

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, June 16, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

FORRESTON WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have had inquiries in recent weeks from some constituents in the Forreston area with reference to the availability of reticulated water, which, I understand, is not available there at present. I believe many people are operating under some difficulty in this place and, as there is a supply of Murray water only two miles away from them at Gumeracha, they are anxious to know what can be done and what plans there are for connections for a permanent supply for Forreston. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry secure this information from the Minister of Works?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring him an answer as soon as one is available.

PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked on May 27 about reconstruction of the Port Wakefield road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My information is that it is planned to construct dual pavements with four lanes from Gepps Cross to the Salisbury highway. This work is in hand as far as the Cavan railway crossing. It will, however, not be possible to continue beyond this point until 1966-67. Because of the cost involved in widening the existing railway crossing at Cavan and the delays that would still occur because of train movements if it were widened, the practicability of constructing an overway bridge is being investigated. It will also be necessary to construct an additional bridge over the main north railway line. In the meantime, a road has been constructed north of the Cavan railway to connect the main Yorke Peninsula road with a diagonal road going to the main north road, and the Yorke Peninsula road has been widened between the railway crossing and the new connecting road to provide storage for turning vehicles.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Over vast areas of South Australia there is at present a severe drought, which is not confined within the boundaries of the State. New South Wales and Queensland, too, are suffering a similar calamity. The drought in the northern area of the State has lasted a long time, in some parts for 10, 12 or even 15 years. I understand that recently the Minister of Mines toured this area and probably has first-hand knowledge of conditions in those parts. A large area in New South Wales has been declared a drought area and I believe that a similar position applies in Queensland. The New South Wales Government has made announcements on the extent of the relief it is prepared to give to people in drought-stricken areas, as has the Queensland Government. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Lands ascertain whether the Government has considered the drought-stricken areas of this State and the matter of granting relief to necessitous cases in those areas when application for it is made?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have an answer as soon as possible.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT AND LAND SETTLEMENT COMMITTEES) BILL.

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill makes certain amendments to the Industries Development Act and the Land Settlement Act, and its main purpose is to enable the committees established under those Acts to function more effectively. In addition, the opportunity is being taken to extend for a further two years the life of the Land Settlement Committee, which would otherwise expire in December of this year.

Clause 2 deals with the Industries Development Act. Paragraph (a) of that clause inserts a new subsection (1a) in section 4 of the principal Act. That section now provides by subsection (1) that the Industries Development Committee must consist of two members of the Council and two members of the Assembly, one of whom is in each case to be a member of the

Opposition. A fifth member is one other person appointed by the Governor. The new subsection (1a) will provide by paragraph (a) that if the Leader of the Government in the Council certifies to the President that no member of the Government Party is available for appointment to the committee, and the President transmits a message to this effect to the Governor, the committee is to comprise one member of the Council and three members of the Assembly, one of whom is to be drawn from the Opposition in that House. The practical effect will be that two Government members will come from the Assembly while the two Opposition members will comprise one from each House, thus preserving the balance of two from each side.

Paragraph (b) of new subsection (1a) will make similar provision where the Leader of the Opposition in the Council certifies that no member of the Opposition in the Council is available for appointment to the committee. In this event the committee is also to comprise one member of the Council and three of the Assembly, two of whom will be Opposition members. This will likewise preserve the balance of two members of the Government Party and two members of the Opposition group.

Paragraph (b) of clause 2 inserts a new section 12a in the principal Act, providing that membership of the committee shall not be deemed to be an office of profit within the meaning of section 45 of the Constitution Act. Section 45 of the lastmentioned Act provides, as honourable members know, that if any member of Parliament accepts any office of profit from the Crown (except offices required by the Constitution Act to be held by members) his seat immediately becomes vacant. The Government has been advised that members of the Industries Development Committee hold an office of profit under the Crown. Both the Land Settlement Act (section 4) and the Public Works Standing Committee Act (section 15) contain express provision that membership of each of those committees is not to be deemed to be an office of profit, that holding office or accepting payment as a member of either committee shall not be deemed to be the acceptance or holding of contracts with the State Government, and that the seat in Parliament of a member is not to be vacated merely because he accepts payment as a member of either committee.

Such a provision is not included in the Industries Development Act. A possible reason for this is that it may have been thought that

section 54a of the Constitution Act would operate as a saving clause. Section 54a was inserted in the Constitution Act in 1939 and the Industries Development Act was not passed until 1941. But it will be seen that section 54a relates only to membership of any committee appointed by either or both Houses of Parliament. The Industries Development Committee is appointed not by either or both Houses but by His Excellency the Governor. There are, therefore, very strong grounds for argument that the members of the committee are and have been ineligible as members of the Parliament, and members will be aware of the considerable penalties that under the Constitution could attach to present and past members of the committee if the legislation remedying this oversight and validating what has happened were not passed. New section 12a is along similar lines to the saving sections in the Land Settlement and Public Works Standing Committee Acts. By clause 2 (2) of the Bill the insertion of the new section 12a is made retrospective to the commencement of the Industries Development Act in 1941.

Clause 3 deals with the Land Settlement Act. Paragraph (a) inserts a new subsection (2a) into section 4 of the principal Act. That section provides for a committee of seven members, two from the Council and five from the Assembly, but it does not specify the groups from which the members are to be drawn. New subsection (2a) inserted by clause 3 (a) provides that if the Leader of the Government or the Leader of the Opposition in the Council certifies that he has no member from his group available for appointment to the committee and the President transmits a message to this effect to the Governor, then in either event the committee will comprise one member from the Council and six from the Assembly. In other words, the group in the Council that has no member available for appointment to the committee will be able to appoint a member from the Assembly.

Clause 3 (b) and (d) extend the life of the Land Settlement Committee for a further period of two years. I do not think any honourable members will disagree with the Government in its view that the provisions of the Act should not be allowed to lapse. The amendments are on lines similar to those that have been enacted every second year over a long period. Clause 3 (c) amends section 8 of the principal Act, which provides that four members shall form a quorum except when the committee meets for the consideration of its report or recommendations, when the quorum is

to be six. This has given rise to difficulties in the past because if only two of the members of the committee are away or indisposed the committee cannot consider a report or make recommendations. The amendment reduces the quorum for this purpose to five.

I submit the Bill for the consideration of members. I understand that complete agreement has been reached on amendments moved in another place, and I am happy that that is so. The Bill handed to honourable members has not had incorporated the amendments made in another place. I have moved that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass without delay. If this Bill and the Supply Bill, which is to be introduced shortly, are passed tomorrow afternoon I do not think it will be necessary for the Council to sit next week, but as the Bill handed around is not the amended version I have no objection to the Leader of the Opposition now asking for the adjournment of the debate. Whether or not we sit next week depends on when the two Bills are passed.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I was about to draw the attention of the Chief Secretary to the fact that the Bill as circulated is a month old and is not the Bill to which he was addressing his remarks. Consequently, it is not possible to proceed now and therefore I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of moneys so that the public services of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. The Bill is in the same form and for the same amount—£18,000,000—as the Supply Bill (No. 1), 1964, passed by Parliament 12 months ago. Honourable members will be aware of the fact that the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until about the end of October, and that, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, and without this Bill now under consideration there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal expenditure from July 1, 1965.

B1

A short Bill for £18,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1965-66, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the £18,000,000 within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates for 1964-65. Honourable members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1965-66 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill now submitted is the usual one presented to enable the Government to carry on pending the introduction of the Budget. In previous sittings legislation covering further appropriations for the financial year 1964-65 was passed, but the present Bill is to enable the Government to meet its responsibilities in the new year. I see no reason for delaying the passage of the measure as it is normal procedure controlled by Statutes or by awards made by a responsible authority recognized by Parliament. That aspect is covered by the clauses in the Bill. I therefore support the passage of this measure.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1964, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1964. Read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 15. Page 311.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): First, I join honourable members in expressing sympathy to the families of the late members of both this Council and another place. I desire, not to repeat what has already been said in that respect but to

associate myself with the expressions of sympathy that have been uttered. I express my appreciation of the admirable speech made by His Excellency in opening Parliament recently. I know I am only reiterating what has already been said when I talk of the high standing enjoyed by His Excellency and Lady Bastyan in the eyes of the people of South Australia, who dearly love them both. There is no doubt that they have endeared themselves not only to the people of South Australia but also to people outside our State boundaries, for I am sure that similar feelings towards them exist in other States. I am pleased that His Excellency has fully recovered from the recent illness he suffered while he was touring the Northern Territory. Unfortunately, it prevented him from finishing that tour. I hope that he will see fit in the near future to continue the tour which he so unfortunately had to abandon.

I rise in this debate merely to attempt to answer some criticisms levelled against the present Government and its policy. The Government has been accused of not implementing its avowed policy and we have heard much about the so-called "broken promises" of the Labor Party. But I maintain that our policy cannot even slightly be given effect to after a period of only 100 days in office. After all, when we look at the previous Government's term of office of about 26 years and then find that members opposite say that the present Government should do this or that or something else, it is bordering on the ridiculous. For instance, I have heard it said in this Chamber that this Government should be subsidizing certain activities, including libraries. I repeat that this Government has been in office for only 100 days and I fail to appreciate why something along the lines suggested was not done by the previous Government. I do not know whether these matters were completely ignored by the previous Government over the past 25 years but members opposite were members of that Government for lengthy periods and surely they attempted to have something done! If they did, apparently they failed to convince the previous Government.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe told this Chamber that certain statements allegedly made by the Labor Party during the last election campaign were totally unfair. I believe that they are practically his exact words, "totally unfair", but we do not hear any comment in relation to statements published by his Party. The Hon. Mr. Story referred in this Chamber to an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* and

took rather strong exception to the views expressed therein in relation to redistribution of electorates. It appears that the honourable member himself does not believe that a person should be allowed to express his opinion, because he objected violently to the opinion expressed by someone else and stated that, because of this other person's standing in the community and the fact that he is a tutor in politics, he should be completely unbiased and should not express such views.

On the other hand, when we look at the advertisement in the *Sunday Mail*, we see that the half-truths in it emanated from the Liberal and Country League and we then wonder what they call "totally unfair and unjust". Recently a newspaper, under big black headlines, featured an article relating to a question asked of me in this Chamber. The heading was, "Broken Promises of the Labor Party," but the article did not quote the reply that I had given. If we analyse the statement in the newspaper and then look at the answer that I gave from the floor of this Chamber we find a totally different aspect altogether, because in my answer I said that at this stage the Labor Party did not intend to go on with the exemption of Eyre Peninsula from the ton-mile tax. That is in *Hansard* and twice during that reply I used the words "at this stage". If that had appeared in the *Sunday Mail*, it would have given a totally different meaning to the advertisement and would have correctly informed all in this State of the answer that was given. When Liberal and Country League members use expressions like "totally unjust" or "unfair" they should have a look at their own house. They should not throw bricks if they themselves are not prepared to be fair and just in their comments.

It appears to me that throughout the whole of this debate in this Chamber members opposite have set out to attempt to ridicule the present Government. It seems that they have mapped out a programme for the next three years for the purpose of doing this, in order to win back the position that they lost and gain the Government of this State at the next election. There is no doubt about that at all, having regard to comments that have been made.

I should like to comment briefly on certain statements made in this Chamber. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Lyell McEwin, spoke about the Housing Trust and the fact that this body came into existence in 1936 and provided rental houses at a rental of 12s. 6d. a week. He said that this was

the brain child of the Liberal and Country League Government. For the honourable member's information (although I know he is fully aware of it), in 1924 a Labor Government in this State introduced the idea of providing low-rental houses for people on low wages. That was known as the thousand-homes scheme. Under the control of the Playford Government, the Housing Trust departed from the original purpose of providing low-rental houses and went into building houses for sale. I did not object to that at all, but the trust built houses and let them at a rental not within the reach of the low-wage earner, whereas that was not the purpose of establishing the Housing Trust. The trust engaged in some luxury building and flat building on a large scale, but not at low rentals. A person needs to be in, shall I say, the middle salary bracket to be able to pay the rental required and at the same time live decently and have outings such as an evening at a picture theatre. The ordinary wage earner today is not able to meet these rentals and have money to spare. The Housing Trust had a most luxurious scheme for reclaiming swamp land to obtain building blocks that would sell for between £2,500 and £4,000 each. This scheme was definitely not within the principles under which the trust was set up. Complaints have been made repeatedly in this Council about land values being forced up and being considerably inflated, yet an instrumentality, set up to provide cheap rental houses for workers, entered into a project that would have had the effect of inflating the price of building blocks. Remembering the cost of purchasing a block, the cost of building a house would have meant a total outlay of probably £15,000 to £17,000. Only people in the particularly high salary bracket would be able to afford these houses, so where, in the scheme embarked on by the previous Government, is the principle of supplying houses to workers on a low salary?

It was said that the return would exceed the expenditure. The scheme was estimated to cost £9,000,000, but, having in mind what has happened on other projects, that would probably have increased to between £10,000,000 and £12,000,000. It was expected that a profit would be made from the venture. However, the only person who would be able to purchase one of these blocks would be one on a high income, not the average working man. It would have been far better, and within the principles under which the trust was set up, if this land had been reclaimed and the ordinary

houses that we know as the type normally built by the trust had been constructed in the area so that they would be within the reach of the average wage earner. This State is in dire need of houses, and every house built here should be within the reach of the people who need them. If this were done we would be doing a job worthy of praise everywhere, but a scheme under which blocks cost up to £4,000 is completely contrary to the principles under which the trust should be operating.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe mentioned statements which had allegedly emanated from the Labor Party and which he said were unfair. I draw the attention of members to the statement he himself made in this Chamber when referring to the policy of the Labor Party in relation to the proposed amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank, which he condemned rather forcefully. He said that we would find a passing of the pass books of the people and their children around the Cabinet table. This was an effort on his part to misrepresent the Government's intention, and it was childish in the extreme. When he said that I am sure he knew perfectly well what he was saying and knew that it was far from true and totally unfair. I did not think from my experience of the honourable member that he would make such a statement: I did not think he would go as far as he did. I am afraid he let his feelings get the upper hand and cloud his judgment. None of us on this side of the Chamber can agree with his statement, as we know such an act as he visualized would not take place in any circumstances. At no time has the Labor Party said that it would nationalize banking in this State, and, even if it did, his statement would not be correct. The pass books would not, even in those circumstances, be passed around for examination at a Cabinet meeting.

He made references to statements being unfair and unjust, and I suggest that he look at the statements that have come from the other side of the Council. Many references have been made to the redistribution of boundaries proposed by the Labor Party. I think every honourable member opposite who mentioned the matter said that there would have been a redistribution in this State had the Labor Party not stopped it. It was said that any change the previous Government wanted was opposed when the legislation came before Parliament. The Labor Party is being blamed for stopping redistribution of boundaries, but the general public is aware of the previous Government's redistribution proposal. Of course it was defeated by

the Labor Party, and in the same circumstances it would be defeated again by the Labor Party. It was said about three years ago that the Labor Party was attempting a redistribution to disfranchise country people, and that if the Labor Party were successful the representation of country districts in Parliament would be reduced, primarily in another place. It was stated that the country representation would no longer be 26 members, because this would be considerably reduced if Labor were successful. These statements were made in an election campaign, and again they were far from true. Statements have been made about a House of 56 members, and I cannot see where, on this figure, there would be any reduction.

Much has been said about a redistribution of districts and the intentions of the Labor Party, but nothing has come from the Government on this matter. Before tearing things to pieces I suggest that members look at the proposition, and that can be done only when a Bill is before them. What was the previous Government's plan on redistribution? It was 20 country districts and 20 metropolitan districts for the Assembly. This is the Party that unjustly accuses the Labor Party of reducing country representation. Under such a proposition there would have been a House of 40—20 metropolitan members and 20 country members. In those circumstances who would have done the reducing, the Labor Party or the Liberal Government? We did not hear any cry from a member of the previous Government about the proposal to reduce representation.

Country representation would have been reduced had the Playford Government's proposal been successful. It was proposed that there should be country industrial districts and country rural districts, as well as another Council district, which in all probability would have gone to Labor, because of its being a residential area. It was freely stated the Labor Party would win the additional seats in the Legislative Council, but that resulted from the fear of the Playford Government of the change taking place within the boundaries of the Midland District. In such circumstances it was thought it would be a good idea to offer this additional district to the Labor Party. Midland would have been made safe for the Liberals for some years to come. There is no doubt that that was the intention of the previous Government. We were not told how the 20 country seats would be distributed. However, when analysed it was found that about five of the six seats now held by the Labor Party would have been wiped out! Yet,

the Labor Party is criticized because it opposed the scheme. What audacity the Labor Party had to oppose such a proposition!

Mention has been made of a gerrymander and various meanings of the word have been given. If the Labor Party had not strenuously opposed the redistribution suggested by the previous Government, electoral boundaries would have been so unjust and unfair that it would have been impossible for the people to have any say in the government of the State. We hear comments that under no circumstances should adult franchise for the Legislative Council appear in our Electoral Act. This Chamber has extreme powers, including the power of veto, and it can even cause the downfall of a Government over a money Bill. That is the power vested in this place, yet people are debarred from having a say regarding just representation in it. We are supposed to live in a democracy that is fair and just! Other States discovered how unfair and unjust was the set-up and altered their Constitutions to provide for adult franchise for the Legislative Council. If we are to have democratic government all people should be entitled to say who their representatives should be in this Chamber and in the other place.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They do in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, and not only in that Parliament, because in other parts of the world where the bicameral system of government operates all persons eligible to vote in one House are eligible to vote in the other. Our present system is unfair and unjust. After all, it has always been recognized that the other place is the popular House where the seat of government is to be found. I use that term because it is there that real business in the interests of the people is dealt with. Nevertheless, many people are not able to have a say in the representation in this Council. I could go back to the dark ages and say this is the sort of thing that happened in those days, but the position has eased. At one time 50 per cent of the members were appointed and 50 per cent elected, but now all members are elected. Certainly they are elected, but under such a restricted franchise not 50 per cent of the people have a say in who shall represent them in this Chamber. Yet, we are told by members opposite that if the Labor Government has the audacity to introduce legislation providing for adult franchise for the Council they will toss it out. Why? I think the primary objection is that they are afraid that if adult franchise is introduced some of them will lose their seats.

The Governor's Speech contained a paragraph about natural gas in this State, the need for it and the Government's intentions in that direction. It was said in another place that it was apparent that the Labor Government was prepared to play a "wait and see" game. The present Government is not prepared to do that with natural gas in this State: we want quick answers. Operating in this State are two oil exploration companies that are doing excellent work. I have no criticisms of their programmes, of the work they have carried out, and what they intend to do. One is Delhi-Santos. On May 26 of this year I discussed with them their programmes, and their intentions about their programmes, towards finding more natural gas and its utilization. It was made clear at that discussion that, whilst the Government was most appreciative of the exploration work by the Delhi-Santos group and would prefer to utilize natural gas from South Australian sources, be it this group or some other, it could not afford to wait indefinitely for further gas strikes. Both for the Electricity Trust and industrial usage it was necessary to have a positive answer in six months. Therefore, the Government would be considering outside sources of gas, such as Mereenie, as well as local. I am not criticizing Delhi-Santos: rather do I praise them. From May 1958 to December 1964 this company spent £6,600,000 on oil exploration, of which 80 per cent was spent in South Australia.

I have some information from this company about its 1965 programme. It intends to spend in this State £970,000 on further exploration, and the French Petroleum Company will spend £428,000, making a total of £1,400,000 to be spent in 1965 by these companies in their search for oil and gas in this State. We can all appreciate that. I wish these companies every success in their exploration and hope they will come up with another Gidgealpa. However, if they cannot, the Government is not prepared to wait indefinitely, and I have pointed this out to the companies. Natural gas is a fuel that should be harnessed and used. This Government wants to know quickly where it is going in the supply of natural gas in this State. We want it at a competitive price for the Torrens Island power station. The Electricity Trust of South Australia wants to know where it is going. I hope the oil companies can come up with an answer within six months. It may be asking something, but I think they can and will be able to do so.

A question was asked this afternoon about Government assistance in drought-

stricken areas. As honourable members know, during the recent adjournment I visited the Far North of this State on an extensive tour. After leaving Oodnadatta we travelled approximately 450 miles, all across country, in vehicles, to the far west of this State and to Alice Springs. I had never seen worse country in my life than what we travelled through in the Far North. One must see it to appreciate it. We drove on what could scarcely be called a track, with nothing but sand and dead mulga about.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We know a bit about that country, too.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I know about it because I went back recently to look at it; but I knew quite a bit about this country years ago, in the Far North, in Queensland and in the Northern Territory, but I have never seen the country looking as bad as it does today. There is not a blade of vegetation—just deep red sand and dead mulga, mile after mile, day after day. We need 10 good seasons to restore this country.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is wonderful how it does come back, though.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I cannot see anything there that will bring it back. No seed is there. Seed will have to be brought back for it to germinate. We saw numbers of mulga trees, considered one of the hardiest of trees, all dead—not only just a tree here and there, but many trees standing up like sentinels, just dead mulga. There were miniature forests of them with nothing under them but red sand; not a bush of any description. This does not augur well for the forthcoming season. If the drought does not break shortly the primary producers will suffer heavily. If rain does not come soon, the crops will fail. It is too dry in many parts of the State to work the land. It cannot be done unless rain falls soon. I hope we get it quickly because we are in the middle of June with practically no rain having fallen. By the appearance of much of the Far North, it has not had rain for about the last 50 years. That may be an exaggeration, but that is the way the country looks. We need rain for a reasonably good season.

I turn now to the Appila silo, and in this connection the Government was asked what authority it had for not proceeding with its construction. The statement has been made that the Government has no legal authority at all in this matter. This sounded quite well but, of course, this is not a project that was submitted only to this Government; it was considered by the previous Government. A look

at *Hansard* answers all the questions raised and when honourable members say we cannot do this or something else perhaps they forget that the dockets that were available to the former Government are available to the present Ministers. I could ask what happened to the previous Government's report about a silo at Kybunga and whether the previous Government had any authority to reject that proposal. Why criticize the present Government for doing something that the previous Government did?

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on their contributions to the debate, which were up to the high standard of contributions in the past. I am sure the debates

in this Chamber will continue to be of a high standard. I extend a welcome to the new members and congratulate all of them on their contributions, and I know that we shall hear a lot more from them. I support the motion so ably moved and seconded in this Chamber.

Motion for adoption of Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT: For the information of honourable members, I inform the Council that I have arranged for the Address in Reply to be presented to His Excellency the Governor at 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, June 17, at 2.15 p.m.