

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 18, 1966.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Prices Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

ATHLETICS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question relates to the successes of the South Australian athletes who have just returned from competing in the Commonwealth Games in Jamaica, with a record number of awards. Does the Chief Secretary concur in the fact that the assistance given, with the consent of Parliament, to the Highland Games in Adelaide over the past five years and the establishment of the Olympic Sports Field at Kensington have materially assisted in raising the standard of South Australian athletes, and does he agree that the Olympic swimming pool being constructed in Hazelwood Park will help in raising the standard of our swimmers?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer obviously must be "Yes". I have always been connected with sport of various kinds and have two boys of my own who indulge in sport. One was a member of the Adelaide Harriers. I watched their progress and the conditions under which they were training in the park lands. Obviously, the Olympic Sports Field at Kensington must help in raising the quality and keenness of our athletes. I am happy to live in a local government area that is keen to see another Olympic swimming pool established and is prepared to play and pay its part in that direction. It goes without saying that, if we have a standard Olympic swimming pool built within grounds readily accessible to the contestants, it must improve the standard of swimming—and who knows but that within another decade we may produce some world swimming champions. I hope that the swimming pool eventuates and I know that the Premier is keen on it. Just as the sports ground has helped develop athletes in this State so do I believe that the establishment of such a pool and correct tuition will assist our swimmers.

JUVENILE COURT.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question deals with the freedom of the press, which concerns all of us. I notice by this morning's *Advertiser* that the Attorney-General has stated that there is every likelihood of the State Government prohibiting the circulation in South Australia of newspapers, and I gather that he was referring to interstate newspapers printing court reports forbidden to be published in this State. Will the Chief Secretary advise whether the Government is likely to introduce such a prohibition affecting interstate newspapers printing such reports?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Although the question is obviously one of Government policy I do not wish to take that easy way out in my answer, although I can only state my personal views. To the best of my knowledge, the subject has not been discussed by Cabinet. Further, despite the fact that at times I hate the newspapers and what they sometimes print (including the untruths despite the fact that such untruths cannot be proved) and that I do, on occasion, become hostile towards the press, I would not like to see any prohibition of newspapers. Sometimes I wish that the press would see the error of their ways and be a little more tolerant towards the point of view of other people.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In yesterday's *News* there appeared an article headed "More road strips are needed" and it went on to say:

The Australian Road Research Board has urged that more median strips be built in Adelaide for the protection of pedestrians. The plea is contained in a long list of recommendations in the board's first special report which follows the most extensive investigation into traffic accidents ever made in this State.

The Minister will recall that recently I had a discussion with him in the Council regarding a median strip on Grand Junction Road. He probably knows already that Grand Junction Road is one of minimum width and that the

median strip on it has caused much inconvenience to the industries operating along the road.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the honourable member not to debate the question.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I appreciate that I must not do that. I am making the matter quite clear to the Minister.

The PRESIDENT: I think he already understands.

The Hon. L. R. HART: These industries have been placed at much disadvantage because of this median strip. Along this road there is a footpath 18ft. 6in. wide, which few people use. Will the Minister have his departmental officers investigate the position regarding Grand Junction Road with a view, perhaps, to lessening the width of the footpath and thereby increasing the width of the road? If he is not prepared to do that—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member has gone quite far enough.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I was going to ask a further question.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should ask one question at a time.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If the Minister would be prepared to go to the area—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Apparently, the honourable member is not in agreement with the report he read in this morning's newspaper. I also read the report, which urged the provision of more median strips or arrangements of the kind provided in King William Street as safeguards or shelters for pedestrians, so that they could wait on a type of island in the middle of the road until traffic is clear and then proceed farther across the road. Apparently, he does not consider that this should be done, because of the question he asks in relation to Grand Junction Road.

I think that, when the honourable member asked about the median strip on Grand Junction Road previously, I made it clear that the Highways Department had widened that road, particularly in the area to which the honourable member refers, to about double its previous width. The honourable member now says that the median strip is causing inconvenience and apparently desires that trucks be permitted to cross through to heavy traffic lanes to go on their way, instead of having to turn at particular places along the road as at present. The median strip was put down the middle of the road for the sake of safety.

The honourable member went on to ask, as I anticipated what he said, whether I would inspect the area. I inform him that I have been there at least 20 times since he has mentioned the matter of the median strip on Grand Junction Road, and I am fully conversant with the road. In relation to safety, I have no intention of ordering the Highways Department or any other authority to open up that strip so that heavy vehicles can come across that road through traffic, having regard to the amount of traffic using the road.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister did everything but answer my question. With your permission, Mr. President, I redirect the question to him and ask whether he or his department is prepared to investigate the possibility of reducing the footpath width with a view to widening the road.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: To satisfy the honourable member, I shall take up the question with the department. As I pointed out in answering the previous question, a considerable amount of money has been spent on widening this road in order to cope with the volume of traffic using it. The width at present is considered adequate, after being rebuilt to cope with the traffic. There is no allocation in this year's programme for any further widening of the road at the points mentioned by the honourable member. However, I shall refer the question to the Highways Department, but I could go on and give an answer now.

WATER STORAGEES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, who represents the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the position of water storages in the State, particularly as to the amount of water they are holding at present. I believe that all honourable members are concerned because in most of the State the run-off this year has been unsatisfactory, and that the water storages are, perhaps, not as full as we should like them to be. Can the Minister inform me of the present position regarding our main reservoirs in the metropolitan area, and in the near metropolitan areas, such as the Barossa, South Para and Warren, as compared with the position at this time last year?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I understand that the Minister or Mr. Dridan made the statement last week that at that time we were

a little better off than we were at the same time last year, but as there have been further falls of rain in the catchment areas since then I shall contact my colleague and obtain a report from him as soon as possible.

LAND SALESMEN.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on July 27 regarding the issue of licences to land salesmen?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The matter raised is one of many reforms currently being considered in connection with licences under the Land Agents Act.

BURR-INFESTED STOCK.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 9 regarding burr on stock?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has informed me as follows:

The following information has been submitted by the Senior Weeds Officer to enable a reply to be given to the Honourable R. A. Geddes regarding Noogoora burr-infested horses that entered the State through Cockburn and were eventually held and cleaned up on Kallabity Station. Regulations under the Weeds Act, 1956-1963, require the owners, or their agents, of stock entering South Australia to make a written declaration that the stock have been examined and found to be free of Noogoora burr. Furthermore, it is an offence to move stock that are infested with burrs of this weed from one part of the State to another. When the drover of the horses in question arrived at Cockburn, he was unable to produce a declaration regarding Noogoora burr and was required by an inspector at the roadblock to make one on the spot. He was also instructed to put the horses in the yards for inspection. However, when the inspector went to the yards some time later to inspect the horses, he found that the drover had ignored the instruction and that there was no sign of him or the horses. Station managers in the area were alerted and the co-operation of the police was given and within a short period the horses were detained at Kallabity Station and the burrs removed under the supervision of an officer of the Agriculture Department. The horses were then permitted to proceed to Gawler, where they were sold by auction some days later. An examination is being made of the evidence obtained during the above incidents with a view to taking legal action. Subsequently, on August 11 the department was advised that a further mob of horses was being brought from western New South Wales. With the co-operation of the Pastures Protection Board ranger at Broken Hill these horses were intercepted at Broken Hill and held for hand-cleaning of burrs under the supervision of an officer of the Agriculture Department.

MORPHETT VALE BUS SERVICE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to a question I asked on August 9 about public transport for Morphett Vale?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The provision of additional bus services has been the subject of discussion between the Transport Control Board and the passenger company concerned for some time. It is now proposed that the following additional timings be introduced, Mondays to Fridays inclusive, between Adelaide and O'Halloran Hill, Reynella, Pimpala, Morphett Vale, Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga as from September 12, 1966:

Leave Adelaide	9.00 p.m.
Leave Adelaide	11.00 p.m.
Leave Port Noarlunga	6.45 p.m.
Leave Port Noarlunga	10.00 p.m.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1113.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I rise to address myself to this Bill, largely for the purpose of supporting some of the submissions put forward by my colleagues who dealt with the Bill at considerable length. One does not support a Bill of this type with any great enthusiasm, because it imposes a further tax on the community; in fact, it imposes a very severe tax on certain sections of the community. One wonders, with a tax of this type, whether the Labor Party has changed its policy in relation to land tax. It was the stated policy of the Labor Party at one stage that land tax was instituted, particularly by the Commonwealth Government, for the purpose of breaking up large estates. It was instituted by the Commonwealth Government during the Fisher Labor Administration in 1910. However, in 1952 the Commonwealth Government abandoned the field of land tax and the States took up where the Commonwealth Government left off. But, of course, the States at that stage did not impose a tax as stringent as had been imposed by the Commonwealth Government. In fact, the State tax at that stage was only 65 per cent of that imposed by the Commonwealth Government. However, it becomes fairly apparent now that the Labor Party is using land tax as a means of gaining revenue. This, of course, is entirely foreign to its policy, because a prominent leader of the Labor Party in 1952 had this to say about land tax:

Labor believes in progressive land tax for the purpose of breaking up large rural estates.

The larger the estate the higher the rate of tax. A progressive tax can only be justified on the assumption that it has some purpose. A land tax for revenue purposes should only be on a flat rate.

Therefore, if the Labor Party has not changed its views on land tax (and I do not believe it has) and if it is to be a revenue tax, it should be based on a flat rate. Possibly, a case can be made out for the imposition of land tax. Funds are required for the provision and maintenance of public utilities such as roads, water supplies, electricity and other facilities. This fact is realized by rural people and is accepted, providing the imposition of the tax is both just and equitable. These two words "just" and "equitable" are, I believe, the theme of most of the debate that has taken place in this Chamber during the last few days. We accept the principle of land tax, but let it be just and equitable. A number of examples have been given indicating that the proposed tax is neither just nor equitable. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday drew attention to a scale of comparative rates submitted by the Government in the second reading explanation of this Bill. He drew the attention of this Council to how completely misleading they were. I do not wish to deal further with that matter but it boils down to this, that two given pieces of land in the two different periods for which assessments have taken place incur a higher and not a lower rate of tax. This is brought about, of course, by the higher assessment.

There are provisions in the Act that make certain concessions to certain types of land. One section of the Act provides for a reduced assessment (if one may term it that) for land defined as rural land, but this land must be in an area that is defined by the Governor by proclamation. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins drew the attention of the Council yesterday to this section. He urged that the Government further consider the need for expanding the area proclaimed under the section. I lend my support to the honourable member's request made yesterday, because during recent years there has been an expansion of what we may call urban areas—areas that a few years ago were completely rural and now have become subdivisational areas, but within them there are many landowners who still wish to carry on as primary producers within the meaning of the Act. However, these people are being prevented by the imposition of excessive land taxes from carrying on the pursuits that they and their families have followed for many years. So, a good case could be made out for the expansion of the defined area.

I have a few figures here of assessments in areas that should be defined under this section of the Act. In one case a landowner who is known to me, and who is a genuine person, at present is in the position where he will be paying \$4 an acre a year under the new system of land tax. That is an excessive amount and, as the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said yesterday, this is not land tax but land rental. I will give an example of the extent to which the assessments have been increased. One block of land previously assessed at \$70 an acre is now assessed at \$350 an acre—five times higher than previously. I realize that over the years facilities have been provided that improved land values, but over the last five years there is no evidence of facilities being provided that would result in an increase of land values to the extent quoted above. The increase is based on the fact that land within this area may have been sold at increased prices, but in this case this gentleman would find it difficult to obtain \$350 an acre for this piece of land if he placed it on the market. Yet, that is the unimproved value placed on the land. The same man has another block adjoining the one mentioned. This second block was previously assessed at \$100 an acre, but that is now assessed at \$360 an acre—over 3½ times as much as previously. The land would have been assessed five times as much if it had been parallel to the first block, because the reason given for the increase in the value of the other block was that a bitumen road now runs along its edge. A bitumen road may increase the value of land to some extent, but for primary production purposes such a road does not mean much. A good road existed previously, and the fact that it has now been sealed does not increase the value of the land fivefold.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And it does not increase the productive capacity of the land one iota!

The Hon. L. R. HART: It does not increase that at all. Talking about productive capacity, it is interesting to note the comments of some members of the Labor Party when in Opposition, because it appears that their views at that time were entirely different.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I could name a lot of others!

The Hon. L. R. HART: The members of that Party took the view that it was their function to look after particular types of people, and I don't blame them for that. It has always been my view that the function of this Council is to look after all classes of people and not any particular section. The present

Premier, who in 1961 was the Leader of the Opposition, had this to say in relation to the unimproved rating system:

I hold strong views on the unimproved rating system. For instance, if a person has engaged in primary production in an area and other land owners surrounding his property have sold out for subdivisional purposes the person who remains in primary production should not have his tax based on subdivisional values whilst he retains the property for primary production. The assessment should never exceed the economic earning capacity of the land.

Going back to the example that I gave earlier, how can anybody substantiate the argument that the assessment of primary-producing land can be \$350 an acre on unimproved value? This is not an isolated case: many similar cases exist where land has been so assessed.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is so.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The person concerned could not possibly sell his land for that price if he wished to do so. The only way in which that type of land can be sold at prices anywhere near those quoted is for the vendor to finance the purchaser.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And sell it in little blocks.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Finance could not be obtained for it. No lending institution would be prepared to lend money on land at prices such as these, but that is the only way these people are able to sell out at present. Assuming such people do not sell out and that they indulge in what has been termed intensive culture such as market gardening, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins yesterday, on a broad acre basis, 400 to 500-acre farms, where would the markets be for the produce and where would they obtain the water necessary to indulge in that type of intensive production?

Honourable members are aware that recently a Bill was passed that will, in effect, restrict the number of bores and wells that may be sunk in areas of this nature. I believe we are all in agreement on that subject. Therefore, if the land concerned is to remain in primary production it can only do so for the purposes of broad acre farming. No wheat farmer, however fertile the land, can grow wheat on land valued at \$350 an acre. If the Labor Party is genuine in its approach to this matter it will examine the question of valuation and ensure that land values for assessment purposes are equitable. Let that be based, as the Leader of the Opposition said in 1961, on the productive capacity of the land. We realize that the Government must

have money and we accept the fact that taxation has to be increased.

Another feature under this Act is that when land is assessed there is no acceptable method of appealing against the assessment. The matter of an appeal board was before this Council yesterday in connection with another Bill and dissatisfied people could make appeals and get some adjustment, but there is no opportunity to appeal to an independent body under the Land Tax Act: the appeal is made to the people who made the valuation in the first place. In other words, Caesar appeals to Caesar! That is not akin to normal thinking, because even on a local government basis the council employs an assessor and the whole council becomes the appeal board. It hears the appeals against assessments, not the person who originally made the assessment.

I do not wish to belabour the Bill because I know the Government is keen to have it passed today. I realize that the coffers of the State are low and if we must have land tax we should permit the Government to collect it. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act. Under that section "primary production" includes many facets but not forestry. I believe it should be included in the definition of "primary production". I ask the Minister what is meant by "forestry". Does it mean privately owned forest that grows naturally, of which there are 145,000,000 acres in Australia (although there are only a few in South Australia), or does it mean planted forests? There is quite a difference between natural forests and planted forests. Australia has 160,000 acres of planted forests, much of which is in this State. The inclusion of forestry is more in the nature of window dressing and does not mean a thing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Why ask the question, then?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am asking the question of the Chief Secretary. If this is included in the definition of primary production, it will have to be within the bracket under \$12,500, or no worthwhile area of forests would qualify for this concession. Furthermore, it is unlikely to be within one of the areas defined in the Bill as rural areas. So, while I agree, perhaps, that this should read in the amended form, I point out that it does not have any effect and will not be a concession to anybody.

The other section being amended is section 11, which is amended by clause 5. This amendment merely changes the symbols to decimal currency. Of course, this is a concession which

the primary producer has enjoyed and which is being taken away from him by the new assessment. People engaged in primary production who were enjoying the concession previously are no longer within the range set out in the Bill. The Government should be prepared to let these people retain the concession that they have had for many years. There should be a realization that, although there has been a steady fall in farm incomes and in income from primary products, assessment values have increased drastically. A good case can be made out for the Government to bring the figures up to date, as has been suggested by other members.

I have dealt with the amendment to section 12c, which deals with defined rural areas, but I emphasize that the Government should declare further areas if it has a genuine wish to help people to have economic farming units that can remain economic units in the community. If it does not do that, people will be forced to subdivide their properties. They will be forced out of the type of primary production in which they are engaged into other forms of primary production for which no markets can be found. I do not think the Government desires that, and I implore it to reconsider its decision. I reserve further comment until the Bill is considered in Committee and at present am prepared to support the second reading.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN (Northern): This Bill has already been debated thoroughly and, therefore, I intend to speak very briefly on it. I speak mainly to register a protest at this steep increase in taxation which, together with the many other increases we have had, is having the effect of reducing still further the slight margin of profit under which primary producers, in particular, are operating. Such large increases in taxation affect the economy of the whole State.

The recent quinquennial assessment has increased from an aggregate of \$810,000,000 to \$1,301,000,000, an overall increase of 60 per cent. The increase in land tax revenue since 1964-65 is \$2,856,000. The revenue in 1964 was \$4,944,000 and last year the Labor Government increased this figure to \$5,700,000 and this year it desires to increase it still further to \$7,800,000. I, with other members, realize that the Government has to explore every avenue to increase its finances, because of the state of the Treasury, but I object to this being done by such a steep increase that is, in my opinion, a sectional tax. Primary producers cannot pass this cost

on. Therefore, they must absorb not only their land tax payments, but also the costs of the manufacturer whose goods they have to buy, and the cost of the services they need.

In addition, some assessments have increased astronomically, while other increases have been slight. Apart from complaints about having to pay more in land tax, one of the main complaints I have had was about what appear to be inconsistencies in the assessments. This is not a criticism of the officers of the Land Tax Department but rather of the system under which they operate and of the formula laid down for assessing unimproved land values. The definition of unimproved land value in the Land Tax Act can evidently be interpreted in more than one way. The definition states:

“unimproved value” of any land means the capital amount for which the fee simple of that land might be expected to sell if free from encumbrances, assuming the actual improvements (if any) thereon had not been made. In this definition the term “improvements” means houses and buildings, fixtures, or other building improvements of any kind whatsoever, fences, bridges, roads, tanks, wells, dams, fruit trees, bushes, shrubs, or other plants, whether planted or sown for trade or other purposes, draining of land, ringbarking, clearing from timber or scrub, and any other visible improvements, the benefit of which is unexhausted at the time of valuation.

So far as broad acres are concerned, I interpret the definition as meaning the amount that land would bring if all improvements were taken off and timber, scrub, etc., were standing in the original natural state. But the formula for determining unimproved values is evidently taken much further than this. In the district where I live I have had an example brought to me of two properties each of between 1,600 and 1,700 acres. In fact, there is a difference of only three acres in their size; they are very similar in soil types and they would be equal in productive capacity and in nearness to markets and silos. In fact, there is little to choose between the two properties on the basis of either an improved or an unimproved value. One property is assessed at \$12,000 and the other, because of one or two sales of very small parcels of neighbouring land at very high prices, is assessed at \$29,000.

Here we have a great difference in assessment between two properties of almost identical productive value. To me, this indicates that valuations cannot be made by means of a formula or, possibly, from an office desk. The only way a true valuation can be made is by means of a physical inspection, together

with information as to sales of properties of similar size and quality in the area. Unfortunately, land tax assessments could have an effect on water rating assessments, and so another Government service could also be involved. Taxation measures of this nature can have nothing but a depressing effect on commerce, industry and primary production. I am critical of the Government for introducing this sectional tax, and register my protest that the amount to be collected is so large as to endanger the prospects of future development of this State.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): In speaking to this Bill I point out that the case that has not yet been put concerns the small landholder and the small businessman who, through failure of the Government to protect the level of exemption from tax, are going to be brought into the area of land tax payment.

The small businessman in the Adelaide area, the small fruitgrower along the Murray River, and the small dairyman, who is trying to get a start in the Adelaide Hills, are all involved in this. The only start a small farmer and the men who are undertaking a great amount of vegetable production and potato production in the Adelaide Hills, but particularly the Murray River dairyman and the dairyman of the Adelaide Hills, can make today is a small start. All of them are small people in the matter of income, and are people who are just beginning to find their feet.

In other debates in this Chamber it has been pointed out that, on average, farm holdings in South Australia change hands about once every 15 years. The new man has to start with new capital and a heavy financial commitment in the form of a mortgage or other financial assistance. Normally, it takes about five or six years at least for him to get on his feet. He needs a happy run of seasons. The small man today is very far from being in that happy position; particularly does this obtain in the fruitgrowing industry.

There is no need to labour the point that there is not one fruitgrower on the Murray River who has been in a state of healthy liquidity in his finances, unless he has had large resources to draw on apart from his fruitgrowing. In the last few days, the fact that we are facing difficulty in the apple industry in the Adelaide Hills has been over-emphasized; in fact, we are trying to find who is behind this terrible smearing that has been put on the apple growing industry by means of the press, television and other means over the last week or two.

I know where some of it has arisen. It is an apologia of the actions of the Socialist Government in Great Britain when it tried to hold prices when the shipping strike disrupted trade with the United Kingdom. It has also arisen from other sources, but that is something quite apart from the financial position of people growing potatoes, apples, oranges and winegrapes who, in total as an average of Australia's population, make up 28 per cent of the people engaged in agriculture.

In South Australia the percentage is very much higher than that. I do not know what the exact figure is, but it is certainly more than 28 per cent who are dependent on the small fruitgrowing industries. When the dairying industry is added to this, we have a very large sector of the population outside of Adelaide that is being dragged into the land tax net. The Socialist generally visualizes a farmer as sitting on money bags that are being swollen by the rich produce of the land.

In fact, I heard one man who should know a lot better say, "Wheat farmers today have a magnificent existence; they work for about a fortnight at seeding time, put in their crops, go away and have a holiday, work for about a week at harvest time, and that is all they do." Actually, one of the Ministers of the present Government is reputed to have said that he knows one dairyman in the southern Murray district who has a herd of 100 cows and who pays tax of \$30,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Minister would not be in this Council.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: No, but it is more or less factually reported. If this is the feeling, that the riches are there for the Labor Party to draw on, I am afraid there is a terribly wrong picture in their minds. Do not forget that the man who is making his start in business or in manufacturing in the Adelaide area is in exactly the same position where he has the whole of his liquid capital that he does not use immediately reinvested in more machinery, buildings or materials with which to work.

This is where the Labor Party does not realize what it is doing when it imposes these purely capital taxes on our agricultural and small manufacturing industries. It is this man who is making a start in agriculture or industry who is the person who builds houses; almost invariably he has a young family that he is bringing up; and he buys television sets and other goods. If we injure him, the immediate effect is not only on him but on the

building industry and on the people who supply him with the materials and goods he uses. This is why the effect is being felt so profoundly in our economy: it is the result of the measures that this Socialist Government has imposed.

Most of these people do not go to the Housing Trust if they need a new house, but go to the private builder. If they want assistance, they do not go to the Government; they usually do it on their own. Generally, these are people who employ a large work force, not only in the agricultural but also in the urban areas.

I earnestly ask the Government to look closely at the amendment foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. It is of enormous importance, far more important than the Government can possibly realize unless it has been actually engaged in these industries. It is not hurting the big man, the established farmer, the large landholder: **it is hurting the man (whoever he is) trying to make a start—the settler at Parndana, the farmer and the dairyman along the River Murray, and the many farmers who in the last few years have tried to expand their capital investment but are now being hit to leg in every possible direction by the present Government.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I think all honourable members will agree that the standard of this debate has been fairly high, whether or not some honourable members agree with the arguments put forward by others. All honourable members who have spoken have given considered thought to this Bill and have expressed their considered opinions on it. First, I thank the Opposition Whip (Hon. R. C. DeGaris) for his co-operation in working to a satisfactory time table on this Bill. It augurs well for the functioning of this Chamber. We must have some sort of a time table and, if unanimity can be reached on a time table and it can be strictly observed, so much the better for all concerned.

Much has been said about this Bill. Some honourable members have said that they support it reluctantly. I hope that no honourable member feels that the Government introduced a Bill of this nature, which raises taxation, with happiness and pleasure. This Bill in its preparation was given much thought. It was not merely formulated and then agreed to immediately: it was examined and re-examined before the final version was accepted. We all know that people have to pay taxes, that we have to get money for the State somehow.

Not only we but also other States have discovered that the taxation field is very limited, so I hope that those honourable members of the Liberal Party who have said that they support the Bill reluctantly do not imagine that the Government brings it down with much pleasure.

Other honourable members have said that they oppose the Bill. Again, I say that honourable members have that right. I have never raised any objection to any honourable member putting forward his point of view. He must do that in his own conscience; it is his prerogative to express his views provided (and I think he does) he knows that, in addition to expressing his views, he must take the responsibility for them. As long as honourable members realize that they can express a view and that they must then accept the responsibility for it, that is all right.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Why do you bring down the Bill if you are not pleased with it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We have to get money.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: There are other ways of rectifying finances, you know.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I shall touch on that directly, but there are limited taxation fields from which one can get money.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I am not talking about increased taxes.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I am talking about increased expenditure.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have a few notes and want to come to this point in its turn. As I say, honourable members have the right to express their views provided they take the responsibility for them. Listening to the speeches in this debate, one would think that the South Australian Government was the one and only State Government in Australia in financial difficulties. That is not true. I see that the press gallery is not full.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Mr. President, on a point of order, does the Chief Secretary wish the gallery to be cleared?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I wish the newspaper reporters were here. If I am out of order, I am sorry. Let us look at our sister States. Not all of them have Labor Governments, but I do not want to go into detail on that. However, over the past month I have not stopped reading passages in our newspapers to the effect that taxation has increased in our sister States, along with the charges for public utilities. If my memory serves me

aright (and I believe it does) the increases in other States are greater than anything here.

I was recently at a Ministers' conference. If things are done in other States on the lines that two or three of the Ministers told me they would be done, our costs will compare favourably with those of other States. I do not want to go into detail on that, because I do not think it would do much good. I appreciate what the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has said, that there are other ways of getting money.

We have heard much about mismanagement of money. Let me assure the Council that there has been no mismanagement of money or money spent wrongly since this Government came into power. I do not say that has happened before. We have the same set of people—the same Auditor-General, the same people at the Treasury, who give very good service to whichever Government is in power.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: They have a new set of people directing them.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and that set of people takes their advice. They do not allow any Government to spend money illegally or wrongly.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A new policy has been formulated.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; I am not ashamed of our policy. We stand or fall by it. We never run away from our policy. I have been in the game too long to fall for this one! We stand or fall by our policy. We gave service pay to Government employees in daily paid occupations, and it cost us money. It was enunciated in our policy speech, we did it and it cost money. I do not apologize for doing it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Are the Opposition members implying that they would not have done it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The former Government did not pay it. Over the years it refused to give it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It offered to pay it to railway employees.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It refused to give service pay on the same basis as we did. Don't try to tell me otherwise, because I was Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council for some years. This has increased our costs and we take full responsibility for it. We do not apologize for it—and that is fair enough. It has cost money and we have to get some more money. The only way to get it is by taxation, and this is one of the very few fields of taxation left open to us. We have given

much consideration to it. As Sir Arthur Rymill said, other means exist and we hope that they will be successful. We also hope that T.A.B., when functioning, will be successful—a silent and painless extractor of money from the community! We further hope that the lottery will be successful. It is something the previous Government was not prepared to establish. When the opportunity arises I will have a discussion with my honourable friend, Sir Arthur Rymill, to see whether he can tell me of any other way of getting money without raising taxation. If he can do so, I will be pleased to hear it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I would like to help in any way I can.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I will be glad to have a private discussion with the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: But I wasn't talking about getting money; there are other ways of saving it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Don't ask me to depart from present Government policy or to deny giving to one section of the community what is given to another section.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: But the Government does not have to do that.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In that case, will honourable members opposite tell me how it can be done? We can go on, and our works have gone on. It is true that there has been a tightening of the economy, but that is not singular to South Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is just worse in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I take that remark seriously. I want to tell honourable members opposite that it is no worse than in Victoria and New South Wales, if what Ministers in the respective Governments have told me is true. In fact, it is not as bad in South Australia as it is in other States, and when the Budgets come down in Victoria and New South Wales my comments will be substantiated if what has been told to me is the truth. I know what is in front of the people of Victoria and New South Wales in certain directions. Our Government wants to proceed and keep the work force in South Australia going.

Do honourable members opposite imagine that I, as a Minister, am happy to see unemployment? I have spent the best part of my life, from a very young man until I entered this august Chamber looking after the interests of these people, and it would not give me any pleasure to do anything else. I repeat, the Government will go to any extent to correct

the position, but it cannot be done without the wherewithal to do it. I believe that if there had not been a change of Government at the last election conditions would possibly have been just as bad as they are today, because if money is not in the kitty it cannot be spent. The present Government is being blamed for having a deficit, but recently I heard of a deficit of \$230,000,000, and it was not a Labor Government.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: But that Government had a number of surpluses to finance it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. Today's press states that it must be covered by borrowing. If that is wrong, don't blame me. I am merely quoting what Mr. McMahon said.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Does the honourable member believe that it will go over or under that figure?

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is out of order for honourable members to refer to another Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: With respect, Sir, I do not think so. We are talking of Budgets and deficits; surely we will not be pinned down on that. We have been told how bad our Government is and I think I am correct, under Parliamentary procedure and Standing Orders, in referring to the position as it exists in other States. If that is out of order, I think we may just as well go home; that is, if we are not permitted to speak like that. I want to leave it at that, but I make the point that this State is not the only one within the Commonwealth in financial difficulties. I honestly believe that our difficulties are not nearly as severe as those of some neighbouring States, and I do not say that lightly.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The position has been deteriorating for years in this State.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It commenced in 1964. I do not want to continue with that train of thought. It may not do anybody any good. Another matter to which I wish to reply deals with a statement by Sir Lyell McEwin, which received some play in the press. It concerns the period of effectiveness of this Bill. I would be pleased if he or any other honourable member could prove to me that my views on this subject are wrong. I said in the second reading explanation that the Bill provides that the rates shall apply for a five-year period from 1965. That would appear to be consistent with the effective decision arrived at during the conference on the 1965 Bill. It decided not to continue rates of tax into a period when a new valuation

might reasonably call for a full review of the rates. It is most desirable from the point of view of the Government, the administration and the taxpayers that there should be a good measure of continuity in the rates, and, in particular, that all parties should know the anticipated rates early in the tax year, and preferably before it commences.

I pause there, knowing there is another paragraph. If my memory serves me correctly, with the exception of last year the new rates following the quinquennial assessment always apply for the period of the assessment. We did not want to be misconstrued or misunderstood on this matter, so we added a further provision, and this is where we might have been too honest! In the explanation I pointed out that this did not mean that the Government would abstain from any amendment whether by way of increase or decrease during the five-year period should the occasion warrant a variation, but any variation during the period could be made only with the consent of Parliament.

I think that is the usual verbiage following a new valuation. The Government hopes that the rates will not have to be altered during the period. That does not mean that they will not be altered. I will give this guarantee, that they will not be altered in any circumstances next year. That is being completely honest, and there is no ulterior motive in my make-up. I hope (and I think the Government hopes) that there will not be any upward amendment; we would all be happy if by some means there was enough money to reduce the rates within the five years. I think every honourable member will agree with that. I make that point because I move in various circles. It was suggested to me that there would be another go at us next year. We could have left it for five years and kept everyone in doubt.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But wouldn't that be an election year?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It would be the year before.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We wouldn't expect one then, would we?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, and I do not think the honourable member would expect it, either. If we had a lot of money it would be good election bait to reduce rates by 20 per cent. I think the silence of my colleagues has indicated that we want this Bill passed as it is. The Bill was not brought down without considerable thought. We examined every aspect with our advisers and summed up

the position. We decided that unfortunately this was the minimum we should get from land tax. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has proposed an amendment and said that \$40,000 or \$50,000 is not a large amount and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has said that it would not cost very much. However, I have been in Government sufficiently long to enable me to know that many small amounts add up to a large amount. The finances of the State are such that the Government, in trying to keep the position at a reasonable level, cannot accept any amendments.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Taxable value."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I move the following suggested amendment:

To strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,250".

The value of the statutory exemption for land used for primary production will be retained by this amendment which raises the amount in proportion to the increase in assessment. I have been surprised at the Government's attitude to the amendment, which does not increase the value of the concession already given. As the Chief Secretary has said, comparatively small amounts aggregate to large amounts, but we are only considering the amount mentioned in clause 5. I am not surprised that members on this side of the Council have indicated support for the amendment, because they do not represent any one section of the community. They honestly try to represent all sections and to look at every Bill with that in mind.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You did not do that in 1961, when you made a reduction in certain respects.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If the honourable member would tell me the particular part of the Act, perhaps I could refer to it. I was not a member of the Council in 1961.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is what they did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I bow to your call, Mr. Chairman, because we are discussing clause 5. I would have thought that, of all the amendments that could have been made, this one would have received the support of the Government, even taking into account the Government's desperate need of money. The Government, when in Opposition, repeatedly claimed to be the champion of the small man and the small producer. Immediately before

the last election the Labor Party claimed in an advertisement in the *Advertiser* that it supported the grapegrower, and there have been further claims with relation to the problems of the grape industry since. In addition, similar statements have been made expressing sympathy with the citrus industry and with potato growing.

Were these statements sincere? This imposition of this tax on small landholders affects many people on low incomes for the first time. Some small landholders are working for larger landholders, or for district councils, and in other ways in order to earn sufficient money to enable them to provide for their families. Any increase in taxation presents real difficulty to these people. I cannot understand how any political Party can claim to represent the small people and yet oppose the principle in the amendment. The Minister said that the present financial position of the State could have come about under the previous Government, but the record of that Government of always meeting its financial obligations does not suggest that it could have occurred. The amendment preserves a concession that already exists for the smaller and less privileged people on the land.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I strongly support the amendment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I appreciate the strong case made by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. He was reflecting the opinion of many of his electors who have taken strong objection to the provision. On the other hand, he and another honourable member mentioned today that we should not favour one section of the community as against the people of the State as a whole. If we truly believe in that principle, I ask myself whether any section of the industry can escape the net, as it has been termed, that has been cast by the Socialist Government to obtain more revenue which, it is claimed, is necessary for the State to carry on. It is true that it should not have been necessary to introduce this measure to obtain this sum of \$2,100,000. It should not have been necessary, but as it appears to be necessary it is fair to say that the burden should be borne by all sections of the community.

The amendment seeks further relief, or at least relief, for one section. I was interested to hear the Hon. Mr. Kemp introduce the matter of the small manufacturers. I think it should be said that manufacturers, generally, need relief; they need help, if any help can be given, but they have not been given it. They need it because they are reaching or have reached a position where

they, too, as a section of the community cannot pass on increased costs, because they arrive at a point where their product cannot be sold.

If they reach that point, instead of the cost being increased by additions of this kind, they have to do the reverse and reduce costs. Other people that need relief, yet I am not moving an amendment, are private house dwellers.

Many people are in this category. About 60 per cent of Adelaide's population now lives in what could be broadly termed the new metropolitan area. If this figure is correct, many people are affected.

Many people in this category in my electorate have to pay their increase with a smile, although very upset about it, and to the same degree as the people referred to by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. The people in the new housing areas in my electorate are complaining. They do not have the hospital they were promised, free books for schoolchildren, and little is being done about their floodwater scheme.

They have a case, but, generally speaking, as the money is urgently needed by the State, all sections should bear the increase. Following these principles, I cannot support the amendment that seeks relief for this one group.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: In answer to the last speaker, I should like to make one point very clear: that I, together with other honourable members, have an appreciation of the difficulties facing small businessmen, manufacturers and householders. I have no quarrel with that at all, but the purpose of this amendment is not to confer a concession on a section of the community but to retain the value of a concession that already exists.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I rise on a rather small point. In the second reading debate I made a strong plea that the Chief Secretary should consider this small amendment. I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has said: that this is a small amount of money to the Government, but it means a tremendous amount to some people who have to pay this rather steep increase in land tax. Apparently, the Government cannot see its way clear at this stage to give any amelioration of the tax to these people. I wanted to correct an impression that might have been given by the Hon. Mr. Banfield in an interjection to the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. He said the previous Government did not do anything to lift the exemption in 1961. I remind honourable members that it was in 1961, due to the increase in assessments over a period of years

when land values rose very steeply, that the exemption was first introduced. That is the reason why there was no alteration.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Mr. Chairman, in which way will the question be put?

The CHAIRMAN: I am putting it as a suggested amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Then, if one wishes to vote for the suggested amendment he can say "Aye", and if against "No".

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 14) and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1124.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support this Bill. I believe it is correct that people should have some flexibility in the planning of their lives. This Bill makes provision for them in their later life to retire at the age of 55 or 60, as the case may be, at their own election. It makes provision for people to have this freedom of choice without in any way affecting the rights or equity of other people. I do not agree with previous opinions expressed that this Bill was probably inspired by a desire to help those people who wish to retire because of ill health, praiseworthy as this sentiment may be. I think we should take a wider view of this whole matter of life and work in the light of recent discoveries in the field of geriatrics. Medical science has brought about a complete revolution in the matter of old age. We must now plan for years of life after the age of 60 years and we must aim to make those years healthy, useful and happy.

If the world's standard of living is going to rise, this is surely one of the first places where the advantage of a rising standard of living may be felt—that is, the right of people to retire from active work while they still have the vitality to take a lively interest in the world around them. This business of retiring in order to wait for death is shocking to me by reason of its negativity. Psychologically it is surely a deadly sin. How often do we hear the case of an alert, capable person retiring and, within a few months, becoming a neurotic invalid. By giving people the chance to retire at an earlier age than is possible at present, this Bill in fact offers them a second life. Surely we have progressed past the depressing Shakespearean view of old age:

Second childishness and mere oblivion,
Sans teeth, *sans* eyes, *sans* taste, *sans*
 everything.

Our modern outlook is far nearer Browning's famous words:

Grow old along with me,
 The best is yet to be.

Moreover, we are constantly being told by assorted experts that with the introduction of the new technologies—of automatic machines and computers—people will have to work less hours in their lives. It is necessary, therefore, to make this type of provision, perhaps well in advance of the necessity, in order to encompass the requirements of such an age of easier living. But what appeals to me particularly in this new concept of living is that both men and women will, if they decide to retire from their public service at these comparatively early ages, find they can start new and interesting lives. Nearly all people wish they had more time to study and broaden their horizons, to travel and see other parts of the world, or to take up fascinating but time-consuming hobbies. Here now is a chance: an enormous field is open to us.

Adult education, retraining at university level, and courses in every subject under the sun are available in all capital cities and many country centres. As for travel, one is not too old at 60 or 55 to undertake some form of social work in many of the undeveloped countries of the world. Many of our most capable social workers are people who did not start until they were in their middle age. In other words, life can take on a new meaning if one is able to enjoy the benefits of a retirement at a reasonable age.

If there is any query about the benefit of this Bill, it must come from the point of view expressed by the Hon. Mr. Potter yesterday that statistics seem to show that after middle ages males seem to decay faster than females. It must be extremely frustrating to my honourable colleague that this is a matter difficult to rectify by legislation. I give this Bill my complete support.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 1012.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): This is a measure of some merit, but I am in somewhat of a quandary about it because of a lack of essential information on the necessity

for its introduction and on the operation of the lands trust when it has been established. Considerable publicity has been attached to the introduction of this Bill. The many reports one can read about it show that much emotionalism has been associated with its introduction. Some of the statements made about the Bill and about this honourable Chamber confirm that the measure has been shrouded in emotionalism.

A study of the second reading explanation discloses that in it there is an egotistical characteristic that I have not seen associated with any other second reading explanation to such a degree since I have been a member of this Council. About half of the explanation was devoted to tracing matters relating to the history of the Aboriginal population of this State. While I freely admit that past history is very important in this matter, it is not important to me in considering what this measure does to assist Aborigines and part-Aborigines to assume a position of independence in our community and society. I believe that every action we take and every policy we make in relation to Aboriginal people and part-Aboriginal people should be aimed at the eventual abandonment of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs as a separate Government department: in other words, every policy we adopt should lead us along the road to the complete assimilation of our Aboriginal population.

I had the opportunity last night of watching a television programme about some 800 Aboriginal people who had recently come from established Government missions into Adelaide. It was interesting to note the attitude of these people towards this problem of assimilation and to hear them being interviewed on this programme. Not one of them agreed that there was any discrimination; they all agreed that most of the Aboriginal people would like to come and make their lives in the environment of a major city or town.

In the historic background given in the second reading explanation, I was disappointed that no mention was made of the Aboriginal Affairs Act of 1962. In my opinion, that Act took a most significant step forward in relation to the Aborigines and part-Aborigines in South Australia. Indeed, I think I am right in saying that it took the most significant step in regard to the relationship between Aborigines and part-Aborigines and the community that has been taken anywhere in Australia. The then Minister (Hon.

G. G. Pearson) was respected, sincere and self-effacing, and in no way sought personal glory or emotional publicity during his administration. In drafting the new 1962 Bill (which in my opinion and in the opinion of others in Australia was a significant Bill) the then Minister appeared to be influenced by International Labour Office Convention No. 107. Perhaps I could give some information on that convention.

In 1951 a committee of experts of 11 different countries met under the auspices of the I.L.O. to examine aspects of working conditions of indigenous groups in various parts of the world. I mention at the same time that other organs of the United Nations initiated discussions on improving social and working conditions amongst Aboriginal populations. These organizations included the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. This committee had its first meeting in 1951, and in 1954 it recommended the undertaking of international action on social problems of indigenous populations, and placed it on the agenda for the 39th session of I.L.O. in 1956. Convention 107 concerns the protection, assimilation and integration of indigenous and other tribal and semi-tribal populations in independent countries, and the convention was adopted at the 40th session of I.L.O. in June 1957.

Convention 107 contains 36 Articles, covering such matters as general policy, land, recruitment and conditions of employment, vocational training, handicrafts and rural industries, education, social security and health, administration, and general provisions. In all, there are 36 Articles. It appears to me, on making a close study of Convention 107, that the then Minister was greatly influenced by Convention 107 in drafting the 1962 legislation.

Since the end of the Second World War, in South Australia there has been a significant but slow change in our attitude towards our Aboriginal community. There has been a significant change in the attitude of our community towards the Aboriginal question. As I have attempted to point out, a very significant step was taken in 1962 by the passing of the 1962 Aboriginal Affairs Act. I now quote from *Aboriginal Affairs Information Paper (No. 7)* on this question, where it deals with the legislation in force in each of the States in Australia:

Queensland—There has been no alteration of the position in Queensland since 1960.

There is further information on Queensland. Then:

South Australia—The situation is still that while South Australian law generally conforms to the spirit of the convention, it does not comply with the convention's specific requirements in all respects, as most of the provisions of the recommendations are not applicable to existing conditions. However, since 1960 the position in the State has moved much closer to the provisions of the recommendation following the enactment by Parliament last year of a new Aboriginal Affairs Act which, *inter alia*, repealed the previous legislation. The new Act abolishes all restrictions and restraints on Aborigines as citizens except for those primitive full-blood people in certain areas; it provides machinery for rendering special assistance for Aborigines during their developmental years and encourages their assimilation; it places all Aborigines under the same legal provisions as other South Australian citizens with the same opportunities and the same responsibilities.

That is a part of a summary of the *Aboriginals Affairs Information Paper* of April 1965.

It can be seen from that that the 1962 Act came very close to implementing the full provisions of Convention 107 of the I.L.O. I am not surprised that this matter was not mentioned in the historic background given in the second reading explanation, but I am disappointed that in the second reading explanation on a matter of this nature the 1962 Act was not mentioned. I want to emphasize one point, that I have more than sympathy for any practical step taken by any Government to assist the Aboriginal people to become a part of our society and community, and to achieve in themselves an individual independence. I know also that sympathy on its own can be a humiliation. The application of any emotion based on sympathy is not necessarily constructive. I repeat that I have more than sympathy for any practical steps that may be taken. Yet, having said that, I do approach this measure with some caution.

I admit that the Bill has some merit. My reasons for approaching it with some caution are that, first, I am not certain of the final result of this legislation. I am afraid it may have a purely psychological rather than practical effect. It is a measure with which much emotional publicity has been associated. It is a Bill that could cause a false expectation and one that may, in the long run, place a block in the way of the assimilation of Aborigines in our population.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do you think it could give them false hopes?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have mentioned expectations, which I think has a similar

meaning. I have said that the 1962 Aboriginal Affairs Act took the most significant and most important step that was ever taken in this State to cope with the problem. Section 21 of that Act provides:

The Minister may, on the recommendation of the board and the Surveyor-General, allot to any Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood, any Crown lands available for settlement or may, on such recommendation as aforesaid, purchase land for occupation by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood, and allot the same, and any such allotment shall be upon such terms and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by regulation.

That provision appears to give all the necessary powers for the settlement of Aborigines and part-Aborigines on the land and for the encouragement of co-operative ventures on any land scheme. Although I am not sure about this (and my legal friends may advise me), I suggest that the regulation-making powers of that Act are sufficient and adequate for carrying out most of the functions included in this Bill. For example, it appears to me that the proposal regarding mineral rights can be implemented under those powers. Section 21 of the 1962 Act could cover almost everything contained in this Bill.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The 1962 Act did not vest the land in the Aboriginal.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: To me it is perfectly clear that, under that section, Crown lands can be settled, and that reserves can be handed over to persons of Aboriginal blood. I also consider that co-operatives could be started under it. The passing of the 1962 Act was the most significant step ever taken. That Act came almost completely into line with I.L.O. Convention 107. As I have said, although I have asked my legal friends to examine certain aspects, I am sure that almost all the provisions of this Bill could have been implemented under section 21 of the Aboriginal Affairs Act of 1962. If I am correct, the Bill could have a purely psychological effect or application.

There are possible differences, such as that section 21 may be limited to the individual groups developing independently, whereas the concept under the Bill is one massive land trust controlling all the land that could be transferred in the interests of the Aborigines. The Bill provides for representation from the reserve councils and tends to maintain a paternal approach to the Aboriginal problem, and this approach was criticized in the second reading explanation. The provisions in the Aboriginal Affairs Act enabled us to move away from the paternal attitude so roundly criticized. How-

ever, by this Bill, we are coming around to that attitude. Section 22 of the 1962 Act reads:

The board may, subject to the approval of the Minister, provide special assistance, either financial or otherwise, on such terms as it thinks fit, to an Aboriginal or a person of Aboriginal blood, to assist him to establish himself in primary, mechanical or business pursuits.

I consider this important, because we must realize that the aspirations of the Aboriginal population are not limited to land settlement. We know that, in the matter of the reserves, there is a concept of carrying on semi-tribalism in the development of co-operatives and, in this context, there is a possibility of the development of arts and crafts to assist in the village or semi-tribal life. It is most important to have power to assist these people to reach aspirations other than a life on the land, and section 22 of the Act allows these other aspirations to be developed. However, apart from the psychological effect, the Bill does not take a very great step forward. The approach to the problem made in the 1962 Act and the approach made in this Bill seem to differ in this respect. The Bill tends to maintain the paternal approach in the formation of one massive land trust to control and own all lands, although there is provision for the councils to have representatives on that lands trust. This may or may not be the correct approach.

The Bill tends to allow the trust gradually to take over many of the functions of the Aboriginal Affairs Board, although not much information has been given about the future of the trust. This will tend to maintain in perpetuity the Aboriginal Affairs Department. Any policy that we adopt must lead to the eventual abandonment of the Aboriginal Affairs Department if we are to say that we have reached the stage of integration or assimilation.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What is the difference?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I intend to deal with that at a later stage. I ask leave to conclude my remarks next week.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's suggested amendments.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the suggested amendments be not insisted upon.

The purposes for which the Bill was introduced were to provide for the quarterly payment and annual payment of rates, provided that on receipt of each quarterly notice the amount still owing could be paid. These suggested amendments mean that the situation will be disturbed, as many people will elect not to pay their rates until December 31. It was realized that the basis of the payments was to enable the programming of the computer to be done economically.

Under the suggested amendments many people if given the opportunity, will do this, and it disturbs me. There will be no difficulty

in looking after the people in real hardship; they can be extracted from the programming as there will not be many of them. They can be handled separately. I am told by the department, and my colleague, the Minister of Works, that it would defeat the purposes for which the Bill was introduced. I ask the Committee to agree with me and not insist upon the amendments.

Amendments not insisted upon.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 23, at 2.15 p.m.