LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, November 5, 1963.

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

QUESTION.

STATE WHEAT COMPETITIONS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: For many years State wheat crop competitions were held in South Australia, but were discontinued in the 1960-61 season. At present competitions are held in districts and the top six entries are judged by Agriculture Department officers and local competitions are also permitted to be judged by departmental officers provided all competitors follow the judge. I have been asked by some of my constituents to request that the State wheat crop competitions again be held. In view of the importance of the wheat industry to South Australia, the fact that wheat-growing is an industry in which many people are engaged and that many of the younger generation are becoming interested in this phase of agriculture, I ask the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, to consider this matter with a view to having State wheat crop competitions reinstated.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have some knowledge of these competitions, which were held up to the year mentioned by the honourable member. His question is directed at whether they should be continued and relates to the future. I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague for consideration.

KLEMZIG PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Klemzig Primary School.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. A. J. SHARD.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That 10 days' leave of absence be granted to the Hon. A. J. Shard on account of absence from the State on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

It is hardly necessary for me to amplify the reasons for which this leave is necessary. The Hon. Mr. Shard is away representing the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at a conference in Kuala Lumpur. In order to conform with the Standing Orders of the Chamber, I move accordingly.

Motion carried.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1201.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading. We are all indebted to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for his explanation of the Bill, and his further explanation of one or two difficulties he sees under the legislation. They seem to be administrative difficulties, as far as origin is concerned but, generally, the administration of the Act, and the protection of long-established rights to purchasers and vendors of land, and to other people who have dealings in land, are so well-established that we must consider carefully any legislation designed to alter them.

South Australians should be justly proud of the great record of achievement in the field of real property registration. This State was the first to inaugurate the Torrens system of real property title registration. It has spread throughout the English-speaking world and has been adopted by some foreign countries. In the administration of the Act eyes are always turned to South Australia to see how well the matter is being conducted here and whether any improvements have been made. One speaker in this debate said that ours was probably the finest run office in the British Commonwealth and I think, by and large, that is true. However, I was interested in the administration that has come into being in New Zealand. On examining it I found one or two refinements and administrative details that are indeed good. Our Registrar-General has evinced great interest in them and I believe he is shortly going to confer with his opposite number in that country to see whether or not they might be introduced here. It is important that people should learn to rely on the register

and to know that documents lodged for registration in the Lands Titles Office will receive priority in accordance with the date of registration. That has always been the basis on which the Torrens system has worked.

All members look forward to seeing the amendments Sir Arthur Rymill proposes to move to deal with the important question of the proper exercise of power to be given to the Registrar-General under clause 5 of the Bill. It seemed to me, while listening to the honourable member, that perhaps he was making a little too much of his point, because I fail to see how, from an administrative point of view, the Registrar could possibly have acted in any way other than what the honourable member contemplates. Again, however, the matter is so important to people involved in land transactions that I would give my support to any amendment that the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill desired to introduce if it would clarify the position and clearly prescribe limits to the administrative power of the Registrar-General.

I think the stage is reached where we should look at these amendments that the honourable member is to put on the file. I understand that they have already been circulated or, if not circulated, at least that the Parliamentary Draftsman has prepared them. I shall look at them with care when we get into Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think that those responsible should see to it that these amendments are on the file before we proceed.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I entirely agree with the Hon. Mr. Bardolph. My intention was to allow the Bill to proceed as far as clause 3 and then ask that progress be reported. The first amendment that we shall need to consider is in respect of clause 4. That is not on honourable members' files. There is no query with regard to the first three clauses. If the honourable member is agreeable to that, I shall ask that progress be reported when we reach clause 4.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I must, on a point of order, object to the procedure that is suggested. Only a few days ago there was a similar occasion when one of my colleagues, on moving an amendment, was asked to withdraw it instead of proceeding with it, as we had done in the Companies Bill, and come back to the clause needing amendment. We should not proceed until the amendments are on the file.

The CHAIRMAN: As long as the amendment is in a form that everybody can understand without his having a copy before him, I think we can proceed with the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 129."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think the position is somewhat different in this case from that posed by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph. In that case, I think the Committee proceeded beyond the clause that needed amendment and it was agreed that the Bill should be recommitted in order to deal with that amendment. In this case, I do not see that that is the position. So far, there has been no suggestion of any amendment to these clauses. I therefore think we are following the correct procedure. I suggest at this stage that progress be reported to enable the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill to prepare the amendment he requires to clause 4.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

In Committee.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, Section 129."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I regret that my amendments were not earlier on member's files. I move:

In new subsection 2 (*b*) (*i*) after "specifications" to insert "which are in existence at the date of the mortgage or encumbrance".

The clause presupposes that where there is a covenant with plans and specifications it will be in existence when the encumbrance or mortgage is entered into. In practice this is not so, and in my second reading speech I pointed out the difficulties that were likely to arise. The amendment will cope with the position.

Amendment carried.

The Hon Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I move:

In new subsection (2) after "they are" to insert "or will be".

This part of the clause relates to the same plans and specifications, and the intention is to make them available when they are in existence. As amended the clause will read:

. . . the plans and specifications or a copy thereof shall be attached to the instrument unless it is or they are or will be available for public inspection . . .

Normally when a document is executed there is a mortgage or an encumbrance, with the usual collateral documents. Often the plans and specifications are attached, for necessary purposes, to those documents. However, it is not

always possible to register them previously, and it is envisaged that they will be registered at a future date.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL. I move:

At the end of the clause to insert "or will be so available within 28 days of the date of execution of such instrument".

The collateral documents may not be registered at the time of the execution of the mortgage or encumbrance. It will be impossible for that to happen. In the case both of a bill of sale and of a debenture there is a time limit under the Bills of Sale Act and the Companies Act of 28 days for the registration of those instruments. Therefore, it will have to be within 28 days, and that will be for the protection of the Registrar-General because he will not have to register the mortgage until he is satisfied that those other documents have been registered.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Amendment of principal Act, section 220."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The amendments standing in my name on this clause I regard as extremely important, as I mentioned in the second reading debate, because in my opinion without some such amendments the clause as at present in the Bill, although having excellent intentions, would negate one of the fundamental underlying principles of the Real Property Act, namely, that priority of lodgement and acceptance does give a priority. The clause as at present drawn establishes that priority just the same, but it enables something to happen that has never been capable of happening before: it enables the Registrar-General to reject documents once he has accepted them. This is something completely new and, while there is a desirable reason for the amendment, it undoubtedly in my opinion needs protective clauses so that the normal flow of business in this regard can continue without the necessity of lodging a caveat immediately a settlement is made or without the fear that, because of the rejection of documents, an instrument can be voided.

With the indulgence of honourable members, I propose to read to the Council the clause as it would stand if my amendments were adopted, because I think that will give the clearest exposition of what I am moving for. I shall make one or two comments as I go through the clause. Of course, when I come to move the amendments, I shall move them separately but I think it is necessary for me to explain their whole pattern because, although there are a number of separate amendments, they do in fact form a totality of ideas. The clause would read:

(3a) If in respect of any instrument or other matter arising under this Act the Registrar-General is of opinion that—

(*a*) the production of any other instrument or document;

(*b*) the giving of any information evidence or notice; or

(*c*) the doing of any act,

is necessary or desirable, the Registrar-General may—

The clause to that stage remains the same, but the pattern of the following amendment is that he shall give the person of whom he makes the requirement two months to fulfil the requirement and, if it is not then fulfilled, he shall give another month's notice not only to that person but to all other people likely to be affected by the possible rejection of the document that he proposes to reject if the information is not given to him. The other people concerned are the other parties to the document objected to, the parties in all subsequent documents depending upon the registration of that document, and the persons lodging it; so that everyone who may be affected by this rather drastic act will have the opportunity to do something about it. So the clause, with my proposed amendments, would continue:

I. require the person lodging the instrument or some other person concerned in the matter to produce the other instrument or document, give the information evidence or notice or do the act; and

II. until the requirement is complied with, refuse to proceed with the registration of the first-mentioned instrument or with the other matter or to do any act or make any entry in connection therewith.

(3b) If any such requirement is not complied with within two months after the making of a requisition under subsection (3a) of this section:

(*a*) the Registrar-General shall give notice in writing of his intention to reject the first-mentioned instrument and any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon to the person or persons lodging and to each of the parties to such instrument or instruments; and

(*b*) if any such requirement is not complied with within one month after the giving of the notice under paragraph (*a*) of this subsection the Registrar-General may reject the first-mentioned instrument and any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon and

return any instruments or other documents lodged in connection therewith in such manner as he thinks fit; and

(*c*) any fees paid in respect of any instrument so rejected shall be forfeited.

That forfeiture clause is as it is in the Bill at the moment. After that I propose to insert something that will really be the teeth of the clause: what someone can do if a document is to be rejected because of the failure of some person, possibly some entirely different person, to furnish the information required by the Registrar-General. The concept of what they can do is that they can lodge a caveat at any time before the instrument is rejected, having received a month's notice that that is likely to happen; and (and this is particularly important) on the lodgement of that caveat the instrument to be rejected will retain any prior rights it had because of its priority of lodgement. Of course, it will retain that only until such time as the legal title is established, when it will be permanently retained; or until such time as the caveat is warned and removed from the register, in which case the equity established by the document will have to compete on its own feet, as at the moment.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: How long can a caveat remain in force?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: For a long time. There is provision under the Act for what is called warning a caveat, and that can be done by any person effecting a caveat or by the Registrar-General himself. On warning, the caveat may be removed by the person lodging it, which means it is the end of it; or, if he refuses to remove it, court proceedings are then taken and the parties all go to court to try to establish their case before the court. So a caveat will remain until it is removed by the court in those latter circumstances. If this particular part of the amendment were not in, it would mean in my opinion that in most transactions after this Bill became law a caveat would have to be required as a matter of prudence every time a settlement took place—which, of course, would not be desirable. It would mean much trouble and great expense, because it happens in relation to practically every settlement that takes place. This amendment is designed to get over that by giving in these unusual circumstances everyone affected by a possible rejection of the document a right to take action to put a caveat on only when the rejection is threatened. Therefore, the necessity to lodge a caveat under this proposed amendment will, I hope, be quite rare, but the procedure will be there for the protection of the people concerned with these transactions if it is needed. This is, of course, the basic principle of the Real Property Act itself.

There is another proviso: I wanted the word "rejected" altered to "returned", but the Registrar-General wanted the word "rejected" to remain, so I suggested as an alternative that we put in a proviso making it clear that if a document had been rejected and if it were put in order, it could be relodged for registration because in a legal concept I considered that rejection could mean a final act and that a rejected document could remain as such. The proviso concerning the rejection of any document shall not prevent the relodgement of that instrument for registration after compliance with the requisition referred to in subsection (3a) of this provision. I move:

In new subsection (3b) to strike out "such time as the Registrar-General allows" and insert "two months after the making of a requisition under subsection (3a) of this section:

(*a*) the Registrar-General shall give notice in writing of his intention to reject the first-mentioned instrument and any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon to the person or persons lodging and to each of the parties to such instrument or instruments; and"

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I support this and the other proposed amendments. I think with this first amendment we can now meet the problem that confronted the Registrar-General when the Real Property Act was enacted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I support the series of amendments of which the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has given notice of intention to move. As far as I can see, he has not forgotten any situation that could arise and I think the suggestion for the lodging of a caveat in the circumstances set out in the particular amendment is a happy solution to a problem that is quite obviously there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I support the amendments moved by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, and I am certain that he has achieved a balance between what the amending Bill sets out to do and the principles of the Torrens system under which this State has worked for so long. I am pleased about the provisions in his last two proposed amendments. I think the only point on which I was at variance with the honourable member in his second reading speech was his ideas on the rejection, if I may call it that, of this word "rejected". In the last two paragraphs the word "rejected" is retained, but with the

provision that the document is not debarred from making a reappearance if it is placed in order. I support the amendments.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I move:

In paragraph (*a*) of new subsection (3b) to strike out "(*a*)" and insert "(*b*) if any such requirement is not complied with within one month after the giving of the notice under paragraph (*a*) of this subsection".

The purpose of this amendment is merely to leave out the letter "(*a*)" and not the whole of the paragraph. As there is a new paragraph (*a*) that has just been inserted, the existing paragraph (*a*) should become paragraph (*b*).

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL moved:

In new subsection (3b) before "return any instruments" to insert "any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon and".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL moved:

In new subsection (3b) to strike out "(*b*)" and insert "(*c*)".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL moved to insert at the end of the clause the following words:

"Provided that the rejection of any instrument in pursuance of the provisions of this subsection shall not prevent the relodgment of that instrument for registration after compliance with the requisition referred to in subsection (3a) of this section.

Any instrument rejected or returned in pursuance of this subsection shall, if the party or parties deriving an estate or interest thereunder lodges a caveat to protect such estate or interest before the expiration of the period mentioned in paragraph (*b*) of this section retain the priority to registration which it would have had if it had not been rejected or returned."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1397.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill and, following the explanation given by the Minister who introduced it, I think there is little that need be said concerning its provisions because, on the face of it, this is a Bill making administrative changes which I support. I should like to take the opportunity to raise a matter related to the subject matter of this Bill: clause 11 amends section 80 of the principal Act providing for the issue of a learner's permit, where desirable in the opinion of the Registrar. This is an important point and raises generally the matter of learners' permits and licences to drive. I am wondering whether or not we in this State ought to give early and earnest consideration to the possibility of raising the initial age at which a driver's licence may be obtained from 16 years, as it is at present under section 76, to 17 years.

This is the only State in Australia that permits boys and girls of 16 years of age (and older) to obtain a driver's licence. I have looked at the provisions existing in other States and I find that in New South Wales a person must be 17 years of age to obtain a driver's licence and, in the case of driving a taxi or truck, 21 years. In Victoria the age is 18 years, but it is possible to apply for a learner's permit at the age of 17 years. In other States the age is 17 years, although in Western Australia higher ages are required to drive certain types of lorries and trucks.

Members may be wondering why there should be any difference between driving at 16 years and driving at 17 years and whether this matters very much. If honourable members look at the 1962 Commonwealth Year Book they will see that South Australia has the rather doubtful reputation of having the highest number of road accidents in Australia. Accidents per 10,000 motor vehicles in South Australia in 1962 were 260 and the nearest to that was Western Australia with 223. Honourable members may ask: is this at all related to the fact that we have a 12 months earlier age at which one can obtain a driver's licence? The statistics in the Police Commissioner's report for 1962 show that the group 17 years and under 21 years represents the highest number of people who are killed and injured on our roads. A total of 1,495 people in that age group were killed and injured on our roads in 1962; the figures for other age groups are not nearly as high.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph; Do you advocate the use of speed governors on cars?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have never considered that point and I am addressing my mind at the moment to this question of early licensing of young people.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: Does that report start at 16 years?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No, at 17 to 21. It does not include figures for 16. I am glad the honourable member raised that point because I remember that some years ago the then Registrar of Motor Vehicles, the late Mr. Kay, was asked to give a report on this matter and, although I have not a copy of it at the moment, I know he said that as far as he could ascertain there was not much difference between 16 years and 17 years. However, that conclusion is really based on fallacy. Whichever age one takes as the starting point —whether it is 16, 17, 18, 19 or 20—the first year will show a much lower percentage of accidents, because throughout the first year in which one can obtain a driver's licence applications will be staggered and there may be a considerable number of people who do not obtain their licences until late in that year. One cannot take the first year—it does not matter what the age is—and base any reliable statistics on it.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Have you compared the accidents of the youngest age groups in this State with those of the youngest in other States?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I have not, because the age is one year younger in this State. I cannot compare our 16 with 17 because other States start at 17 and some even later.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: I thought you said the figures for this State start at 17. Can't you compare those figures with those of other States?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I think the honourable member will find that the same pattern applies throughout Australia: the 17 to 21 age group is the dangerous one in any State and there is no question about that.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: So the age for a licence should be raised to 21?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No. I am just saying that I think it is important that young people be responsible when they first obtain a driver's licence. It may be said that if a person now is required to pass a driving test at 16 years he is probably just as good as someone at 17 or 20 years, but I suggest that is a fallacious argument. It is not so much the capacity to pass a driver's test that is important from the point of view of road accidents, but the capacity to deal with the exigencies that arise in an emergency on the road, and I suggest the young boy or girl, who in many cases is still at school between the ages of 16 and 17, is not very well equipped to meet such a situation. I am suggesting that we have an older qualifying age and that we make it at least as high as that in the other States. I put this to honourable members so that they can think about it and if they believe I am wrong or that I am misconstruing the statistics, then undoubtedly they will privately or publicly tear me to pieces. I believe this is a factor that should receive some consideration from the Government and I hope that an attempt will be made to further consider the statistics and see whether some steps should not be taken soon to bring the age of qualifying for a driver's licence in this State to 17 years, because no discrimination is provided at all. The licence is to drive anything from a 10-ton truck to a small Mini car. This is something that may warrant investigation. As I said before, the Bill is unexceptionable in every way. The administrative amendments it makes are worthwhile and I support it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I support the second reading. As has been pointed out by the Hon. Mr. Potter, everything contained in this Bill is of an administrative nature. I wish to comment on one or two of the amendments. Clause 4 inserts after the word "implements" in section 12 (1) (c) the words "or carrying farm implements by means of an attachment designed for that purpose". This amendment is designed to allow the carriage of implements on three-point linkage by tractors. At the moment the principal Act stipulates only the drawing of farm implements. However, I am certain that farmers have understood that the drawing of implements by three-point linkage was covered by the Act; this clause makes that quite clear. Other parts of section 12 are not so clear. Subsection (2) enables a person to travel more than 25 miles from the farm occupied by him in the event of repairs being necessary to any tractor or implement. Subsection (3) states:

> A farm implement may without registration or insurance be drawn by a tractor or other motor vehicle on roads within 25 miles of a farm . . .

Subsection (4) deals with self-propelled machines. Subsection (5) defines what is a farm implement, and states:

> . . . "farm implement" means an implement or machine for ploughing, cultivating, clearing or rolling land, sowing seed, spreading fertilizer, harvesting crops, spraying, chaff cutting, or other like operations and includes a trailer bin constructed for attachment to a harvester . . .

A number of machines used on farms are not covered in that provision. I suggest that practically every farm of any size has machines such as compressors, welders, swing saws, loading ramps, concrete mixers and other like machines. I am sure that these are not covered by section 12 (5). This places farmers in some doubt as to whether they are breaking the law by not having these implements registered when travelling on a road from one section of their property to another. Section 12 (1) also covers the position of a person who owns a farm and at the same time does contracting. I believe this person is entitled under subsection (5) to take any of the machines stipulated therein on to the road without registering them, but there are occasions when a farmer uses the other equipment mentioned in his normal farming practice without knowing whether he is allowed to take it on the road. I believe subsection (5) should define more fully exactly what machines a farmer may take on to the road without their being registered.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Which machines do you think he will be in doubt about?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: For example, a welder or compressor. When a farmer is harvesting he could use a compressor or welder and take it with him. Under this subsection I am not sure whether he is entitled to take this equipment on the road. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that he believed consideration should be given to applying a simple means of registration for these particular implements and providing some form of third-party insurance on them. Section 12 (3) states, "A farm implement may without registration or insurance . . . ." This covers a tractor owned by a farmer and he may drive it on a road without third-party insurance. Section 102 of the principal Act states:

> (1) A person shall not drive a motor vehicle on a road unless a policy of insurance complying with this Part is in force in relation to that vehicle: Provided that this section shall not apply in respect of a tractor being driven in pursuance of the provisions of subsection (1) of section 12 or section 13 of this Act until the Governor by proclamation declares that this section shall so apply.

At present, the position is that many primary producers drive tractors and draw implements on the road without having third-party cover for them. I do not consider that this is correct, because all other persons using the road have some guarantee in the event of an accident and a claim for damages. If a person driving a tractor on a road is not covered by third-party insurance and claims are made against him because of an accident (and they could be as high as £20,000) this could well result in the insolvency of the person involved. If the person driving the tractor was not solvent the claimant would not be able to recover his claim.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Is it not covered by another section?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not sure.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I think you will find that the third-party is covered by the Road Traffic Act.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have examined that Act closely and I am not sure of the position. I am raising this matter so that an assurance on the present position may be given. Until the sections of the Act are proclaimed there will be some doubt regarding this matter. I should like some clarification on this particular point. Section 129 (1) of the principal Act says:

> Upon the recommendation of the Treasurer the Governor may appoint a committee to inquire into and report from time to time what maximum rates of premiums for insurance under this Part are fair and reasonable.

That matter is also referred to in section 102. I want to know whether the person who drives a tractor on a road without third-party insurance is covered. It would be unfair for a person to be allowed to drive on a road without having a third-party insurance cover.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Parliament has passed the matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. It is now a matter for proclamation. I would like some clarification on the point I have raised; meantime, I support the second reading.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TROTTING).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1322.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. Whenever an amendment is proposed to lottery and gaming legislation it creates opposition in some quarters and favourable response in other quarters. This Bill will not have these consequences, because it has been unanimously agreed to by the South Australian Trotting Club and the South Australian Trotting League. The proposal in the Bill will make

for the more amicable conduct of trotting in this State. Over the years there has been something of a rift between the two bodies and their attitude towards one another in the control of trotting meetings has not been harmonious. After going into the matter the Premier submitted proposals to both bodies, which unanimously accepted them. The Bill brings about a more centralized control of trotting under the league and confers on it certain mandatory powers. The league will be responsible for the overall rules under which trotting shall be conducted in South Australia. The executive committee of the league will administer trotting, and the committee is to remain as at present constituted.

All direct levies upon trotting clubs to support country trotting are to cease. Up to the present there has been a levy on each metropolitan area meeting, and a percentage of the profits has been distributed to country trotting clubs affiliated with the league. The Bill provides that 5 per cent of the winning bets tax, now paid to the Treasury, shall be paid to the league for distribution to country clubs. In other words, instead of a levy being imposed for the maintenance of country trotting clubs, 5 per cent of the winning bets tax will be used for that purpose. I understand that the Bill has been agreed to by both bodies, which are happy with the proposals. Consequently, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. I mention here that I also favour racing in South Australia being controlled by a proper authority. Racing has developed into a large industry because of the breeding of blood stock and all the ancillary industries attached to it. If we had a proper authority controlling racing we would have more uniformity than at present.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading. I have read the remarks of speakers on both sides on this matter. I have no reason to doubt that the Bill will improve the control of trotting in South Australia. I was impressed by the letters sent by both the league and the club to the Premier following his acting as arbitrator. Both those organizations complimented the Premier upon what was put forward by his advisers and himself. I can only think that this Bill improves things and settles much of the animosity that has existed over the years in these two organizations. I know that in many parts of the country trotting meetings are held in varying numbers during the year and that those country clubs need the support of metropolitan patrons and of metropolitan owners who go to those areas for the sport. This seems to me a good solution to the problem. From the assurances that we have and as both organizations are happy about the Bill I see no reason for Parliament disagreeing with them. Such a situation does not often happen.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1326.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the second reading and do so, not because I think the proposed amendments will make the Industrial Code an ideal piece of legislation but because they do bring some improvements to it. The Code was placed on our Statute Books in 1920 and has remained there during all the intervening years with no great amendments being made to it. One of the most important amendments was made in 1924 or 1925, when public servants, including employees of the Savings Bank and the State Bank, were brought under its provisions. Most amendments since have been minor, although the trade union movement through its political wing, the Parliamentary Labor Party, has in the intervening years introduced a number of Bills into Parliament for the purpose of endeavouring to bring about some amendments that the trade union movement thought should be made to the Industrial Code. Through weight of numbers in another place, of course, those Bills never reached this place.

The Trades and Labour Council for many years has had its own Industrial Code Committee, which has periodically looked at the Code and discussed ways and means of improving it. Indeed, it had more than one conference with the Chamber of Manufactures in the hope that it could convince the employers that there was need for some change and that some of the things that the trade union movement wanted should be done. Also, another committee was set up, with representatives of the Trades and Labour Council, the Australian Labor Party and the Parliamentary Labor Party sitting on it. That body was instrumental in bringing down to another place the amendments proposed in the past. This is a compromise Bill as, although it has been sent to us from another place, the amendments it embraces have been unanimously agreed to. This unanimity came about in this way, that some of the things that the trade union movement wanted it was prepared to trade with the

employers for some of the things that the employers wanted.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: A spirit of compromise.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The position was that that conference, comprising representatives of the trade union movement, the Chamber of Manufactures, the Employers' Federation and the Department of Labour and Industry, considered many things: it must have for a Bill with so many clauses to be introduced. In the final analysis, however, it was agreed by those representatives that the proposals to be brought down should not be amended. The trade union movement is not over-enthusiastic about some of these things, and I suppose the same applies in reverse to the employers. The whole Code was, in the first instance, gone through and it was found that there were changes sought by the employers not acceptable to the trade unions, and that there were changes in which general agreement was reached, the majority of those being in the nature of cutting out dead wood. Then there were changes sought by the trade union movement to which the employers would not agree, and there were a number of things in respect of which it was thought that some compromise agreement could be reached between the two sides.

This was the position reached in about 1960, when the conferences broke off for a while. Subsequently, they were called together again. Those matters in respect of which it was thought there was some chance of compromise were the things that were negotiated upon, and eventually some of them were included in this Bill. The Trades and Labour Council had a well-attended meeing at which these matters were discussed. Some of the unions were not very enthusiastic about some matters, but the result of that meeting was that by a fairly substantial majority the Trades and Labour Council agreed to recommend to that committee that I have already mentioned this afternoon, comprising three sections of the Labor organization (called the Labor Industrial Advisory Committee), that the Parliamentary Labor Party should support the Bill and not oppose its passage through Parliament. Many people in the trade union movement are a little apprehensive about some of the things that were traded and some that were received in exchange. Some of us are concerned with the penal clauses in the Code. It has had these clauses for as long as the Code has been in existence, but this Bill seems to extend them. The trade union movement has always opposed the penal clauses and sought their removal. We are concerned that in this legislation an individual employee stands to be fined the same amount as an employer. That seems to be a new departure in this type of legislation, particularly in South Australia.

We cannot, of course, move amendments to the Bill because we are committed to supporting it, but that does not make us over-enthusiastic about some of the clauses. We think some go a little too far and that there are provisions wanted by the trade union movement but not by employers which should have been included. There is one matter causing us particular concern because it affects the skill in the building industry, the availability of skilled people, and the number of apprentices to be trained in that industry. Surely there is something we can insert in the Code to cover the situation of the alleged subcontracting of work within the building industry. I have no doubt that this is really piece-work and one may think that there are already provisions within the Code to cover it but, apparently because it is camouflaged as subcontracting, the provisions of the Code do not cover this type of work.

I refer to the "labour only" contracts within the building industry which are causing concern not only to the trade union section but to employers, where we find that because of the system that operates very few apprentices are being trained. This must have an effect upon the degree of skill of the work in the building industry in the future. People will have to rely on semi-skilled and unskilled people to replace skilled men. I thought something should be inserted in the Code so that we could get back to a position where sufficient people were being trained in that industry.

There is a new provision for the appointment of a board of reference, which does not, however, compare favourably with the provisions within Federal awards where boards of reference are composed of representatives of the industry plus an independent chairman. The clause in this Bill allows for that type of appointment, certainly, but does not do so specifically. It could be that the board of reference is composed of one man who may not have any knowledge of the industry in respect of which he is making some decision. During the conferences that preceded this legislation one of the parties told me that certain proposed provisions were not included because they appeared in the Metal Trades Award. I do not agree with that view at all. Anybody

who knows the industrial set-up of South Australia will know that that is not a valid reason for excluding a provision from a State Code of this nature. The Metal Trades Award deals only with Federal matters and there is nothing in the State jurisdiction comparable with that award to cover people who are not respondents to the Metal Trades Award. Usually when an award is made in the Federal sphere people who would not otherwise be covered become parties to a State award or State determination. If there is no State coverage by way of a determination or agreement coverage should be provided in the Industrial Code. There must always be some people who are award-free between the making of a Federal award and another award.

I think that this Bill improves the Code and that is why we are supporting it. It could have gone further but I realize that there had to be a unanimous agreement among the bodies who were initially responsible for the legislation now before us. I pay a compliment to the Secretary for Labour and Industry, Mr. Bowes, without whose efforts this Bill could not have been drafted. I understand that at times it was difficult to reach agreement between the parties and I can quite understand that. On the other hand, I realize that the parties who were negotiating on this occasion must have been anxious to see certain other provisions included. I feel sure that the negotiations could have reached the point where they could be broken off but for the fact that the department persevered. I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading. In some respects it is a major Bill and because of that I was rather surprised to hear the lukewarm reception it received from the Hon. Mr. Kneebone. He came fairly close to damning it with faint praise and made many comments upon points not agreed upon without really lauding all the excellent results obtained by the conferences between the parties over the last two years. A Bill which contains 165 clauses and amends a Code that has been in existence for 43 years without any really major amendments should be welcomed by everybody. It is within the experience of all honourable members that a Bill that has been on the Statute Book for that length of time will obviously be crying out for administrative and substantive amendments to deal with the situation existing at present. Undoubtedly the situation that obtained when the legislation was first introduced does not apply to today's conditions.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why did not the Government accept the amendments proposed by us?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Members of the Labor Party have asked for amendments over the years and when they are introduced in such a comprehensive manner as they are in this Bill, Opposition members look down their noses and say they wish the Bill could be better than it is. By its very nature I believe this Bill is essentially a Committee measure. Each clause virtually deals with a different subject matter and I believe all honourable members can be content with the Minister's statement that it is the result of a series of conferences held over a protracted time by the two major parties concerned—the Department of Industry and the Trades and Labour Council. It is a fact, as the Minister has said, that every amendment proposed was unanimously agreed to at that series of conferences. That is enough for me.

I have considered most of the provisions in the Bill and the Minister's speech and I am satisfied this measure makes worthwhile amendments to the Code. Irrespective of the Hon. Mr. Kneebone's remarks, I think the Code will be given an almost completely fresh lease of life. It is true that the very nature of the Code is such that it will probably not please the members of all political Parties. It is essentially an administrative Bill as well as one which embodies certain political and industrial theories and beliefs and it is on the administrative side, particularly, that I believe the parties concerned are to be congratulated on the amendments upon which they eventually agreed. For those reasons I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading and I hope the Bill will be carried through Committee without amendment.

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

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1402.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I believe this Bill and the River Murray Waters Agreement Supplemental Agreement Bill have no political purport at all. This measure deals with the tributaries of the River Murray in connection with the Chowilla dam for the harnessing of water at present flowing into the river and which is not being fully utilized. In his speech on the second reading the Minister gave

a detailed report on the acre feet of water that would be available for irrigation. This measure will assist the further development of South Australia and consequently I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I also support the second reading. I must have been so excited about this Bill, for which I have waited so long, that I nearly beat the Hon. Mr. Bardolph to his feet. I believe all honourable members are extremely interested in this Bill. It provides for something which will be the life blood of this State over the next few years and will allow its development to continue. It is designed to ratify and approve an agreement entered into by the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia respecting the River Murray, Lake Victoria and other waters, and for other purposes. Nobody could suggest that the storage of this water is not a necessity. I remember reading in the *Murray Pioneer,* an organ which circulates in the Upper Murray Valley of South Australia and has been so doing for some 75 years, similar remarks to those being made today at about the period 1912 to 1914 when the agreement was established which brought the River Murray Commission into being. When the first Bill was passed in 1914 the population of this State was 441,000 and the demand for water was small in comparison with that of today. Water was mainly used for agricultural purposes. Today the population is over 1,000,000 and secondary industry has developed greatly. Because of this, there is no doubt we need some provision for not only maintaining secondary industry and primary production at this level but also going ahead. Adelaide's population today is greater than was the State's population when the first agreement was made. In 1959, our last drought year, 80 per cent of the State's water supply came from the Murray River, which enabled both primary and secondary industries to keep going. Some people wondered when the last agreement was made whether the locks would work properly with the water available, and whether the water stored in Lake Victoria would be useful to South Australia. The Premier and Chief Secretary of that time made a special trip to Renmark to have long discussions with the committee there. They had doubts about entering into the agreement with other States, and wondered what would be achieved by establishing Lake Victoria. That lake came into being about 40 years ago, and since then we have had water from it every year. Although the water has been stored in the lake for sometimes up to 12 months its salinity has been lower than the salinity of the river water. Often the water in the lake has sweetened. Some people now believe that seepage problems will occur because of the earth and rock fill. They wonder whether that type of fill will retain water.

Recently I took one of Australia's most eminent engineers to the site. I refer to Sir William Hudson, the Chief Commissioner of the Snowy Mountains Authority. We drove on to the top of the cliff overlooking the site and Sir William said that it was exactly what was being done in Russia, only they did not go to so much trouble. He said that in Russia they built completely earthern dams with a fairly friable type of material, and put two miles of solid earth across the river. In between the banks they would perhaps have 20 miles of water. In this way some of their great rivers were made navigable for 300 to 400 miles. When we have an assurance from Mr. Dridan, and no-one will doubt his ability, and confirmation from Sir William, we must regard the Chowilla dam as a practical proposition. Some people have doubts about the matter of evaporation, but in a country where the mean temperature during the summer months is about 100 degrees there must be some evaporation. The amount likely to be lost in this way has been calculated in fixing the quota of water to come to South Australia. Because of the mighty fight put up by our Premier in 1958, the Commonwealth agreed to this evaporation allowance. The water lost from this large area through evaporation will be insignificant, because if the water were not impounded it would eventually run out to sea. Some landholders are worried about losing good river flats when the area is inundated with water, but whenever progress occurs these things must be accepted. Most of the area concerned is held under pastoral lease. When the founders of the State thought of pastoral leases they regarded them as temporary until such time as better use could be made of the land. We should commend Mr. Dridan for his work. He has been our representative for some time on the River Murray Commission. He is a very unassuming man and always ready to give information that is sought. He is regarded highly by his colleagues on the commission, and other States regard him as a most efficient engineer.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: He is one of Australia's foremost engineers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. We are fortunate in having Mr. Dridan to look after our interests in this matter. The Chowilla dam will be the biggest dam in Australia. It will hold 4,750,000 acre feet of water. When we remember that an acre foot of water is the equivalent of 272,500 gallons we can see just how much water will be impounded in the dam. We rely very much on the River Murray and an average of 12,000,000 acre feet of water passes along it each year. In 1914 only 1,000,000 acre feet went through, but in the 1946 flood we had 43,000,000 acre feet. We never know what will be the position in relation to the water in the river, but we are dependent on that water and in times of surplus we should impound water for use later. The dam area will be 550 sq. miles. The water will go back as far as Wentworth and the impounding of the water at Chowilla will enable many people to operate on irrigated land. Up to the present that type of land has not been available because of being too far from the water in the river. The main wall of the dam will be 42ft. high. That is not very high when compared with other great dams in Australia. I do not think we could have any better material for the banks and levees than River Murray clay. I do not think anything can compact as well as that. Concrete weirs will be placed in the dam and radial gates will enable the water to be let out at times of flood. They will also enable steamers to pass through, if we have any steamers traversing that area.

I wish to raise one or two further points. The first relates to the timber in the dam site. There are many good forests of red gum in that area and every effort should be made to get out the commerical timber before the whole area is flooded. Otherwise, it will die. When a river level is raised and water laps around the roots of red gum, they soon succumb.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: They become waterlogged?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; in other words, they drown. The roots cannot take it. We must get this timber out. Approaches are being made to the appropriate authorities at the moment. As we have that new railway line going from Port Pirie to Broken Hill, now is a good time for us to consider using South Australian red gum in place of perhaps some other timbers imported from other States.

Another point is compensation. As will be realized by honourable members, those people concerned have had the question of the Chowilla dam hanging over their heads for three or four years while this matter has been discussed; they are keen to know their fate—which sheds will have to be removed, whether they will have to re-erect a house or build a new house, where the line of the water will be, what the rise and fall of the lake will be, etc. These things are important to them so that they will know just where to put in a new pumping plant. Also, they want to know to which authority they shall go for compensation. Although South Australia is the constructing authority in this matter, I do not know but I presume that each State will look after its own compensation—Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. I believe there are only about four people in South Australia who would be eligible for compensation; the rest would be in Victoria and New South Wales. Although they are in other States, most of them have dealings with South Australia far more often than with their own States. A decision should be taken at an early stage to decide in what form the compensation will be, and to give those people a fair and clear indication of the limits of the actual dam site.

My only other point is that I notice that we have been consulting with experts from America and Great Britain. I wonder whether or not we cannot utilize the excellent facilities available in the Snowy Mountains scheme. I have visited that project several times and have viewed with much interest the experiments they do, not only for dams in Australia but for dams in other parts of the world. It seems a little like carting coals to Newcastle for us to be going to other places when we have an authority set up that could probably do all the experiments that we need. I have no doubt that in time the authority will be called in to help in our project. I hope that, when this gets under way, it will be a contract job and that we shall get the benefit, in the same way as the River Murray Commission has had the benefit in the past, of good contractors.

I remember when the Lake Victoria scheme was being carried out, I think the tender price was about £600,000. It was done by the Utah Construction Company and at the time there was much talk to the effect that that price was too high. Somebody carefully worked out the price per cubic yard of shifting the earth in the Lake Victoria scheme compared with what New South Wales was getting its soil moved for in the Menindee storage scheme.

Everything went along well, the only difference being that Lake Victoria held water and the New South Wales dams did not; they blew out. The cost to that State, as will ultimately under this Bill be the cost to this State, was great because it was done by day labour and obviously not by experts.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: But, if there is any criticism, surely it should be of those responsible for the construction of the dam and not of the day labourers?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not reflecting on the workers at all; I am reflecting on the method. The Utah Construction Company are experts in that particular type of job, and so are the members of other contracting firms who build this type of dam. It is much better to get people with ability and who will submit a price rather than choose the method that was used then. I do not think secondary industry will use quite all the water provided under the new scheme. Primary industry will need to develop in the next 15 to 20 years in order to keep up with the increased demand in this State and the other States because of the natural increase in population. It is now up to us and our experts to decide exactly how we shall utilize the amount of water made available for primary production. We have had some experiments made recently on cotton growing. Cotton is a rather glamorous thing in Australia at the moment. It is something new and grows quite well (that has been proved) in the Loxton area, in the Robin Vale area of Victoria and in Namoi in New South Wales. At the moment the cotton industry is propped up, and very heavily propped up, by a generous Government subsidy to get cotton growing under way. Before we get wildly enthusiastic about cotton growing, we have to see that we can produce cotton economically without this substantial Government subsidy. The importation of raw cotton into Australia at present is worth about £7,000,000 a year. If we are to subsidize this cotton industry by almost that much a year, as appears from the Ord River scheme and various other schemes, it may be better for us to buy our cotton from people who can produce it. I do not say that we should not grow it, but we should not get too enthusiastic at this stage about everybody planting cotton; otherwise, we shall be in much the same position as with sultanas a few years ago. The soya bean is another crop with some promise.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Is that in the Bill?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No; I think it talks about water. Unless I have it on the brain I think I am still making sense. I want to advance this subject of frozen vegetables. I feel sure that the additional water will enable more vegetables to be produced for freezing. We know there is a good market and use for this commodity. Provided we have that market and can grow the goods I see no reason why we cannot use a good deal of this additional water. Certain new varieties of soil and grain are being tested at the moment with the object of diversifying plantings in this area.

This Chowilla dam project is a worthy one and I am pleased to be present in this Chamber to see the Bill passed. I hope the job will commence in the near future and it is most gratifying to see both sides of Parliament in complete agreement on the subject; indeed, they have been ever since the Premier's first announcement, when the late Mr. O'Halloran, in another place, gave it his blessing. The matter has been discussed without any animosity in this Parliament and I believe that 99 per cent of the people of South Australia will be in complete agreement with this legislation. It is unfortunate that a few people have raised queries, but I think they have been misinformed. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): The introduction of this measure gives me great satisfaction which I am sure is shared by all honourable members. I was pleased to hear the Hon. Mr. Bardolph say that this was not a political matter but a matter of great moment and potential benefit to the whole State. It may be true to say that the Bill is similar to the amending Act of 1958 but it has an outstanding difference, for it provides for the establishment of this great dam—the Chowilla dam—upstream from Renmark. As I think the Hon. Mr. Story has said, this dam will be the greatest in Australia because it will be considerably larger than Lake Eucumbene in the Snowy scheme and nearly twice the size of the enlarged Hume dam. This project is one in which I, in common no doubt with other honourable members, have had an intense interest. Last year I asked the Hon. Mr. Story to show me the site of the proposed dam which will, as has been said, give South Australia security in water supplies for a long time.

I do not think we can over-stress the importance of this Bill as it will mean that normal expansion programmes will be able to continue in South Australia in every possible way in

both secondary and primary industry. Primary industry will benefit greatly because irrigation can be stepped up. Mr. Story has already referred to some of the problems of increasing production by means of irrigation and I am sure we have to exercise great care because, as I think we are all aware, many of the products that we now grow by irrigation are not easily marketed overseas and any increase in production in these commodities would have to be carried out with great discretion. I refer particularly to dried fruits. We may be able to gain further export markets for citrus fruits and, if so, we shall be able to proceed in that line.

The production of meat has not been mentioned in connection with this project but it may well be expanded in the future by most broad-acre properties within reasonable distance of the River Murray having an irrigated portion as well as a dry portion of those holdings. This has already, in isolated instances, greatly increased carrying capacity in that area. We are much nearer the point where we consume most of the meat produced on the home market than we are with some other commodities. The great increase in population which is envisaged must greatly increase the demand for meat in due course Mr. Story referred to the fact that primary production will have to keep up with the great expansion which we expect in this country, and that is most definitely so.

I refer to the subject of irrigation in relation to the Chowilla dam because we could well be only at the beginning of our programme in this activity in South Australia. I believe that the day will come when we shall have large storages on all our smaller rivers probably to the north and south of Adelaide and all these storages will be supplemented by pipelines from the River Murray, as has already happened in some instances. We have a great potential for expansion of primary production by a certain amount of irrigation on many of our properties, thereby accomplishing what my honourable friend referred to as "keeping up" with rapidly increasing population.

If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Story previously drew attention—I think it was last session—to the large amount of valuable timber on the Chowille site which should be removed and used before the dam is filled. I am sure the honourable member is correct in that contention and of course he mentioned the matter again this afternoon. Much of the timber is apparently suitable for use on the great project of the standardization of railway gauges. I am exceedingly glad that agreement has been reached to vary the old arrangement of distribution of water between the three States. Under the old arrangement New South Wales received five parts, Victoria five parts and South Australia three parts. I am glad that this will now be altered so that in the drought years this State will receive one-third of the quantity of water available. This means that in years of shortage—and surely these lean years are the ones for which this agreement is needed—South Australia will be entitled to one-third of the available water instead of less than one-quarter, and this is of great importance.

As the Minister has said, it completely changes the outlook and makes the agreement of great value to South Australia, which is required to contribute only one-quarter of the cost of construction of the dam. The Minister referred to some of the engineering problems and they have also been mentioned by other speakers. Whilst we have those problems, I agree that in the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Dridan, we have a highly qualified and capable engineer who has had much experience overseas and in other parts of Australia. He has observed the construction of other dams, and I am sure that he will be able to cope with the situation at Chowilla. I am very pleased to know that satisfactory arrangements have been made for the supply of water during the interim period of about seven years until the dam is completed, but as this is the subject of another Bill I shall not say more about it at this stage. I wish to pay a tribute to the Premier, whose energy, drive and vision have made this scheme possible. It has now been brought much nearer to the point of implementation. The scheme was referred to some years ago as a pipe dream of the Premier's and I believe the fact that it is nearer to implementation is a great achievement, and I compliment the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford who today celebrates one quarter of a century of wise leadership of this State.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS AGREEMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1402.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I support the

second reading of this Bill, which is ancillary to the previous measure discussed. I join with other honourable members in paying a tribute to those responsible for the oversight, energy and skill in formulating this irrigation proposal. Their actions are reminiscent of the early activities in the development of this State which involved a long-range plan. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Story when he says that the provisions in this measure will enable a long-range plan to be established. The Bill provides for a supply of water to South Australia until the Chowilla dam is completed. The Premier of New South Wales, Mr. Heffron, agreed that a certain volume of water would be made available from the Menindee lakes for a period of seven years until the Chowilla dam was completed. I think all honourable members realize that the three States concerned are unanimously in sympathy with the River Murray Waters Agreement and that whenever they can New South Wales and Victoria are prepared to help South Australia by releasing water. Unfortunately, this State has never been endowed with natural water resources other than the River Murray and it is for this reason that the proposal in the Bill is essential.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading. This measure runs in double harness with the previous Bill. As the Hon. Mr. Bardolph said, its whole object is to tide the State over the period of seven years until the Chowilla dam is completed, during which time South Australia can utilize portion of the water stored in the Menindee lakes. Three of those lakes are completed and the fourth, Lake Cawndilla, is almost completed and will soon be holding water in common with the others. I believe that the total quantity of water that can be stored in these lakes is 1,470,000 acre feet. The proposal is that when these lakes have water to spare it will be released to South Australia and Victoria in times of need. New South Wales will, of course, retain its share. This will provide a supply of water for South Australia during the seven years until the Chowilla dam is completed. The River Murray Commission is prepared to pay the New South Wales Government £160,000 per annum for these services over the seven years and will also assist in the maintenance of the dams in New South Wales. I believe this proposal is typical of the manner in which this whole dam project has been approached. There has been good relationship between the States on this measure. Matters were settled to the satisfaction of this State in 1958 and since then the other States have been extremely generous to South Australia. The fight put up has focused attention on the fact that this is the driest State of the driest continent in the world. It has been the experience of those who have negotiated since 1958 that South Australia needs water and the other States are doing something to help. New South Wales will benefit greatly from the assistance it will receive from the Commonwealth Government in completing Blowering dam, which is associated with the Snowy Mountains scheme.

South Australia is fortunate that water is to be made available by New South Wales and in times of drought we shall derive great benefit. I give my blessing to this measure, as I did to the previous Bill. It is part of the one big scheme and I think that South Australia's share of the £160,000 per annum involved is a good insurance policy, as it will enable this State to have an adequate supply of water in drought years. Because of the value of such a guarantee, we should approve of the scheme before New South Wales changes its mind. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): As I said in my previous speech, I am very much in favour of this Bill and I believe it is an excellent insurance to enable this State to continue its development during the seven years until the Chowilla dam is completed. It is a good instance of the spirit of co-operation which has come about in the whole set-up. I am sure all members wholeheartedly support the Bill, which is a wise one and which will tide the State over until the great dam is in commission. I support the recond reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): As the Hon. Mr. Bardolph said, the Bill is ancillary to the previous Bill discussed, and will allow the continued expansion of industry during the period the dam is being constructed. I commend the national outlook that seems to have existed over the last few years between the States in relation to the River Murray Waters Agreement, which has been of great advantage to South Australia. I am pleased to support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 6, at 2.15 p.m.