental officers. In all, evidence was taken from 62 witnesses, and a report was furnished to the Governor. It is Parliamentary Paper No. 36. The land inspected in the Upper South-East by the committee has an average rainfall of 17 inches. The soil is mostly deep sand, but with the assistance of lime and trace elements much of the country, when cleared, would have a great potential for the development of pasture. It is certain that within the next two years there will be much other work for the committee to do.

The Rural Advances Guarantee Bill has been introduced in another place, and with the likelihood of more uncleared land being available, and the consequent prospect of closer settlement, particularly along the River Murray, the State can expect increased production. A number of projects will be referred to the committee. I feel that the extension of its life for another two years is justified, and I support the second reading.

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

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1275.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the second reading with much pleasure, because during the Budget debate last year I referred to this matter and supported a proposal like the one we have before us now. At that time I was accused by the Chief Secretary of reading laboriously from a report in support of my view. I do not think I would be misquoting him if I said that he was opposed to the proposal last year. Apparently the Government has now changed its view, but everybody is entitled to do that. The Government can be commended for introducing the measure. When introduced in another place it provided that the Government would assist councils to provide buildings in which aged citizens' clubs could meet. As a result of an amendment suggested by the Labor Party in another place, it has now been extended; the subsidy will apply also to amounts subscribed by other institutions or bodies with the approval of the local government body.

The subsidy is to be pound for pound, limited to an amount of £3,000 for each club. That means that £6,000 would be available for the building of such a club. It is interesting to note that without the encouragement and help of the pound-for-pound subsidy 13 such clubs have already been established in the municipal council areas. Indeed, in the West Torrens council area three such clubs have already been established. I understand that there are also clubs at Murray Bridge and Naracoorte. I feel sure that this legislation will bring many centres into being.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Are they established by the council?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: With the assistance of the council. The bringing together of these older citizens into clubs where they can make contact with other people in like circumstances will save valuable hospital space. It is well known that 20 per cent of our older people are living in lonely isolation. That is established by statistics. It is also well known that people living alone represent the larger proportion of those persons admitted to psychiatric hospitals. The provision of means for these people to enjoy contact with similar people in suitable surroundings can in this way greatly reduce the number admitted to this type of hospital.

It has been said, and said correctly, that there is probably no period of life in which physical health is more dependent on the mental state than in old age. It is my opinion that the provision of these clubs will assist greatly both the mental and the physical health of our old people. Therefore, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern): I, too, have great pleasure in supporting this Bill. It will be welcomed by many people and will give much comfort, pleasure and assistance to them. This organization started in Victoria several years ago. It was formed to provide some interest mainly for those people who live alone and have nowhere to go. They will now have an opportunity to mix with other people and play such games as cards and darts. When Mr. Bate came here only a few years ago and organized the movement in South Australia, he contacted many councils and they became enthusiastic. The movement is really flourishing and, as the Hon. Mr. Kneebone has said, there are 13 clubs in the metropolitan area. They are controlled by a board consisting of the mayor or chairman of a council and other prominent people. Each club has a president and a secretary.

The eligible age is 60 years and over. The Victorian Government subsidizes their buildings, furniture, etc., on a £2 for £1 basis. This Bill subsidizes the movement on a pound-for-pound basis, with a maximum of £3,000. So far in South Australia buildings have been loaned free of charge to these clubs, in most cases, and people generally have been sympathetic towards them. The subsidy will enable them to build their own premises and furnish them, etc. At Walkerville there are 110 members in the club. The council has offered the members a block of land for building. They have already collected £650. An effort is to be made to raise more money and, with the aid of the subsidy and perhaps a small bank loan, they will be able to build their own premises, which will, of course, create a greater interest for its members. Many doctors realizing the benefit of this movement advise eligible people to join. It will bring them much relief from medical attention. The subscription is only 5s. a year, so they are certainly helping themselves. I heartily commend the Government for the introduction of this Bill and have great pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I do not wish to delay the passage of this Bill, because I think it is one of which we all approve. I commend the Government on its initiative in introducing such necessary legislation. Although we already have a number of

similar clubs in South Australia, there is ample scope for further clubs both in the city and in the country areas. Similar clubs have been in existence in other States for some time, and we should be able to reap the benefit of the experiences gained by those clubs in management generally.

The span of life expectancy today is much higher than previously. Scientific advancement in the medical profession has eliminated many of the hazards to a long life, with the result that we have an increasing percentage of aged persons in our community. If it were not for the influx of young immigrants, this percentage would be much higher. One of the great problems today is to be able to segregate the young from the old and, although we appreciate that the older generation gets great pleasure from associating with the younger people, to live with them without any opportunity of mixing with and enjoying the companionship of people of their own age and with similar interests can become very tiring.

Through living to a greater age, the aged persons' life savings tend to become dissipated and they are unable to avail themselves of the social life as it exists in the community. Thus it will be seen that aged persons' clubs form a necessary need in our community. Further, they help to compensate for the loss of a life partner, which is one of life's great tragedies. Loneliness is something very hard to combat, but what better means can we have than aged persons' clubs? Furthermore, through the aid of a pound-for-pound subsidy, there is every opportunity for the formation of these clubs in local areas so that the aged people can enjoy the amenities in the kind of environment with which they are familiar. It gives them the opportunity to associate with people of similar interests and with whom they have had life-long associations. It will also allow and encourage local people to take an interest in the welfare of their senior citizens in the eventide of their lives. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1321.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I support the Bill which I regard as a machinery-making Bill rectifying some anomalies that are embodied at the moment in the principal Act. Clause 5 inserts a new section after section 12 of the Act and states:

A motor vehicle may be driven without registration on a wharf.

Section 12 of the principal Act deals with exemptions such as farm tractors and implements that may be driven on a road from, say, a farm to a garage for service or repair, or from field to field. Section 12 (*a*), as it will become, refers to another exemption, namely, a motor vehicle which may be driven without registration on a wharf for the purpose of loading or unloading cargo. I was dubious whether that provision was in its appropriate place in the Act, but I am satisfied now that it is. On first reading the clause I wondered how a vehicle could be on a wharf without having first been driven on a road, but I find that the vehicle is wholly confined to the wharf itself. This provision will exempt what have become known as "biddies" on the wharf—a line of trucks used for loading and unloading and pulled by a machine.

Although I first thought that the clause did not make provision for an accident occurring on a wharf that was accessible to the general public, I find now that this has been adequately safeguarded by other amending legislation in the Bill. I find that the amendments are improvements on the principal Act and the anomalies, which were unforeseen when the original legislation was enacted, have been removed. I therefore have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the second reading and I believe this is a good Bill. The Motor Vehicles Department is very efficient and I think that most honourable members will agree that over a period of some years its work has been streamlined to provide better service to the public. I believe this Bill will enable the department to give even better service. I shall not deal with the Bill in detail because obviously a number of points will be discussed in Committee, but I should like to refer to clause 4, which extends the range of farm implements that may be taken on the roads by inserting after the word "implements" the words "or carrying farm implements by means of an attachment designed for that purpose". The matter of farm implements used on roads is becoming quite important because of the diversity of equipment used nowadays. It would be difficult to describe some of these units as farm implements in the true sense.

I believe consideration should be given later to finding a simple means of registration and, perhaps, provide some form of third party

insurance to cover all farm equipment. One suggestion which has been put forward is the consideration of special plates similar to traders' plates. Clause 6 states:

40a. Where a vehicle has been registered upon payment of the full registration fee and the owner of the vehicle becomes entitled to an exemption from or reduction of registration fees at any time during the period for which the vehicle is registered, the Registrar may at his discretion refund to the owner of the vehicle such part of the registration fee as the Registrar deems just in the circumstances.

This is another problem sometimes encountered in country areas that could be overcome by this clause. Bulk handling of wheat has almost become an accepted practice throughout South Australia. Many farmers have purchased large semi-trailers so that much of the grain can be shifted at the one time. For the rest of the year they use the hauling portion as a light truck. Therefore, the semi-trailer unit is used only for a month or six weeks a year. A problem has been encountered in adjusting the registration of these dual-purpose vehicles and I believe that this clause will help to simplify the machinery in this respect. I have read through each clause carefully and I believe it is a worth-while Bill and will do much to streamline the smooth running of the Motor Vehicles Department.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1276.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): This is an important Bill. It does not include many amendments to the principal Act but their effect, particularly the effect of one clause, could have a great influence upon the future of the wine and grape-growing industries of South Australia. Over the years it has been famous for the quantity of wine and brandy it has produced. In all, it produces about 75 per cent of Australia's total. Phylloxera is a scourge and if it becomes established it could wipe out the whole industry in this State in a short time. I would describe it as an insect—plant lice virtually. In some parts of the world it is known as the green fly. It has appeared in many areas and is thought to have originated in the Americas. It is very destructive particularly to the root system of vines. The Bill has several effects and is designed to improve the Act, and I believe it does this. Phylloxera is the worst vine disease in the world.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson: How long has it been in this State?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This State has never had an outbreak of phylloxera. About 50 or 60 years ago the district of Rutherglen, a most prosperous Victorian vine growing area, was absolutely ruined by phylloxera and the whole area was lost to vinegrowing and remained so for many years. It is still possible, when visiting this area, to see many of the old distilleries used prior to phylloxera. Lilydale, in Victoria, suffered a similar fate. South Australia has been extremely fortunate in this respect and our vignerons and the Government have combined to bring down rigid provisions to guard against it. This law has been carefully policed. Heavy penalties are imposed on anybody who brings vines or vine cuttings to this State. I believe that, out of the 15,000 acres that existed prior to phylloxera in Rutherglen, hardly a vine survived. At present, in some areas out from Rutherglen, a few acres of vines is being grown. The area I have referred to would be equivalent to the whole of the Renmark vinegrowing area and the best part of Berri. From this it can be seen that it is very important that we pass this Bill.

Section 23 of the principal Act established a fund which has been contributed to by the industry and now stands at about £50,000. That is a large sum, and because of its being so large no contributions have been made to the fund over the last few years. The first amendment of any importance is contained in clause 3, which amends section 5 by striking out the definition of "up-rooted". The purpose is to no longer require the up-rooting of vines should we have a phylloxera outbreak, because we have means of spraying that will control the position.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Is it satisfactory?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. Clause 4 says that the board shall continue to be known as the Phylloxera Board of South Australia. That amendment merely tidies up the position. Clause 5 contains an important amendment, and deals with a matter in which the Hon. Mr. Bardolph will be interested, because the other day he referred to the inflationary spiral. I assure him that there has been no inflationary spiral with the Phylloxera Board, because for each meeting the chairman gets only £2 and each member £1. It is proposed now to enable the Minister to decide from time to time what the remuneration shall be. That is a departure from what is contained in the principal Act.

This board was one of the first boards to be appointed, and most of the decisions were left to the board. Now the Minister has been given more power than he had at that time regarding its operations. I do not object to that because in the near future undoubtedly there will be work for the board to do, and it will need the support of the Minister and the department. I am pleased that some of these things are now under the Minister's direction. Should people in any way get difficult there will be power for the Minister to deal with the matter.

The Bill also covers the collection of levies, and the proposal is to have an entirely different scheme from what we have had previously. The levy has been arranged on the basis of a payment at so much an acre by a grower and at so much for each ton of fruit purchased by a distiller. Under the new scheme the Minister will fix the levy and the method of collection. Clause 8 provides for contributions to be payable at the office of the Commissioner of Land Tax. Previously it was at the office of the Commissioner of Taxes. Clause 11 amends section 36 and empowers the board to quarantine or treat or quarantine and treat all areas of a vineyard as the board deems necessary, and extends the area of quarantine to two chains. That conforms with the powers held by the Government at present in regard to a fruit fly epidemic. In dealing with an epidemic of fruit fly a wide area is covered rather than the actual street where the fly is found. I visualize this provision working in the same way as the treatment of the oriental fruit moth outbreak.

The Bill also deals with the bringing in from outside sources of vine cuttings for experimental purposes, and the testing in our conditions of varieties of stock that are declared non-resistant. The American type of stock is a resistant stock. We could only import that type, but under the Bill the board will be able to bring in other varieties, which will be placed in isolated nurseries. This was attempted three or four years ago and on Kangaroo Island it was hoped that experiments could be carried out with this type of stock, but the conditions were unsuitable for the growing of root stock. Also, the stock got a virus, which ruined the experiments. Then experiments were carried out at the Waite Research Institute, but it is necessary for the State to get new stock. The proposal will not permit the bringing in of stock from anywhere: it must be brought in by the board after collaboration with the Waite Research Institute and the Agriculture Department.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It will be clean stock.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. Experiments could then be made with phylloxera so as to ascertain the best stock for us to plant when replanting becomes necessary. If we had a phylloxera outbreak and we lost many vines we would not be able to put in any of our old stock. We would need a resistant stock, which we must build up in the same way as the Americans did. There have been peculiar experiences with phylloxera in several places. The resistant stock from America when planted in Europe was susceptible to phylloxera, and in one period large areas of plantings were lost.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The phylloxera attacks the roots.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but in the flying stage the phylloxera will attack foliage. Mainly, the damage is done to the roots. Clause 12 amends section 37, and is a wise provision. It gives the board power to clean up derelict vineyards. If we had this power under other legislation it would have been possible to do much cleaning up of codling moth. We have the power in connection with the oriental fruit moth. With the codling moth in particular one gets burnt-out gardens or people who walk off and leave them. The trees remain on the property and there is no power to go in and cut them down. One can strip the fruit but cannot do much else. Under this old provision there was a two-year period before one could go in and clear a neglected orchard; under this new provision it will be at the direction of the board and, if a place is let go, as often happens in the Barossa Valley where vines have become unproductive and they turn the sheep or cows into the vineyards and leave the vines there, in the case of a phylloxera outbreak the board will have the power to go in and clean it up, which is an excellent provision, for otherwise one would not be able to spray or uproot vines infested with, perhaps, phylloxera.

I do not wish to labour this any further but can assure honourable members that this is good and acceptable legislation. I only hope that the provisions dealing with an outbreak of phylloxera will never need to be used in this State. If we can continue to police it, as the department has done over the years, and if people continue to co-operate and be reasonable, there will be no worry that we shall have an outbreak; but it is most important that we have our machinery in order just in case we ever suffer an outbreak. It is also

important that we have all the experiments done that are necessary to put us back in business if we are unfortunate enough to suffer phylloxera in the State. I commend the Bill and support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Story has spoken with much knowledge of this subject, as he usually does on all subjects. Being a resident of the River Murray area, it is only reasonable to expect that he would have much knowledge of phylloxera. In fact, he renders great service to his district in the River Murray areas, particularly to those engaged in agricultural pursuits. One of the greatest industries in South Australia, and one in which we have a world-wide reputation, is the wine industry. Some of our early settlers from Europe brought with them much knowledge and know-how in vine growing and wine making and were quick to realize the potential of some of our South Australian soils for that purpose. The vine-growing industry was established in the early years of settlement in South Australia. This industry flourished and expanded but, with all industries of the soil, problems become manifest, not the least of these being disease.

An early disease to raise its ugly head in Australia was phylloxera. There is some doubt about when the disease was first discovered in Australia, but a serious outbreak occurred at Rutherglen in Victoria in the year 1899. In a period of less than two decades the whole of the vineyard area of over 15,000 acres in this locality was wiped out. Also in the year 1899 the South Australian Parliament passed legislation appointing a Phylloxera Board, whose duty it was to apply certain regulations to prevent the entry of that disease into South Australia. So successful have been the efforts of this board that not only phylloxera but many other virus diseases have been kept out of South Australia. In fact, there have been no further outbreaks of phylloxera in uninfested areas in Australia during the last 50 or 60 years.

The vine-growing and wine-making industry is of great economic value to South Australia. This State produces 75 per cent of the wine produced in Australia; thus, an equivalent percentage of excise duty is collected in this State. Notwithstanding the fact that South Australia is the leading vine-growing State, there is always a need to have new and better varieties of vines, and varieties that can be used for research into their resistance to virus diseases. Many of the varieties that we may wish to bring into South Australia for research purposes are not phylloxera-resistant. Therefore, much care must be exercised in how stock is introduced and distributed. A nursery for research purposes is in existence at Wahgunyah in Victoria, and it is proposed that any vine root stocks that are brought into South Australia will be clean stocks and will be used for experimental purposes, under the direction of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow these things, together with other things, to be done. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): Briefly, I wish to be associated with other speakers in supporting the Government in this Bill. Many points have already been covered so I shall content myself with one or two remarks as a member for Southern District—because, as honourable members are well aware, some of the highest quality wines in South Australia come from south of Adelaide, a fact which in some quarters is not fully appreciated! I point out that the life cycle of the phylloxera insect is: over-wintering, then egg-hatching in the springtime; then the stem mother mounting to the young leaf, which it starts eating. Where it eats it forms a gall, which is a pocket-like structure in which it lays eggs. In fact, many hatchings can occur from those galls and up to 500 eggs can be hatched at a sitting. The hatching is done parthenogenetically: in other words, no mating is required to fertilize the eggs. Most of our vines are of the European variety (known as *vitis vinifera*) in this State. In this case the life cycle is reproduced but in the roots; it is not applicable to the leaves as in the case of the American varieties of grapes, whose life cycle I have already described. This is fairly important because of the implication in the Bill in clause 13. The position up until now has been that the only vines allowed into South Australia have been phylloxera resistant: in other words, American vine root stock that has become resistant over many hundreds of years to the phylloxera scourge of that country. Clause 13 removes the need for importations at this stage being phylloxera resistant and allows a more open variety of root stock for experimental purposes.

I think the Hon. Mr. Hart has already mentioned the great value and importance of the wine industry to South Australia. In fact, 75 per cent of the wine produced in Australia is South Australian wine, so the great importance of that industry to this State can be

readily seen. If any outbreak ever occurred in South Australia, which would be most problematical, supplies of root stock would be available to growers to replant vines. The wine industry, like many other industries, takes so long before economic maturity is reached that one must have readily available methods to overcome any dire emergency. We now have protection today through innovations and modern chemical fumigants and sprays; we have the possibility of protection from an attack by means of resistant root stocks (through clause 3 of the Bill) and research work at the Waite Institute. Perhaps most important of all we have the quarantine regulations that have kept South Australia and Western Australia the only States on the mainland free of any outbreak. There is a possibility of research work in relation to predators that could prey on this insect, which is an experimental matter receiving a certain amount of support in some quarters. May I quote from the latest book that I can find on the subject (June, 1963) entitled *Phylloxera and its Relation to South Australian Viticulture*, by Mr. B. G. Coombe. A Mr. Swan is quoted in this volume as saying:

. . . if present safeguards are maintained, the insect should not spread further in Australia. Uninfested regions such as South Australia will, however, be permanently subject to risk of invasion should infested rooted vines enter this State.

Therefore, for these reasons—and I hope I am forgiven for delaying the Chamber in order to follow up this matter on behalf of Southern areas which I represent—I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in similar form to the amending Act passed in 1958 on the occasion of the last amendment to the River Murray Waters Agreement. After reciting that the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have entered into a further agreement to vary the principal agreement subject to ratification by the Parliaments concerned, the Bill, by clause 5, ratifies and approves the agreement, the remaining clauses of the Bill being of a formal or consequential nature.

The text of the sixth amending agreement is set forth in the schedule to the Bill. I do not go into details of the clauses of the agreement but would say that its general effect will be to enable effect to be given to the arrangements which have been made in connection with the construction of a storage dam at Chowilla, ensuring to this State adequate supplies of water well beyond the year 1970 when serious shortages could otherwise occur. This State's dependence upon the River Murray for urban, rural and irrigation requirements is increasing each year.

Total diversions in the year 1962-63 amounted to 300,000 acre feet compared with 190,000 acre feet 10 years ago. Irrigation requirements are growing steadily but there has been a rapid increase in diversions to the water supply system. The average quantity used annually for this purpose during the last six years was 52,000 acre feet compared with an average of 15,000 acre feet in the previous six years. Under the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement made on September 9, 1914, and subsequently ratified by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, the upper States, *i.e.*, New South Wales and Victoria, are entitled to the full use of their respective tributaries joining the River Murray below Albury. Prior to that time little had been done by the upper States to harness and use the waters of their tributaries with the result that most of the water from these sources flowed unrestricted to the River Murray and down that river to South Australia.

There has now been a radical change in the situation as major storages have been built on the three main tributaries, Burrinjuck on the River Murrumbidgee, Eildon on the River Goulburn and the Menindee storages on the River Darling. Storages and diversion weirs have also been built on the smaller tributaries. The result of these works has been to deprive South Australia of the benefit of uncontrolled tributary flows and therefore to increase the State's dependence upon controlled flows from storages administered by the River Murray Commission.

The 1914 agreement entitled South Australia to stipulated minimum monthly flows aggregating 1,254,000 acre feet a year on the basis of 651,000 acre feet for losses and 603,000 acre feet for diversions. The agreement also empowered the River Murray Commission to declare periods of restriction in times of drought, thereby restricting the supply to all States. The method of restriction was placed

on a firm basis when the agreement was amended in September, 1958, clause 51 stipulating that during a declared period of restriction the available water should be divided between the State contracting Governments in the following proportions:—

New South Wales	1,000,000
Victoria	1,000,000
South Australia	603,000

The main purpose of amending the Agreement in 1958 was to provide for raising of Hume dam to increase the capacity to 2,500,000 acre feet.

Resulting from the operations of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority approximately two-thirds of the water diverted from the Snowy River will pass into the River Murrumbidgee, a New South Wales tributary, and South Australia is not entitled to any of this water. However, the remaining third will flow into the River Murray above Albury and South Australia contended that this portion automatically became part of the River Murray resources in which this State is entitled to share. Following protracted negotiations the upper States conceded this point which meant that South Australia would be assured of an additional 100,000 acre feet or more during a year of serious drought. A thorough hydrological investigation has shown that in spite of the benefits received through increasing the capacity of Hume reservoir and obtaining the assistance of Snowy water South Australia would suffer some restriction in its supply on an average of one year in every four and that the total flow to this State would be as little as 700,000 acre feet in years of serious drought. After allowing for unavoidable losses the amount available for diversion in such years would be approximately 300,000 acre feet only, *i.e.* half the normal supply. This would mean that developments in this State dependent upon the River Murray would of necessity be tempered to this reduced quantity. South Australia is already diverting 300,000 acre feet a year and therefore it would be necessary for all expansion to come to an end unless additional regulating works could be constructed to impound water in times of plenty for use in times of drought.

The River Murray is one of the most erratic rivers of any magnitude in the world. The average annual flow of the Murray-Darling system is 12,000,000 acre feet, but during the last 60 years the actual discharge has ranged from 1,000,000 acre feet in 1914 to 43,000,000 acre feet in 1956. Reliability can only be achieved by the construction of regulating storages. An investigation by the River Murray Commission in the upper reaches of the Murray and its tributaries and by South Australia in the lower portion of the river has shown that construction of a storage at Chowilla, 392½ miles above the Murray mouth and 37½ river miles above Renmark, would be the most economical and satisfactory means of achieving the required result.

Chowilla dam will span the river valley at one of its narrowest parts, the overall length of the structure being 3⅓ miles. The dam will consist of an earth and rock fill embarkment with an average height of 42 feet with concrete weir sections fitted with radial gates to discharge floodwaters. The maximum water depth will be 55 feet and the capacity of the reservoir approximately 4,750,000 acre feet. Comparative capacities of Australia's largest water storages are:

Lake Eucumbene (Snowy Mountains Scheme)—3,860,000 acre feet.

Eildon Reservoir (Goulburn River, Victoria)—2,750,000 acre feet.

Hume Reservoir (since enlarging)—2,500,000 acre feet.

The height of Chowilla dam is limited by the need to prevent the flooding of Wentworth and the surrounding irrigation areas. The full supply level will be 105ft. above sea level and 3ft. below the upper pool level at Lock and Weir No. 10, Wentworth. The floodgates will be capable of discharging a flood more than twice the volume of any flood experienced in the past without any raising of the water level at Wentworth. The area inundated will be approximately 550 square miles, most of which is pastoral country in Victoria and New South Wales. The dam will incorporate a shipping lock and a roadway.

A proportion of the impounded water will be lost by evaporation, but it must be remembered that this will be water which would otherwise have flowed to the sea. During the 12 months following filling, evaporation losses will amount to approximately 20 per cent of the reservoir capacity. An investigation carried out for the River Murray Commission by an interstate committee of engineers showed that the benefits to South Australia would be limited if Chowilla were built and operated as a River Murray Commission storage on the present basis of water distribution in a drought year, *i.e.*, five parts to New South Wales, five to Victoria and three to South Australia. In fact, on this basis South Australia's interests could have been adequately served only by

building Chowilla as a South Australian storage at the full cost of this State. However, following negotiations with the Commonwealth and the other States it was agreed that the basis of allocation in a drought year of all waters controlled by the River Murray Commission would be changed to give each State one-third of the quantity. This completely changed the outlook and the investigation showed that on the amended basis South Australia would receive the same benefits and would be required to meet only one-fourth of the cost.

With a repetition of the annual flows which have occurred during the last 60 years and after making due allowance for the further harnessing of tributaries by the upper States, South Australia would experience some reduction in flow on an average of one year in 20 when Chowilla comes into operation and on no occasion would the shortage be sufficient to cause any serious hardship. The calculations show that South Australia's total deficiency in the 60-year period under present conditions would be 3,425,000 acre feet compared with a total deficiency of 425,000 acre feet if Chowilla were constructed.

The deep sand foundation upon which the dam will be built presents design and construction problems. Site investigations of considerable magnitude have been carried out and tentative plans prepared. Expert advice now being obtained from England and the United States may result in some design modifications. Construction of the Chowilla storage will be of great national importance and vital to the future development of South Australia. Ratification of the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement will enable this important undertaking to proceed. It is with great pleasure that I commend this Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

RIVER MURRAY WATERS AGREEMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to ratify and approve an agreement made between the Commonwealth and the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia concerning the utilization for a period of seven years of water from the Menindee storage on the River Darling. The Bill itself is very short, providing only by clause 5 for ratification and approval of the agreement, the remaining clauses being of a formal or consequential nature. The text of the agreement is set out in the schedule to the Bill. With the growing demand for water from the River Murray in the three riparian States, serious shortages could occur before the Chowilla reservoir is completed and becomes effective. The length of the intervening period will depend upon the rate of construction of the Chowilla dam and river flows in the years immediately following completion of the work. In the circumstances it is possible that the Chowilla dam will make no useful contribution until the year 1970, and steps should be taken to safeguard supplies up to that time.

During the course of a conference held in Canberra in April, 1962, the Premier of New South Wales offered to make available the Menindee storage on the River Darling for operation as a River Murray Commission work for a limited period. The River Murray Commission recommended acceptance of this offer and agreement was subsequently reached in regard to the terms and conditions under which this storage would be utilized to augment supplies. The Commonwealth and the three States concerned agreed that this would best be brought about by the signing and ratification of an agreement supplemental to the River Murray Waters Agreement.

The total capacity of the four Menindee storages is 1,470,000 acre feet, and the agreement provides that any water stored in excess of 390,000 acre feet will be available for distribution by the River Murray Commission in accordance with the provisions of the principal agreement. This means that in times of shortage the three States will share equally any water released from the Menindee storage in terms of this supplemental agreement.

The River Murray Commission will pay to the State of New South Wales £160,000 per annum in equal quarterly instalments, and in addition will meet three-quarters of the cost of maintenance work necessary to keep the storage in good order and condition. The total annual cost to each State will be approximately £60,000, which is considered to be a reasonable premium to pay in return for insurance against the serious consequences of a severe drought. The term of the supplemental agreement is seven years from January 1, 1963. In moving the second reading I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

HECTORVILLE CHILDREN'S HOME.

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

In the resolution, to strike out "at Hectorville" and insert in lieu thereof "on section 2054, hundred of Adelaide, county of Adelaide and adjacent areas".

(For wording of motion, see page 434.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

Some difference of opinion has been expressed as to whether the resolution transmitted from this Chamber to the House of Assembly accurately described the location of the land. It has been suggested that the land is not strictly in Hectorville, and the amendment prescribes the exact location of the land.

Amendment agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 5, at 2.15 p.m.