HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, November 25, 1959.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY CARTAGE OF WATER.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Will the Premier state whether finality has been reached in the investigation into the cost of supplying water to residents in small towns on the Cockburn railway line? As I have explained earlier, the people in those towns, owing to the failure of local supplies, are now supplied by the Railways Commissioner with water carted from other points. If finality has been reached, will the Premier state whether a reduction has been provided and, if so, whether it will apply to the whole of the period during which water will have to be carted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, four townships on the line are at present affected. The Railways Department has agreed to make a slight concession on the cartage of water, and has put it on a slightly lower rate than the normal rate. Cabinet has decided that, in view of the drought conditions and the hardships involved in people's paying excessive charges for taking the water over long distances, it will pay to the railways the balance of charges to enable water to be sold at those places at £1 a thousand gallons. I think at one place the cost was £2 7s. 6d.

Mr. O'Halloran—It was up to £6 in one place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know it has been high, but this decision will mean that the water will be available at £1 a thousand gallons and the balance will be met under the "Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous" line, except that the Highways and Local Government Department, which has one big camp in the area, will have to pay the full charges.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about the period since the application was made—two months ago in one case?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I should personally be prepared to take it back to the time when the Leader first asked a question in the House.

NORTHERN FREEWAY.

Mr. COUMBE—This morning's paper contained a plan showing that the proposed route of the motor freeway would be through the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide and, as most of this traffic will eventually have to pass through the electorate of Torrens to get to the city, I am interested in the outlet of connections to the city. As this plan has now been disclosed in the press, will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether other land has been purchased to complete the freeway, and whether the proposed route to the city can now be disclosed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the question to the Minister of Roads for report.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL.

Mr. McKEE—The following statement appeared in today's *News*:—

Port Pirie, today: The six doctors here will refuse to perform all but emergency surgical operations from Monday. The ban has been imposed in protest against "intolerable operating theatre conditions" at the local hospital. While awaiting completion of the theatre in the new £250,000 men's block at the hospital, doctors have been operating in the out-patients' theatre.

"The main theatre is unusable because of the great risk of contamination from dust and soot," one of the doctors said today. "The outpatients' theatre is far too small for the amount of work being done. Doctors and nurses are exhausted from working in the confined space of this inadequately equipped theatre."

The doctors were hostile at the prolonged delay in making available the new theatre. "We had hoped the theatre would be opened on Monday, but now we have no idea when it will be ready," the spokesman said. "There seems to be no co-operation between the Architect-in-Chief's Department and the Hospitals Department."

Will the Premier give this matter his urgent attention, take it up with the Minister of Health, and negotiate to have the theatre opened as soon as possible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know that the Minister of Health is considering the matter, but I will advise the honourable member tomorrow of the position.

RAILWAY SLEEPERS.

Mr. HALL—Has the Minister of Works the report he promised to obtain from the Minister of Railways regarding railway sleepers?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has received the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

I am advised that the sleepers inspected by the honourable member were in the Owen station yard. These are the accumulated rejects from batches of sleepers delivered during the past year. All sleepers used by the department are purchased through the Supply and Tender Board, to specifications approved by the Chief Engineer, and all such sleepers are subject to inspection. At the present time, sleepers are procured from sources in South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia. The department exercises supervision over inspection in South Australia. In the other States, however, inspection is carried out by arrangement with an appropriate local authority. In these circumstances the department can only represent cases of non-compliance with the specification and this is done from time to time. Representations are handled direct by the department with the supplier in each instance, the Supply and Tender Board not being involved. In the case of sleepers rejected after delivery to the department, it is usually found that they can be converted by sawing into smaller sizes required for other departmental purposes. The department has been credited the value of rejected sleepers which were deemed by representatives of both parties to fall short of minimum standards.

AMENDMENT TO WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

Mr. LAWN—I noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Commonwealth Treasurer, on behalf of the Government, had introduced a Bill in the House of Representatives last night to amend the Commonwealth Workmen's Compensation Act, and one of the proposed amendments was to increase from £2,350 to £3,000 the amount payable on the death of a workman. Can the Premier say whether his Government intends introducing any amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act, and whether it will consider an increase in the amount payable in the event of death or total incapacity similar to the provision in the Commonwealth Bill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government has not yet received any report from the advisory committee which, as the honourable member knows, is functioning in this particular field of activity. I believe the reason the report has not been received is the rather tragic death of Mr. Gibb, the employers' representative upon the committee. However, I immediately took up the question with the employers, and I now fancy that they have nominated Mr. Simpson as their representative. I will see if the report can be expedited.

COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of yesterday regarding the Coober Pedy water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I inquired about this matter this morning. Approval has been given for the installation of a pump and engine to equip the bore. When I came down to lunch today the Engineer for Water Supply was in contact with the District Engineer at Crystal Brook to ascertain what progress had been made or when it would be possible to install that plant, but I have not had sufficient time to get the answer on that particular phase.

APPROACHES TO BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

Mr. STOTT—The preparations for the road approaches to the proposed Blanchetown Bridge are now being undertaken. At present a bridge crosses over a channel which is a tributary of the river, and the work on the approaches necessitates filling in that tributary, completely blocking the water from running down it. I received a letter this morning from some of the people on the northern side of where the bridge will go at Blanchetown expressing concern on whether this matter has been examined with a view to what is likely to happen unless culverts are constructed to take the water through the earthworks now being prepared. I therefore ask the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, whether it is intended to construct culverts in the earthworks to let the water flow through naturally when flood-time comes? Further, may I see a plan of the proposal that I could take with me to show the people in my area who are so concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think this matter would come within the purview of the Minister of Roads, and I will refer the honourable member's comments to him for his attention.

PETROL PRICE IN LOWER SOUTH-EAST.

Mr. RALSTON—Oil companies have freely offered throughout the lower South-East substantial reductions in the price of petrol supplied to industrial users and primary producers. This reduction has occurred since the Premier, on October 28, said:—

Until recently it was not possible to effect any adjustments in the South-East. The changed position should enable some alteration to prices in the consumer's favour, and a survey nearing completion should result in an early announcement.

Documentary evidence is available to substantiate my comments on this matter. Has the Premier, as the Minister administering the Prices Act, any knowledge of this matter and, if so, can he give the reason for the voluntary reduction in price?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—These matters are constantly under review by the Prices Commissioner, from whom I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HONEY BOARD'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

Mr. McKEE—I have just received the South Australian Honey Board's balance-sheet for 1958-59. I was requested by one of my constituents to obtain this balance-sheet some months ago, but experienced difficulty in doing so. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Honey Board is required to prepare balance-sheets every year, and whether balance-sheets were in fact prepared for the years 1957-58 and 1956-57? Prior to 1957 it was the practice of the board to publish its balance-sheet in its annual report, and if this practice has been discontinued can the Minister say why? Can he also inform me whether the board is expected to submit a copy of the balance-sheet to the Minister? Is the balance-sheet subject to investigation and report by the Auditor-General and, if so, has he reported on the operations of the board for the year ended 1958-59? Where can honey producers obtain a copy of this balance-sheet?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I ask the honourable member to put his questions on notice.

BARLEY PRICES.

Mr. RICHES—Primary producers in my electorate have asked me to ascertain the reason for the recent increase of 1s. 6d. a bushel in the price of barley, which, they inform me, has been in stock since last season. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate how the prices now paid by primary producers for barley for their own purposes compare with the price of barley sold overseas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—As the honourable member knows, the Barley Board is set up under two Acts of Parliament—Victorian and South Australian Acts—and it markets the growers' barley. The honourable member draws attention to an increase in the barley price—

Mr. Riches—The producers want to know the reason for it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will ask the Barley Board to give me a statement on that and will bring it down tomorrow, if possible.

WINE INDUSTRY PETITIONS.

Mr. KING—Have inquiries into the matters contained in petitions relating to the wine industry presented to the House recently reached the stage when the Minister of Agriculture can make an announcement?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—They have not been completed. I can only repeat what I said last week, that as soon as I can I will give a considered reply.

NURIOOTPA CANNING INDUSTRY.

Mr. LAUCKE—I am most concerned, as I know you are, Mr. Speaker, and as are other people of the Barossa Valley and surrounding districts generally, that the canning industry at Nuriootpa be not lost to that district. Barossa Canneries sustained a major setback a few years ago when the overseas demand for canned fruit suddenly fell away and the local market could not absorb the production. The plight this cannery is in is not peculiar to it: it is a difficulty common to all canneries. Adverse conditions are having a most depressing effect on the economy of the whole valley—on employment, on business houses, and on grower interests generally. Can the Premier say that the Government will do all within its power to ensure the continuation of the canning industry at Nuriootpa?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have an interim report from the committee of inquiry dealing with this matter and shall be pleased to make a copy available for the honourable member's perusal. This is a most complex problem, not easy of solution. The committee takes the view that there should not be entire reliance on Government capital to run the industry but that if it is to function it should also have a substantial amount of outside capital.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER—I notice in the Gallery His Excellency the High Commissioner for South Africa in Australia, Mr. A. M. Hamilton. I invite His Excellency to take a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. Hamilton was escorted by Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. O'Halloran to a seat on the floor of the House.

DIFFERENTIAL FUEL CHARGES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the effect on the community of differential charges for petrol and motor fuels, and to recommend any action deemed necessary or desirable to ensure a more equitable apportionment of distribution and other costs.

(Continued from November 18. Page 1703.)

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—The debate on this motion has surely cleared the air considerably and removed some misconceptions concerning the distribution of petrol. Statements not in accordance with fact have been made and corrected and it is beneficial to all members to have such matters discussed so freely. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) said that a Select Committee could deal with a more equitable apportionment of costs and that assertion seems to be the crux of the arguments advanced by the Opposition. I believe that members speak in accordance with the geographical position of their electorates and that if there were a more equitable apportionment of costs there could be a reduction in some districts, with a corresponding increase in others. Mr. Riches also criticized my attitude on Select Committees. It is true that I have opposed Select Committees because I believe that before we appoint a Select Committee we should know that it can come to some conclusion of benefit to the House, and I do not think a Select Committee could provide any more information on the subject matter of this motion than could the Prices Commissioner. Any information I have sought from the Prices Commissioner has been readily forthcoming, and he and his officers would be more competent to deal with this question than any members of this House.

During the debate members have unwittingly made statements that are not factual. Throughout the debate there has been no reflection on the Prices Commissioner or any criticism of his work. Members have claimed that there are factors beyond his jurisdiction, but if that is so they would certainly be beyond the jurisdiction of a Select Committee, or even a Royal Commission for that matter, because their powers would be limited to this State whereas the Prices Commissioner has power to secure all possible information. Although there is no mention of the Prices Commissioner in this motion all speeches have been directed to the apportionment of charges, which is a function of the Prices Branch. On this matter a Select Committee would either have to accept the Prices Commissioner's apportionment or vary the charges, and if it varied the charges by reducing them in one area it would certainly have to increase them in another. I shall give members a cross-section of charges from which they will see how some people benefit at the expense of others. I do not know whether the Opposition wants a uniform charge throughout the State, but I would welcome it. In my district there would be a fair average price and I doubt whether it would vary from what it is now, but in other cases, particularly the metropolitan area, the charges would be increased to compensate for some excessive charges elsewhere. I think Mr. Ralston first raised this matter and he was supported by Messrs. McKee and Riches, because their districts would have the most to gain by relating prices to the cost of getting petrol to their districts. They now pay a little more so that people farther out can get their petrol for a little less.

Mr. McKee—Did you say that people a little farther out would get petrol for less?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. The Port Pirie price would be about 3s. 5d. or 3s. 6d.

Mr. McKee—Port Pirie is a port of delivery.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member and I agree on that point. The district represented by Mr. Riches would probably get an advantage.

Mr. Ralston—Would Port Lincoln get an advantage?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Possibly. If we could have the same price throughout the State it would be fine and dandy. It was said that if the proposal were accepted Port Pirie and Port Augusta would save 2½d. a gallon. Mr. Riches said information may not be available to members, but all the information is at their disposal if they like to seek it. The Prices Department is only too pleased to make it available. Some of it may be confidential, but surely members can be trusted to handle it properly. There was a reference to anomalies in zoning, and that seems to be the whole bone of contention. In the statements it was said that the Prices Commissioner must accept some responsibility for the zoning, but I think he accepts it all. He arranged the zoning, and I think he did a pretty fair job. He has given outlying areas petrol at a reasonable price, but probably at the expense of some other places.

Mr. Ralston—Do you think that if Port Lincoln were a port at which the landed cost

applied the Prices Commissioner would increase the price in the metropolitan area?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No. Mr. Riches said that if the oil industry were taken over by the Government it would be a fine thing for Australia, but in saying that he was only enunciating Labor Party policy. He believes in it, and he said so. He said flatly that the Opposition would like the Government to take over the oil industry.

Mr. Riches—I was speaking for myself.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Never at any stage did I give the honourable member credit for speaking for all members on that side. I said that the honourable member had enunciated the policy of the Labor Party, which believes in socialization, or does it deny that now?

Mr. Riches—I also said something about the petrol tax being used to level out the price.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is so.

Mr. Riches—But you say the only way to do it is to pay more in the city.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Later I will deal with prices and equalization. Mr. Bywaters said that he desired to get a more even price for users in his district. I am not sure what he meant by that, whether an even price or a lower price. He said that it cost 2½d. a gallon to get petrol from Adelaide to Murray Bridge. I presume he is trying to get a lower price for his constituents. They are fine sentiments and I agree with him about the need to get a lower price. He also said that he was satisfied with the Prices Commissioner and his work. He compared the information given by the members for Gouger and Mount Gambier and said that he accepted that given by the member for Mount Gambier. When an analysis is made of that member's speech it must be realized that he was completely off line when he worked out costs and prices charged generally. The figure he quoted for the landed cost was completely off line, but I will not debate that. If Mr. Bywaters likes to follow the figures given by Mr. Ralston he can do so. Mr. McKee said that Yorketown, 160 miles from Adelaide, had a price of 3s. 7½d., the same as Murray Bridge, 51 miles away. That is all true.

Mr. Bywaters—What is the reason for it?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The inner areas are contributing towards the cost of taking petrol to the outer areas.

Mr. Ralston—Does that include the metropolitan area?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes.

Mr. Ralston—What is the freight differential in the metropolitan area?

Mr. HAMBOUR—If honourable members will bear with me I will read the document.

Mr. Ralston—Just tell me the freight differential in the metropolitan area. You cannot tell me that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member talks about the landed cost and the freight differential, but I am sure he does not know what they mean. The freight differential between two places is the amount by which they differ.

Mr. Ralston—How much it that?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member wants to know the freight differential between Adelaide and Adelaide. If he gives me two situations, I will tell him the difference.

Mr. Ralston—Tell me the difference between Port Adelaide and Elizabeth.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It is the same price.

Mr. Ralston—What is the freight differential?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The cost of getting it from one place to another. Members opposite argue that decentralization is part of their objective but, if their intention is analysed, it will be found to be completely the opposite in that if this motion were passed it would increase the cost in areas to which members opposite want to decentralize, as I will prove. I will not argue about Murray Bridge, which is only 51 miles away, but the cost at a town I mentioned, which is 151 miles away, will be stepped up considerably.

Mr. Riches—You say that Port Pirie pays a premium towards the cost of petrol to the hinterland. Tell me what the metropolitan area pays.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I will in a moment. I have been informed by a reliable authority that equalizing the cost of petrol throughout South Australia would mean an increase of approximately 3d. to the metropolitan area.

Mr. Riches—What are they paying now?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I would say they are contributing at least 1d. now. It is a mathematical problem, and I stand to be corrected. However, when I state the mileages and the prices charged members will realize that it will cost much to keep the price down, and this can come only from the metropolitan area. It has been said that Elizabeth gets preferential treatment. The metropolitan price extends to Smithfield, and it always has, quite apart from the building of Elizabeth in the meantime. An inquiry would do nothing more than bring about a new apportionment of prices. On the one hand members say they have confidence in the Prices Commissioner

and admire his work, yet on the other hand they want an inquiry into a schedule that is his work. Obviously, members opposite are not satisfied with the apportionment of prices.

I think the House has agreed that other States have accepted retail prices fixed by the South Australian Prices Commissioner as a basis for their prices. I am not saying their prices are the same, but they have used information gathered by the South Australian Prices Commissioner to fix them. Their admiration for his work proves that he is an efficient officer. In most of my district the price of petrol is 3s. 7d. a gallon, which is 2d. more than in the metropolitan area. Nothing would please me more than to see it sold at the same price as in the metropolitan area, provided that it is 3s. 5d. a gallon, but I have been assured that if we had one price throughout the State the price would be 3s. 8d. At this price most of my district would be paying an extra 1d. a gallon, and some parts ½d. a gallon. Taking a selfish view, an equalization throughout the State would be of no benefit to my district.

The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) said that a tanker going to Murray Bridge would earn about £50 for carrying 5,000 gallons of petrol, and that is possibly so, but let us see how much money the company makes out of this. The rate paid for semi-trailers of any size is 7s. 6d. a mile, and there is a demand for them. Tankers are getting 10s. a mile, but these vehicles cost much more to construct and run than an ordinary semi-trailer. The honourable member could argue that a petrol company is getting 1s. or 2s. a mile more than other carriers.

Mr. Bywaters—What is the cost for heavy vehicles in the Highways Department?

Mr. HAMBOUR—There is no comparison. A 5,000-gallon petrol tanker is a semi-trailer type and would be equivalent to the semi-trailer I mentioned for which a charge of 7s. 6d. a mile is made. The honourable member computes that a similar vehicle carrying 20 to 25 tons would be getting about 10s. a mile to Murray Bridge, and that may be so, but it is a much more expensive vehicle and it is an arduous journey through the hills. I inquired in my district and found that a contractor who supplies the motor vehicles for transporting petrol over a distance of 53 miles gets 2d. a gallon. He does not supply the tank, only the truck. The cost to Murray Bridge is 2½d., and certainly it is a much more arduous journey. For taking a tanker 17 miles 1½d. a gallon is paid. Where that is paid for transporting petrol under contract and the company supplies the tank the difference in the selling price is ½d. In that situation the petrol company has to find another ⅝d. I am not sympathizing with the companies, but I am saying some people get petrol cheaper than they would if they had to pay all the costs. There is only ½d. difference in the price of petrol, yet in one case it must be taken 53 miles.

Mr. Bywaters—It all depends where that 53 miles is from.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is so, but to cart petrol 53 miles the contractor gets 2d., whereas the difference between the two prices is only ½d., and the companies have to find the balance. I could probably give 50 such illustrations.

Mr. Ralston—What is the base selling price on which the Prices Commissioner starts to operate in South Australia?

Mr. HAMBOUR—If the honourable member wants to get down to fundamentals the Commissioner takes the cost of petrol as the cost at which it was bought.

Mr. Ralston—Can you tell me the price he uses as a base price?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I cannot give that information in detail, but if the honourable member asks the question he can obtain an answer.

Mr. Ralston—It is 3s. 0⅝d. a gallon for standard petrol. Do you disagree with that figure?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, and I will show the honourable member where it is wrong. He contends that 3s. 0⅝d. is the landed cost of petrol. The price of petrol in Adelaide is 3s. 5d., out of which the reseller receives 4¼d. a gallon, which means that the petrol companies receive 3s. 0⅝d. To my knowledge they net 4d. a gallon, and this takes it back to roughly 2s. 9d. Their costs would probably be another 3d. or 4d. a gallon less.

Mr. Ryan—Why are they all identical?

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is by arrangement.

Mr. Ryan—Yes, by arrangement and agreement.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Port Adelaide is not so naive as to think it just happens to be like that; it is gazetted and signed by the Prices Commissioner, if the honourable member wishes to read it. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) has been in business for many years, and I believe has sold petrol for many years. He argues that the landed price should vary. Of course it varies, but in a commodity such as this he will surely appreciate that costs have to be

averaged. Does he think that each shipment should be costed and a tag put on it and that just because it costs a penny a gallon less to land it should be a penny a gallon cheaper? He must admit that it has to be averaged, and it is only the landed cost that can be averaged.

Mr. Ralston—The landed cost is decided by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Commonwealth Government merely fixes the duty.

Mr. Ryan—When primage duty was payable the Commonwealth Government was interested in the landed cost.

Mr. HAMBOUR—We have no control over petrol companies. Our Prices Commissioner knows what petrol costs the companies and he allows them a working amount and a margin of profit, which brings it up to 3s. 0¾d. a gallon. The 4¼d. allowed the resellers then takes it up to 3s. 5d. a gallon. That is elementary.

Mr. Ryan—Can you explain why it costs more landed at Port Pirie than at Port Adelaide?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Who said it does?

Mr. Ryan—The Prices Commissioner says it does. What is the difference in the price?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I never said it was different. I can only quote the selling price at Port Pirie. Each tanker that comes to Port Pirie would have a different cost.

Mr. Ryan—What is the price at Port Pirie?

Mr. HAMBOUR—3s. 7½d. a gallon.

Mr. Ryan—The member for Light is proving why it is necessary to have a Select Committee.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am not concerned with petrol companies. I have had differences with them, and I am having one at the moment. They are quite capable of looking after themselves.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is no doubt about that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I have confidence that the Prices Commissioner is looking after the consumers' interests.

Mr. Ralston—So have we.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I thank the member for Mount Gambier for saying that. This whole thing will hinge on the apportionment of prices. The petrol companies have accepted what the Prices Commissioner has given them overall, and the whole "grizzle" comes out of the confusion regarding the different prices in different areas. The only thing we can control is the distribution of petrol, and we can certainly control that. Petrol is taken to Waikerie by train, which is a long journey. The cost there is 3s. 8½d. Does anybody honestly suggest that he can get petrol to Waikerie for only 1d. a gallon more than it costs to get it to Kapunda? Of course, nobody suggests that.

Mr. Ralston—The Railways Department has special contract rates throughout the State.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Does the honourable member suggest that the railways would carry it all that distance for only one penny a gallon? Let us examine some other prices. The cost at Alawoona is 3s. 8½d., at Appila 3s. 8½d., and at Arno Bay 3s. 10½d. Those prices would be losses from the companies' point of view, but their losses are made up on other places. Let us not run away from the point that wherever they lose money they get compensation out of either the freight-free ports or the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ralston—The people in the South-East are not keen about the extra.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I do not know whose district Cook is in, but that town has the highest charge in the State—5s. 8d.

Mr. Riches—Tell me why the price at Port Augusta should be above that at any place in your district.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The price at Port Augusta, which is many miles away, is 3s. 9d.

Mr. Riches—It is only 60 miles away from the port.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member therefore contends that it should be 3s. 7½d. a gallon, or the equivalent to the cost at a place 60 miles from Adelaide, and if I agreed with that view I would have to agree that every area should be charged the actual cost of getting petrol to that area. Is that what the Opposition wants?

Mr. Ryan—We only want sane costs.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Opposition wants low prices for the places near the ports, and it does not want the increases spread to other places. The petrol companies demand a certain profit and no members have criticized that, for they have said they have confidence in the Prices Commissioner who fixes the overall profit. The Commissioner has apportioned the charges to the people of this State as he thinks they should be apportioned. Members opposite are obviously not satisfied with the schedule, and that is the whole crux of this motion. Port Augusta wants petrol for less, and Port Pirie and Mount Gambier want it for less.

Mr. Ralston—Are they back 3d. in your area?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, there is a war on amongst them; they are almost as hostile to

one another as members opposite. I invite country members opposite to speak on this motion and to give their views on whether we should have one price in South Australia, which seems to be the opinion of some members, or each area charged according to its geographical position. If that were done there would be a reduction in the price in Adelaide, and possibly Port Pirie, but in almost every country area away from ports the price would be jacked up. All members opposite have said is, "Let's have a look at this."

Mr. Ryan—Are you frightened of a Select Committee having a look at it?

Mr. HAMBOUR—A committee must come to a conclusion and it can only decide whether the Prices Commissioner's determination is good, in which case the position will remain as it is, or—

Mr. Ryan—We would be prepared to accept that, but you are frightened to let a committee investigate it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I am prepared to accept it now because it suits me as it is a fair apportionment of cost. Either the price is reduced in the metropolitan area and increased in the hinterland or there is an equal price throughout the State, in which case the metropolitan price is increased. We all have confidence in the Prices Department and I am sure the Treasurer would be able to get replies from the Commissioner to any questions asked by members. I oppose the motion.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—Nothing demonstrates the need for a committee of inquiry more than the words of the member for Light, who appears to have constituted himself as a one-man committee, but notwithstanding all he has said, some matters are still left in the air. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) said that he had carried out some research and that some amazing things had cropped up. If he had examined all the speeches made by his colleagues he would have realized that they were truly amazing because they did not add up and contained a number of contradictions. Members on this side have been consistent. We have not professed to know the answers to these questions and have asked for an inquiry. Mr. Hambour accuses us of not knowing, but we are not ashamed of not knowing, because if we did know the answers we would not be bothering about an inquiry.

Mr. Hambour—I did not say you were ashamed.

Mr. LOVEDAY—The honourable member said we did not know, but he has not enlightened us although he has constituted himself as a one-man committee of inquiry. Mr. Hall said he would enlighten us and that before a committee of inquiry were appointed there should be a need for it. Statements of members opposite clearly demonstrate the need for an inquiry. We have not confused the situation, as has been claimed, but statements emanating from opposite have been most confusing. When challenged on why petrol landed at Port Pirie should cost 2½d. more a gallon, Mr. Hambour said it was to offset the higher cost of delivery in the hinterland. He was not prepared to make a proper comparison with the extra charge he alleged was made on petrol landed at Port Adelaide to offset the cost of delivering in the hinterland from the metropolitan area. He said he believed it was a penny a gallon, but he did not know. Obviously if this charge of 2½d. is made at Port Pirie to offset the charge of delivery in the hinterland, then on the score of justice, there should be some equivalent charge on the price of petrol in the metropolitan area to offset the charge of delivery to the hinterland from there.

Mr. Hambour, on his first examination of this question, said that the landed cost consisted of the cost at the port of shipping, insurance, freight and duty and that 3s. 0¾d. was the wholesale price at the port and included the profit to the petrol companies. He did not mention any amount being incorporated in that price as an offset for the higher charges of delivery to areas outside the metropolitan area, but today he states that there is a charge of about one penny, although he does not know. Government members have said that the wholesale price at Port Adelaide is determined by the South Australian Prices Commissioner, but obviously he has no control over the wholesale price at Portland, which is classified as a freight-free port, and I have heard nothing from members opposite about how and why Portland is a freight-free port and how that price is fixed.

Mr. Shannon—What does "freight-free" mean?

Mr. LOVEDAY—I have heard Portland described as such.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Do you know what it means?

Mr. LOVEDAY—I do not, but I want to.

Mr. Quirke—The member for Mount Gambier used the expression first.

Mr. Ralston—If you ask me, I can tell you what it means.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I have heard it said by members opposite that the freight-free port at Portland does not have this freight-free privilege applied to anything other than petrol. In other words, the term has been used by Government members to show that there is a distinction between the way petrol is admitted to that port and the other petroleum products. There must be a reason for that, but it has not been explained.

Mr. Shannon—Are you suggesting petrol comes to Portland free of shipping charges? That is what "freight-free" means.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I will develop my argument to show that contradictory statements have been made as to the reason for these differences in charges. The Premier said that in relation to Port Adelaide, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie the difference is because Port Pirie and Port Lincoln are multiple port discharge centres and that the two-port discharge methods increase the cost at the smaller port and that is responsible for a portion of the increased differential. He said that other factors also entered the position. The member for Gouger did not agree with that. He said that the extra charge at Port Pirie is to cover the price of distribution to the hinterland. They both cannot be right and obviously members opposite do not know the answers and they need this inquiry just as much as we do, although they will not admit it. The Premier did not say to what extent other factors entered into it nor was he prepared to give details. We have ascertained that, although it is claimed that these multiple discharge ports involve extra costs, tankers at Portland discharge part cargoes then come to Port Adelaide where the wholesale price is the same, although it is a multiple discharge port, and then go on to Hobart.

The question of tonnages landed at Portland as compared with Port Pirie has been discussed. Mr. Hall said that the total quantity landed at Port Pirie—as mentioned by the member for Mount Gambier—included 75,000 tons in bulk for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and the Commonwealth Railways. He did not tell us what these two organizations paid for their petrol and I do not know whether he really meant the B.H.P. or the B.H.A.S.

Mr. Hall—The B.H.A.S.

Mr. LOVEDAY—That makes a difference, because they are in very different places. It would be extremely interesting to know whether that petrol comes in the same tankers as part of the same cargo that is delivered for commercial purposes and what the price of petrol is to those two organizations. The committee of inquiry could throw light on the landed costs at these ports if they knew what was paid by the two organizations. The Premier also said:—

> I do not deny that there has been a slight loading upon the consumer in Adelaide in order to meet some of the very high costs in some country areas.

Today Mr. Hambour claims that the metropolitan area is carrying about one penny a gallon towards the cost of delivery in country areas. If there is any justice it seems wrong that the metropolitan area should pay one penny whereas Port Pirie, according to Mr. Hall, pays 2½d. This has not been explained despite all the inquiry undertaken by experts opposite. Mr. Hambour said:—

> . . surely members realize that where there is a concentrated population close to the city the prices applying there will be the same as in the metropolitan area.

He was referring to Elizabeth and was arguing that the price at Elizabeth, which is 16 to 18 miles from the port of unloading the petrol, should be the same as in the city. Petrol is landed at Port Pirie, where an extra 2½d. a gallon is imposed, but Crystal Brook, which is 18 miles from the port, pays a halfpenny more. I suppose it is a case of the nearer hinterland paying a bit more for the outer hinterland. I want to know why, because it just does not seem to add up. It seems that it is in order for Port Pirie residents to pay 2½d. a gallon more to assist the hinterland, but out of order for metropolitan residents to pay a comparable amount. I cannot see any justification for it. Although Elizabeth can get the benefit of city prices, at Murray Bridge, which is another 40 miles from Port Adelaide, an additional 2½d. a gallon is charged. That does not seem in order and has not been explained. The Treasurer said earlier that there would be a price adjustment at Mount Gambier because of petrol coming from Portland. It is pleasing to note that Mr. Ralston's efforts have been successful for today he said that there had been a voluntary reduction in the petrol price in that city. In his reply to Mr. Ralston's question the Treasurer did not seem to know much about this voluntary reduction, but the reduction obviously could have been made some time ago, because there was plenty of room for it. This is another aspect that could be considered by a Select Committee, which could reveal interesting facts.

The rapid development of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie is a sound reason why the petrol price particularly should receive close attention, and there is a need for an investigation into why there cannot be a bulk installation at Whyalla. An inquiry into the whole question of the petrol price, particularly at Port Pirie and other northern areas, is necessary. It is all very well to say that the Prices Commissioner has done everything possible. He may have done everything possible within the ambit of his power, but a Select Committee could, if necessary, call for Parliamentary action in certain aspects, which is something the Prices Commissioner cannot do. The whole State would benefit from a thorough inquiry into this matter and nothing has demonstrated the need for an inquiry more than the divergence of opinion on many points amongst members on the other side, who have given us some contradictory opinions. It has shown that they need an inquiry into the matter just as much as members on this side do. I support the motion.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide)—I did not intend to speak on this matter but because of some statements by the Government members I think one metropolitan member at least should give his views. Not one metropolitan member on the Government side has spoken. Some of the statements by Government members have been somewhat misleading. I agree with Mr. Loveday that the remarks by some Government members substantiate the move for a Select Committee. Every speaker on this side has put forward identical argument in support of an inquiry. Government members have referred to freight-free ports. I do not know the precise meaning of "freight-free," but I think I can interpret it this way—a freight-free port indicates an agreed landed cost at various Commonwealth ports by petrol suppliers. It is amazing that the petrol landed at a freight-free port should differ in price from the petrol at a port that is not freight free. The Treasurer said that it was because some ports were multiple ports and others not, but that is incorrect for every port in the Commonwealth that receives petroleum products is a multiple port. I know every Commonwealth port and I have seen them all operate and not one of them takes a complete cargo from a petroleum tanker. It is not considered good business to unload completely at one port. There is a need for an inquiry, especially when it is realized that a tanker can unload partly in Melbourne, partly at Geelong and then come to Port Adelaide, where the landed cost applies, and then come to Port Pirie, where the landed cost by agreement is in excess of the cost at the other ports, and then to Hobart where the landed cost is the same as at the ports I have mentioned.

The unloading of petrol at Port Pirie does not cost the petrol companies one penny more than it does at the other ports. It is said that this is a matter over which the Government has no control, but that is incorrect. Prior to the lifting of the import tariff on petroleum products the Commonwealth Government was interested in the cost of landing petrol at any port. I refer to the primage duty at an *ad valorem* rate on all petrol landed. It was based on the money value of the cargo. When that was removed a flat rate was fixed on a gallonage basis and the Commonwealth was then not so concerned about the differential cost. That was when the agreed price was instituted by the petrol companies. I do not disagree with the wild statements made by Mr. Hall who referred to the tonnages landed at Port Pirie, Portland and Port Augusta, because it makes no difference what petrol tonnage is landed at any port. The landed cost is identical and there is no differential cost for the supplier, and that can be substantiated. The statement that 75,000 tons of petrol was landed at Port Pirie for the Broken Hill Associated Smelters and the Commonwealth Railways is not worth much because it cannot be related to this landed cost debate. We want to know why there should be a difference in the landed cost between Port Lincoln and Port Pirie, as compared with Port Adelaide. We want to know why petrol landed at Port Pirie and transported by road to Port Augusta, 50 miles away, should be sold at a different price from petrol from the same tanker landed at Port Adelaide and sent to Port Wakefield over the same distance.

These things show why we desire a Select Committee to make an inquiry. It is obvious that members are opposed to the setting up of a Select Committee because they are afraid that something might be disclosed that would benefit other people. I challenge them on this matter. If they have nothing to fear why do they oppose an inquiry? It is apparent that if people do not want an inquiry there is something hidden that they do not want disclosed. There is nothing cynical associated with this request by the Opposition for an inquiry. If the Committee found that the statements made have no bearing on the case, and ultimately no bearing on the price, we on this side would be ready to accept that view. We would accept any decision reached by the Committee. We

feel that the prices supplied to the Prices Commissioner are not correct in every respect. The prices put forward by members on this side show figures supplied by the petrol companies are not entirely true, and will not stand up to argument we have advanced. There is no differential price for ordinary shipping cargo from London to Port Adelaide and from London to Port Pirie. There is no differential for outward commodities, but it is amazing that a differential price can be created by certain combines, which own the petroleum products, the tankers in which they are transported, and reselling depots.

I am amazed when the Treasurer says that because petrol is now supplied to Mount Gambier from Portland there is a loss to State revenue of £30,000 per annum. I have not heard one member opposite criticize the Government for this loss and not one suggested that the Government should endeavour to regain some of the loss. Mr. Ralston reminds me that although the State loses this £30,000 petrol users in the Mount Gambier area still pay additional costs.

Mr. Jenkins—Tacked on to some others, is it?

Mr. RYAN—It is not tacked on to others. It is £30,000 extra profit, and the oil companies are the absolute beneficiaries. This is one thing that a Select Committee would be able to investigate and make recommendations upon.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The industry is struggling, though.

Mr. RYAN—We can see just how much it is struggling when we know how much it contributes to certain political parties, which do not include the Labor Party. If members opposite believe there is nothing to hide, they have nothing to fear in the establishment of a Select Committee, and they would have representation on that committee. However, it is apparent that, firstly, they do not want the committee set up, secondly, they would not be a party to any decision reached by the committee, and thirdly, they fear what the committee would find. We fear nothing in the setting up of the Committee or the answer it would bring back.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—One of the most extraordinary statements I have heard was made by the member for Port Adelaide, who said that the figures given to the Prices Commissioner by the oil companies were not correct and that a Select Committe would find out the correct figures. Frankly, I will not swallow that, as a Select Committee would not have access to anything more than the Prices Commissioner. I have examined the way the Prices Commissioner works out these things. If there were grave injustices being done to the consumers of petrol the committee would be able to rectify them, but all I could get out of the debate was that there was 2½d. running loose somewhere between the ports. The Prices Commissioner admits that, to give people in the hinterland some advantage, the price is a little higher somewhere else. I have taken out some figures from the *Government Gazette* relating to petrol prices.

Mr. Riches—You are disregarding any possibility of action on petrol tax.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am taking the actual figures.

Mr. Riches—And basing them on freight differential only.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am taking the wholesale cost of petrol at Port Pirie, which is 3s. 0¾d.

Mr. Riches—That includes petrol tax and duty.

Mr. QUIRKE—It includes the price, profit, and everything.

Mr. Riches—Do not forget that it includes petrol tax.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am taking the full price of petrol, which includes the 4d. profit about which we can do nothing.

Mr. Riches—If we do not make representations, we will not do anything.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is the same price all over Australia.

Mr. Riches—It was not the price at Portland until representations were made.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have to decide whether the Prices Commissioner is a fool and has had the wool pulled over his eyes, which is precisely the position on the statement of the member for Port Adelaide, and that he does not know his job and should be sacked in order to give preference to a Select Committee of this House. Frankly, I will not swallow that. As the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) said, prices are higher in some places to equalize the price so that people in the outback do not have to pay too much. The price at Port Pirie and Clare is 3s. 7½d. At Clare, three companies operate. The Shell Company sends petrol by road from Balaklava, and I think it costs ½d. a gallon less than if it were transported by rail. At Cockburn the price is 3s. 10d., and at Hallett 3s. 8d. It is only ½d. a gallon dearer at Hallett than at Clare!

Mr. Hall—That is fostering decentralization.

Mr. QUIRKE—Much as the member for

Light was maligned over this, I think he was correct in saying that the price was equalized to give a lower price in the hinterland.

Mr. Riches—They only equalize all petrol landed at Pirie, not Adelaide.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course they do. The price at Pinnaroo is 3s. 8½d., only 1d. more than at Clare, and at Jamestown, which is 50 miles north of Clare, it is only 3s. 7½d. At Morgan it is ½d. more than at Clare.

Mr. Riches—If Port Pirie had the same price as Port Adelaide, at what price would petrol be sold at Clare?

Mr. QUIRKE—Do members of the Opposition mean that if Port Pirie, Portland and Port Lincoln were on the same basis the price throughout the country would come down by 2½d.?

Mr. Riches—Only up to a certain distance.

Mr. QUIRKE—Who would get the benefit of the 2½d.?

Mr. McKee—The consumer.

Mr. QUIRKE—The consumer where? If it were not for that 2½d., would not the price be much greater than it is in outback areas?

Mr. McKee—That is not applied at Port Adelaide.

Mr. QUIRKE—The price at Port Adelaide is the same as at Portland.

Mr. McKee—But not the same as at Port Pirie or Port Lincoln.

Mr. QUIRKE—No, there is a difference of 2½d. According to the Prices Commissioner that difference is used to subsidize people in the far-flung areas.

Mr. Riches—The members for Gouger and Light said that, but the Premier, who had spoken to the Prices Commissioner, said that was not so.

Mr. QUIRKE—I think the Prices Commissioner would say that too.

Mr. Riches—The Prices Commissioner has given two answers.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have heard only one.

Mr. Riches—The Premier gave as a reason that it was a multiple discharge port.

Mr. Hall—It could be one factor.

Mr. QUIRKE—It could be, and there could be many factors. As I understand it, the 2½d. is the cost of transporting petrol to those areas, and it is evened out at those two ports.

Mr. McKee—That is not what the Premier said.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is my information. Is any other point at issue?

Mr. Riches—Yes, two. Why does the 2½d. apply only to Port Pirie and not to Port Adelaide, and should there not be an inquiry on whether more bulk installations should be installed?

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not know: you can inquire into anything.

Mr. Riches—The reduction at Portland was made because of representations; it was not by accident.

Mr. QUIRKE—Could we make that representation? We could not through a committee because, on what the member for Port Adelaide said, the motion means that we simply do not believe the Prices Commissioner, that he has had the wool pulled over his eyes, and that we believe a Select Committee would get information he has not been able to get and could not possibly get.

Mr. Riches—We have already got a totally different explanation.

Mr. QUIRKE—More than one factor could come into it. I do not agree with the explanation given by the Premier. However, I consider a Select Committee would serve no useful purpose, and that it would cause a considerable waste of public money.

Mr. Heaslip—And it would mean an increase to primary producers.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not so much concerned about that. Everything that has been done today, according to the Prices Commissioner, has been done to serve the primary producers' interests. I do not think there is anything much in this matter at all, and I am certainly not going to vote for something which, in effect, would be a vote of no-confidence in our Prices Commissioner, for that is what it would amount to. If it were desirable to do something by negotiation, it could be done without the suggested committee.

Mr. Ralston—There was a Labor Government in Victoria when Portland was declared a freight-free port.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am prepared to place my confidence in the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—When I moved this motion I intended that the motion would do what it has stated it was designed to do, namely, that a Select Committee would inquire into the differential charges for petrol and motor fuels and recommend any action deemed necessary or desirable to ensure a more equitable apportionment of distribution and other costs. Much debate has taken place around and about this problem, but I have not heard anyone, not even the fiercest opponent of the motion, with the temerity to say that those two points I have mentioned are not important. Surely it is desirable to ensure a more equitable apportion-

ment of distribution and other costs? I think even my conservative friend from Rocky River would agree with that, because I think he would be inclined to the view that the primary producers would benefit from some such action.

Mr. Heaslip—I am afraid they would not; that is the point.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The member for Rocky River has not been able to show any substantial reason why he will not vote for the motion. He spoke in the early stages of the debate and indicated some support for it, saying that if it meant the abolition of price control he would favour the motion. That is a point worth considering. That statement did not indicate to me that the member for Rocky River had any great confidence in price control or even the Prices Commissioner, because if he had he would have been defending price control and the Prices Commissioner. However, he did not do that. His was a sort of left-handed method of getting rid of both, and when people are playing with weak arguments they get themselves into some very difficult situations.

Mr. Hall—Do you still say the Federal authority fixes the differential prices, as you said at page 1062 of *Hansard?*

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am making this speech in my own way and in my own time and, while I appreciate very sincerely the assistance I receive from time to time from the member for Gouger, just at the moment I am not requiring assistance. There is no doubt about the other point I referred to, namely, the effect on the community of differential charges, because some people in primary production, in transport, and in the maintenance of our economic position generally are paying more for this very essential article than other people are paying. All I sought in the motion was a proper inquiry to see whether these costs were properly apportioned.

The Premier alleged that the motion was an attack on the Prices Commissioner, and only a few moments ago the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) made the same allegation. In between those two speeches that allegation has been repeated parrot fashion by many who oppose the motion. Mr. Speaker, I made no attack upon the Prices Commissioner or the Prices Department. I admit that in handling petrol price investigations the Prices Commissioner has rendered a signal service to the people. The Premier said that the Prices Commissioner in the last 2½ years, because of his pertinacity, his investigation, and through keeping his finger on the pulse of petrol prices, had saved the people of South Australia £2,865,000, and that, because other States of the Commonwealth had adopted our South Australian investigational basis, he had saved the people of the Commonwealth £27,461,000. All in 2½ years! Those figures come from the Prices Commissioner. If anything was needed to prove that there should be a full and complete inquiry into these differentials it is that very evidence that I have quoted from the Premier himself, because if it had not been for the Prices Department the petrol companies in Australia would have cheerfully pocketed over £27,000,000 in the last 2½ years.

I did not attack the zoning basis which has been accepted by the Prices Commissioner. I believe the zoning basis is the only satisfactory method by which the prices can be determined in the respective parts of the State. I agree with the Premier that we could not have one price of petrol at one place, another price at a nearby place, and yet another price at another nearby place. There has to be some zoning method, and this applies not only to petrol but to beer, which is also a very important commodity. The price for petrol and beer is zoned in the various districts of the State, and I understand that that zoning also applies to many other commodities. What I complained about, and what I still complain about, is the basic price on which the prices in each of these zones are fixed and determined.

If the landed cost of petrol at Port Adelaide is a certain figure—and it has been proved again and again that it is a certain figure—why should the landed cost at Port Pirie or Port Lincoln be higher than the price at Port Adelaide? I know some honourable members have said that it is due to a balancing up of prices in the inner areas to counter the loss on a lower price that is provided in the outer areas. The Premier, of course, went further than this and said that the price of petrol in the metropolitan area was loaded in the interests of the Murray Mallee and various other places, but the great point is that the price of petrol in the metropolitan area is the basic price based on the landed cost at Port Adelaide, and there is no loading there to benefit the member for Light's electorate or some other electorate. It is precisely the same as Melbourne, Sydney, Hobart, Perth, Rockhampton, or any other port where the price is paid.

In reply to the member for Mount Gambier the Premier said that the price at Mount Gambier was determined by the price at Port

Adelaide plus the cost of freighting petrol by rail to Mount Gambier. However, we find that later on, despite all the Premier's hullabaloo about petrol being carted by rail and about special contracts being made with the companies and so on, the companies are bypassing the railways and having their petrol carted by road. They are providing huge tankers for this purpose to the further detriment of our roads and adding to the cost of maintaining them. That is no hearsay, and it is no pipe-dream conjured up by somebody to bolster an argument. It is a factual statement made by the Premier in reply to a question I asked only a week or so ago. Honourable members will recollect that the Railways Commissioner, in his annual report, referred to the very considerable loss of freight which the railways had suffered during the last 12 months. The Commissioner mentioned the figure of £1,200,000 as the value of the freight lost. I asked the Premier whether he would indicate what types of ancillary traffic had been responsible for this competition with the railways and for this loss of freight, and the Premier said:—

I had a number of different ancillary vehicles in mind. For example, it was always traditionally understood that the petrol companies would deliver from the depots, but that the railways would undertake the main obligation of shifting heavy tanks of petrol over long distances from one place to another. Recently, however, there has been a tendency, although the railways had given special concessions to certain petrol companies, for petrol companies to undertake long-distance haulage with their ancillary vehicles, which would be rather outside what were normally the conditions. Another company I have in mind is proposing to put large carriers on the road to undertake heavy bulk carriage, which normally could well be done by the railways and probably more cheaply than by road, if the heavy wear and tear on the roads and the rather excessive hours that the drivers work were not eliminated. That is the sort of thing I had in mind.

These people, who have been granted concessions by the railways and who until recently used the railways for transporting bulk loads of petrol from the shipping port to their country installations—and there are many distributing depots throughout the State, places like Balaklava and Jamestown—for distribution to smaller centres, are carrying more and more by road rather than by rail. Mention has been made of the £30,000 in rail freight that has been lost as a result of the conversion of the supply of petrol from Port Adelaide to Portland. That opens up another aspect of the case; one for which the member for Mount Gambier has good reason to be pleased because, as mentioned in reply to a question today, there has already been a reduction in the cost of petrol in his area. He, and those who supported this motion, can take some credit for that reduction and no doubt there will be further reductions as time goes on not only in that district but in other areas. Even if this motion is defeated it will have accomplished part of its purpose but the full purpose cannot be realized and the full circle cannot be completed until this inquiry is ordered and prosecuted to its conclusion, namely, why the price of petrol at Port Pirie and Port Lincoln, which are both first-class ports, should be higher than at Port Adelaide. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said that it was due to the loading to help the people in the hinterland, but apparently it is the people in the hinterland who are being mulcted in higher charges for the benefit of people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hall—That is not substantiated by the figures.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is substantiated by the figures given by Mr. Quirke and by his statements.

Mr. Quirke—It is the opposite to that.

Mr. Hall—You have taken it the wrong way.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I shall be pleased if the honourable member can show why the price should be higher at Port Pirie than at Port Adelaide. At Port Lincoln the position is even worse because it costs 3d. a gallon more there than at Port Adelaide, and Port Lincoln is a first class port. The Premier did not argue on the basis of apportionment of charges in order to meet losses in another part of the area served by these ports. He had a report from the Prices Commissioner to the effect that it was due to the fact that these ports were multiple ports, in other words that the cargo which was brought there was not fully unloaded there.

Mr. Shannon—The ships had more than one destination at which to unload.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is so, but that is axiomatic. That goes on all the time. It is a common practice and therefore should not affect the position. I doubt whether the Prices Commissioner has ever had an opportunity of investigating this matter and, indeed, I doubt whether his writ goes that far and that is why we should have an inquiry to clear the matter up once and for all. Another aspect that could be dealt with by an inquiry is the extravagances that are being perpetrated

by the oil companies in building new service stations everywhere, not for the purposes of real competition nor to benefit the public to ensure that they get fuel at a lower price, but simply to enable the companies all to get a cut off the breast of the goose, and the goose is the Australian fuel consumer. It is because I want something done within the ambit of this Parliament to protect the South Australian consumer in the ports and the hinterlands of Port Lincoln and Port Pirie that I commend this motion to the House.

The House divided on the motion—

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, O'Halloran (teller), Ralston, Riches, Ryan, Stott, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tapping and Dunstan. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Millhouse.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1066.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This Bill contains only two clauses of importance. The first deals with the need under present legislation for a candidate to be 30 years of age before he can stand at a Legislative Council election. The second is a move to put the Legislative Council roll on exactly the same basis as the Assembly roll. If we accept these amendments we will have to adopt a new approach to the electoral position. I may be old-fashioned but I believe that it is a good thing to have a bicameral Parliamentary system. I do not think there has been any advantage in Queensland where there is only one House. In fact, it has led to ill-considered and arbitrary legislation being rushed through, and much of it has not received the approval of Queensland electors. There is an advantage in having legislation considered by two Houses.

Mr. Lawn—The present Queensland Government does not support you in that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Lawn agree that there should be a Legislative Council in this State. All members opposite think that way.

Mr. Lawn—I don't.

Mr. Riches—Here is one that doesn't.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If that is so, why do not Opposition members move for the abolition of the Legislative Council? The purpose of this Bill is to make the Legislative Council a rubber stamp.

Mr. Lawn—To make it more democratic.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is to make that House identical with the Assembly, elected by the same people thinking in the same way.

Mr. O'Halloran—By the same people, but in different electorates.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If there were adult suffrage for the Legislative Council there might be different electorates, but there would be the same result because elections would be held under the same electoral laws. In the Federal sphere there are two Houses of Parliament. Does any member say that the Senate has been independent in its views?

Mr. Fred Walsh—Would you abolish the Senate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, because I believe in two Houses of Parliament. To be really effective the two Houses should be based on different qualifications.

Mr. Clark—You would make the Legislative Council a Party House?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member would take the chip off his shoulder and listen to what I have to say, he would learn that I do not consider this matter from the point of view of Party, but from the point of view of the citizen.

Mr. Clark—Which citizen?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Every citizen. The honourable member always looks at things from the class point of view, but I look at them from the broader point of view, and I hope successfully. We have adopted the Parliamentary system of the Old Country. Our Standing Orders say that where there is no Standing Order dealing with a specific matter we accept the Standing Order of the Mother of Parliaments that deals with it. We have in South Australia retained a Parliamentary system close to that of the United Kingdom, and we are proud of it. In the United Kingdom where the Labor Party was in power for years, and where there is a more mature brand of Socialism than in Australia, and where the House of Lords is a

hereditary House, the Labor Party did not see fit to abolish the House of Lords. There is a different approach to the matter by Labor Party members in England, where there is more maturity and not so much ambition.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about their deadlock provisions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They have come about as the result of the maturity. Here we have not the same maturity amongst our political friends opposite. It is in the interests of all people that legislation should be subjected to a double scrutiny.

Mr. Clark—We do not object to that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Bill does not provide for a double scrutiny. It makes the Legislative Council a rubber stamp. I think that is why the member for Stuart supports the Bill. He regards it as an opportunity to continue the gradual move to abolish the Legislative Council. As he nods his head my statement must have been correct. I think that may be the view of the Leader of the Opposition, although he may not be so frank about it. The Bill seeks to give the Legislative Council the same political colour as the House of Assembly.

Mr. Riches—Heaven forbid that. We want something better than that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When I look across the floor of the House sometimes I agree that some improvement is possible. This Bill is a hardy annual and on this occasion I am no more enamoured of it than previously. Of all the elected second Houses in Australia our Legislative Council is the most democratically elected.

Mr. Clark—What must the others be like!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have to exclude Victoria in my statement because recently there was an amendment to the Constitution in that State and now the Victorian Legislative Council is covered by legislation along the lines of this Bill. As a short-term investment it does not appear to have paid any dividends so far. I do not think the Bill will lead to better legislation being passed, or more mature consideration being given to Bills, or lead to a greater protection for the minority.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You do not suggest that mature consideration is given to Bills by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—During the last 20 years or so I have had the privilege of introducing many Bills in this House and if the honourable member looks at those passed by the Council in that period he will see that at no time has the Upper House been a reactionary House or impeded progress. As an example of one such Bill, let me mention that which established the Electricity Trust. Was that a reactionary Bill for a House that was then strongly dominated by Liberal members? Members know that passing that Bill was a bold course for the Upper House to take.

I oppose this Bill for the reasons I have stated. I do not believe it is in the interests of the citizens of this country or of mature consideration of legislative measures that come before the House. On the other hand, I believe it will mean that the Upper House will be only a duplicate of this Chamber. I believe the member for Stuart was correct in saying that its only purpose was to enable the Upper House ultimately to be abolished altogether. Then when there is a socialistic Government, there will be no consideration of whether it is class legislation, whether it will assist the development of this country, whether it will frighten away investment capital, or whether it will have any effect on unemployment or anything else. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo)—Recently in this House I was dubbed "Chief Brave Heart"; since the speech made by the Premier this afternoon, I think perhaps the Government could be dubbed "Sitting Pretty." I was pleased to hear the Premier say that one roll for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council was a good thing. Actually, that is all this Bill seeks. The Premier went on to speak about the retention of the Legislative Council, and I took it from what he said that he must fear that if this Bill were carried it would mean the end of the Council. That was borne out by his statement that we should be debating the abolition of the Council, which showed what was in his mind. I heartily congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on introducing this Bill.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Do you believe in the abolition of the Legislative Council?

Mr. HUGHES—Yes, I do. I consider this Bill is one of the most important measures to be introduced during this session, as it concerns all sections of the people who are accepting a full share of the responsibilities of this State.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Do you believe in the abolition of State Parliaments?

Mr. HUGHES—That is another matter that we are not debating now, as the Minister is aware. This Bill does not seek to give a con-

cession to people, but a right. Often a person is called upon to accept grave responsibilities long before he reaches the age of 30.

Mr. Hall—It is taking away the family viewpoint. Don't you believe in the family viewpoint?

Mr. HUGHES—The less the honourable member has to say about the family viewpoint the better it will be for him. How often do we see advertisements calling for applications to fill executive positions stating that only those under 25 need apply? Many companies wish to get men between the ages of 21 and 25 because they realize that is the period when people can adjust themselves to changing conditions. We pride ourselves on being referred to as a freedom-loving people, so every member should be delighted with the clause in this measure providing that anyone, whether male or female, entitled to be registered as an elector in and for any Council district shall be allowed to place himself in the hands of the electors. Without reflecting on past or present members of the Legislative Council, I say that the country would make greater progress by allowing the Parliamentary system to be challenged by people in their twenties rather than by sidetracking them later in life.

Mr. Millhouse—Yet I am always being told that I am immature. How do you reconcile the two?

Mr. HUGHES—Has the honourable member ever heard me say that? This measure is to bring the Legislative Council into line with the opinions held, not only by members of the public, but by those at the back of the present Government. It has been clearly shown that the supporters of the present Government uphold this measure, as has been clearly demonstrated by the support given to the numbers of young men who have been privileged to enter this Chamber in the last few years. I am sure that many people who are behind the Government resent the present qualifications necessary to stand as a candidate for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Hall—Do you know what they are?

Mr. HUGHES—I know full well, and perhaps it would be as well if the honourable member looked them up. I now turn to the provision that any person who is at least 21 and has lived continuously in the Commonwealth for at least six months and in a Council district for at least one month immediately preceding the date of registration of his or her electoral claim shall be qualified to enrol and vote for the Legislative Council. The Act now provides, in effect, although not in so many words, that a woman who has very little intelligence, but whose husband has purchased a piece of property for her, shall have a vote in the Legislative Council, but that a woman who has attended the University and has obtained the highest honours is not considered fit to have a vote because she has not the property qualifications. How can members opposite justify that?

Mr. Hall—The property qualification is a red herring. It is only necessary to be a householder.

Mr. HUGHES—As soon as a man becomes wealthy enough to buy land in his wife's name, his wife is entitled to vote. That woman is no better than my wife or the wife of any member of Parliament who has no property in her name. All we are asking for is justice, not privilege. The women of this country are asking that they be given this right, which is their due. No longer are they content with being told that their place is in the home. This has been strongly illustrated over the last few years by the strength of the organizations they represent. They will not be dominated by a small section of people, and the day is not far distant when they will really demand their rights. Unless we are prepared to give them their rights there will never be that satisfaction in political affairs that we should like to see.

For the first time in the history of this State women are being directly represented in the South Australian Parliament by their own sex. Already thousands of women have focused their attention upon our two women members. In her maiden speech the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) took up the cudgels on behalf of the female sex by befriending them on the cost of living and supporting the continuance of price control. When this Bill is put to the vote, I sincerely trust it will be carried. The Leader of the Opposition can be sure of at least one vote from the other side: I refer to the member for Burnside. If she does not support this Bill the women of South Australia will want to know why she is not treating them as human beings and sisters equal to herself, and why she is not prepared to allow them to take part in the selection of those who control their own destiny. We are prepared to trust people who have no vote in the Legislative Council to vote for a Federal Parliament—a body that controls the destiny of millions. If these people are competent to send men into Parliament to deal with greater and bigger questions concerning

our national affairs through the Commonwealth Parliament, surely they are competent to vote for a House that, in my opinion, has no standing as far as the general public are concerned and, if it were put to the vote of the people today, would be abolished. However, I am not debating the abolition of the Legislative Council at the moment.

I have noticed on a number of occasions that honourable members opposite, when they have been out in the country making speeches at shows and similar functions, appear to have a very high opinion of the intelligence of the people, but they are not willing that they should use that intelligence because they are keeping many of them under restriction. That restriction is that they are not permitted to vote for the Legislative Council. I have heard the Labor Party accused on more than one occasion of wanting this provision, household suffrage for the people, as a matter of gain for its own ends. That is not so. We want it to give to the people that to which they are entitled, so that there shall be government of the people, by the people, for the people. Considering that the purpose of this Bill is to give every man and woman the right to vote for both Houses of the Legislature, it surely should have the support of every honourable member of this House, because it is only meting out a simple act of justice to those who, in my opinion and in the opinion of others, are entitled to vote. Surely there is no matter that so vitally affects the life of the community as this, that the people should be given the full right of representation.

To continue to deny full adult suffrage is to deny many thousands of women a right. Those noble women who bore the heat and burden of two world wars in the home—and it was in the quiet and solitude of the home that many a struggle took place by those who gave up husband, brother and sweetheart to go away to fight for their country—have to live and abide by legislation that is passed, and they should have a voice in the selection of the men and women who bring down and consider legislation that ultimately becomes the laws under which they live. To have a voice in the selection is only reasonable, fair and just. By voting against this measure honourable members will place a ban upon our womanhood, and no other interpretation can be placed upon this action than that the women of this State are unworthy of the vote or not capable of using it even if it were given to them. One would imagine that voters for the Legislative Council were persons from some other part of the Commonwealth, and that they were not related to those possessed of equal ability. These same people are the parents of the boys and girls of today, and they desire that good and just laws be made for them and all classes of the community.

Recently, I heard it stated that at no time in the history of the State was it more necessary to have the Council elected by persons of mature age and experience than now. Be that as it may, honourable members know full well that, if a war broke out tomorrow, thousands of people denied the right to vote for the Legislative Council would be prepared to offer their services in the defence of the country that did not recognize them in the making of its laws. Surely, there is no matter that so vitally affects the life of the community as that.

I may be accused of being sentimental, and it may be said that if we carry sentiment too far it will bring disaster instead of progress; but that is not so. I am placing the facts before the House as I see them, and every member in the House knows that I am right. The British are a determined and persistent people, as has been proved over the years. It is the doggedness of those living under the British flag that has made this country what it is, and I venture to affirm that whatever reforms there may be in the franchise for the Legislative Council will be brought about by the persistent agitation of members of Her Majesty's Opposition.

Here is an opportunity for members opposite to prove that I am wrong. Here is an opportunity for the Government to prove to the people of South Australia its belief in a true democracy regarding franchise reforms, to prove that it is not lacking in good faith and sincerity, and to gain the admiration of the people by carrying out what I believe are the wishes of the people. I heartily support the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I rise to enthusiastically add my support to the Bill, as I have done on previous similar legislation. The Premier, on behalf of the Government, commenced his remarks this afternoon at 4.15 p.m. and finished at 4.30. It took him exactly a quarter of an hour to oppose this Bill, and during that time he said nothing, because he had nothing to say in opposition to it. After hearing the admirable address just completed by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) one can well understand why the Government has no answer to the proposals now before the House.

Under the present law some members on the Government side of this House would not be eligible to contest an election for the Legislative Council or take a seat in that Chamber. It is a well-known fact that one Government member, before becoming a member of this House—I refer to the member for Mitcham—supported the Labor Party policy on electoral reform. The recommendations from the Mitcham branch of the Young Liberals were discussed at a Liberal Party conference on one occasion, when a former member of the Legislative Council said that he never thought he would hear such words spoken within the portals of the Liberal Club building. He went on to say that when listening to those words he thought he was listening to Mr. O'Halloran, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse—I am afraid your facts are not quite right.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Mitcham has now changed his tune. I have before me the Constitution and State Platform of the Liberal Party. On the inside of the back cover, under the heading "The Liberal and Country League, S.A. Division of the Liberal Party of Australia," the following appears:—

Rules for Principals of the Liberal and Country League and Vested Interests.

Number 4 reads:—

Any member of the L.C.L., who, before Election to the State Parliament (either House) advocates a Democratically Elected Parliament, or the A.L.P. Electoral Reform Proposals, shall, immediately upon becoming a Member of Parliament, repudiate such belief and take Direction from The Master, as without the Gerrymandered Electorate the Liberal and Country League will perish.

This is probably some reference to the former attitude of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. McKee—Where did you get that?

Mr. LAWN—That has evidently been concocted by the Liberal Party to put the member for Mitcham in his place. Number 3 reads as follows:—

Should any female member of the Liberal and Country League become a Member of the State Parliament (either House) and has (for political purposes) prior to her election, advocated Adult Franchise for the Legislative Council Elections, and equal pay for the sexes, she must immediately repudiate her beliefs (if any) on such matters, and give unswerving Loyalty and Obedience to The Master, who shall be her guiding star in these and other matters.

The member for Mitcham, before becoming a member of this House, advocated the Australian Labor Party electoral reform proposals. There is no doubt whatever about that. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) is now representing the women of South Australia. I know she does not represent them all, but she is at least a woman representative in this Parliament, and surely to goodness the women of our State should be able to look to her to obtain justice if it is not forthcoming from the males. If the males are not prepared to give the women of this country justice, then at least those women are entitled to say, "We have one of our sex in the State Parliament, and surely we can expect justice from her."

Mr. Ryan—They will be waiting to see how she votes.

Mr. LAWN—The women in Burnside voted almost unanimously to select the present member in the pre-selection ballot in preference to Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, and I say that she is in duty bound to take the opportunity in this House to speak for and on behalf of the women of this State so that they cannot say that this House, which consists mainly of males, forsakes the women. The Premier, in his 15 minutes' discourse this afternoon was like a drowning man clutching at a straw. In effect, he said the present position in Queensland was not good. In reply to that I point out that Queensland had the Moore Liberal Government from 1930 to 1933, and that the present Liberal Government has been in office for over 12 months, yet no attempt has ever been made by the Liberal Party to restore the Legislative Council in Queensland. These people know their own business best. The Master of South Australia may be the Master here, but the people of Queensland will tell him to keep his nose out of their business, just as Mr. Bolte tells him to keep his nose out of Victoria's business.

The Premier then said that our system, with two Houses of Parliament on the present restricted franchise, leads to better legislation. Members of the South Australian Parliament said much the same thing in 1894. They said that our problems in finance and other things could not be solved by having women in Parliament. The suggestion was, "If we give them the vote the next thing we know is they'll be in here." How terrible that would be! The Premier says, in effect, that Mrs. Cooper should not be a member of the Legislative Council, for he said that the present set-up, without females, would lead to better legislation. He is criticizing the fact that the Liberal and Country League has a woman representing Burnside in this House and another woman in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Coumbe—Rubbish!

Mr. LAWN—He then said that males were better able to deal with the question of investment than females. That comes from the Premier in the 20th century! In the 19th century it was said that the problems relating to the raising of loans, investment, and other problems in the State's development could better be handled by males, and the Premier, some 70 or 80 years later, is still saying that the financial affairs of this State can be looked after better by males than by females. What a statement from the Master of the Liberal Party! To cap it all he said that he wanted two Houses of Parliament on a restricted franchise, but that he would not alter the present set-up in the Senate. How inconsistent can one be? The only thing members opposite are consistent in is their inconsistency. The Premier wants two Houses of Parliament on the present restricted franchise, but he would not alter the present Senate set-up where the very principle we are fighting for this afternoon operates and everyone over 21 years of age gets a vote.

Mr. Hall—They don't get the same representation.

Mr. Clark—Don't point. It's rude to point.

Mr. LAWN—They get better representation than they do in this Parliament. They tell me that Mr. Potter has a habit of getting up in the Legislative Council like a schoolmaster, and apparently that is developing here. The Liberal Party claims that it likes efficiency. In 1956, in his first speech, the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) condemned the inefficiency of our Public Service and wanted a Royal Commission to improve it, yet he and his colleagues do not want to improve the efficiency of the Electoral Office where one enrolment card would do, but they have two cards. Big business would not do that. Big business uses a stop watch to cut out waste motions and waste time to have a job done in the most efficient manner, but in our Electoral Office in Currie Street we have an antiquated system that necessitates two enrolment cards. Why not one card? It costs more to get the Government Printer to print two cards, to handle two cards, to transport them, to issue them and for a person to return them when completed. Can members say that that is an efficient state of affairs? It is a most inefficient set-up! Section 22 of the principal Act states:—

No person who is of unsound mind and no person attainted of treason, or who has been convicted and is under sentence or subject to be sentenced for any offence punishable under the law of any part of the King's dominions by imprisonment for one year or longer shall be entitled to vote at any election for a member or members of the Legislative Council.

Members opposite have the audacity to put my wife and the other women of this State in the category of convicted criminals and of people of unsound mind. It is the attitude of members opposite, who claim to represent the people of the State, to put all women over the age of 21 years in that category. They do not represent the people of this State. I have told them recently who they represent.

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member must not reflect on the other members of the House.

Mr. LAWN—I am making that statement and you can rule me out of order if you like. I say they do not represent all the people of the State. They cannot possibly. Members opposite are only elected for one district and they are keeping on our Statute Books the very Act that prohibits some people of this State from having the right to vote, so that all the people are not represented in Parliament. Members opposite represent landed interests and property interests. I will develop that argument further and prove that members opposite only represent certain interests in this House. On page 60 of David Thomson's book *Equality*, published in 1949, the following appears:—

As with so many reforms of the nineteenth century, it is difficult for twentieth century minds to appreciate the full horror with which the prospect of "universal suffrage" was viewed by men a century ago. The idea that the right to vote should be coextensive with adult citizenship was one of the fundamentally revolutionary conceptions of the nineteenth century throughout Europe and Great Britain. The eighteenth century had regarded politics as reflecting the balance of wealth; economic power as necessarily and rightly determining political power. This notion, which today smacks of Marxism, was the orthodox and generally accepted doctrine of the English constitution in the eighteenth century. Political theorists from John Locks to Edmund Burke were well-nigh unanimous in holding that the right men to govern England were men "with a stake in the country"—the oligarchy of big landowners, who clearly had most to lose if the country were mis-governed or if there were foreign invasion. It was even revolutionary to suggest—as did mercantilists like Thomas Mun or free-traders like Adam Smith—that the wealth of nations might lie in trade or industry and not in land. Once these suggestions were accepted, it was an easy next step to demand that these forms of wealth, too, should be represented in Parliament. Writers like Bolingbroke and Hume normally thought in terms of different blocs of economic interest and social connec-

tion such as "the landed interest," "the moneyed interest," "the labouring interest," "the dissenting interest," and so on. Until the rise of the Radical movement in the late eighteenth century, coinciding with the American and the French Revolutions, it was generally assumed that property and not persons ought to be represented in Parliament.

That is the position today. Members opposite believe that property and not persons ought to be represented in Parliament, and I challenge any member to deny it. This Bill proposes that persons shall have the right of election and representation in our Parliament. I said earlier that one or two of the Premier's remarks this afternoon were similar to remarks expressed in the South Australian Parliament in 1894 when Parliament was debating an Adult Suffrage Bill introduced by the then Chief Secretary who quoted the following words of John Stuart Mill:—

That the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and is now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other.

I commend those words to members. There should be no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other. Men and women of this State are human beings, and they should have equality in voting and the right to sit in Parliament. On page 474 there appeared:—

It was provided in the Constitution Act that all men up to a certain age who had certain qualifications were entitled to vote for members of both Houses of Parliament, insolvents, lunatics and convicts excepted, and it was an insult to the sex for the Government to attempt to associate them with these classes.

In effect, this is in line with my previous statement. On page 1330 there appeared:—

There were reasons why the head of a family should have a vote while his sons and his daughters or his lodgers should not, because should the latter become qualified as heads of families they would have one. If the House of Assembly was going to be elected by the female vote it was as well to allow the head of the family to have some controlling influence.

I wonder whether the member for Burnside would agree with this statement:—

If the head of a family happened to be a woman she would, of course, have a vote, but that would not occur very often. . . . He admired their modesty but while they were so modest he did not agree with them. He thought the present members were just as capable of managing the country as members elected by women would be.

That is similar to what the Treasurer said this afternoon. Then the following appeared:—

If men were unable to govern the colony he was quite sure that women never could. When it came to a question of finance they would be more likely to get an intelligent answer from the men than the women, who were more concerned in whether crinolines were to be worn or what was the latest fashion in bonnets.

Then there was an interjection "or the result of the next football match," and the report continued:—

Better to do that than to spend their time in discussing fashions and the proper treatment of babies.

It was said that if the females had a vote they would soon become members of the House and that the husbands would be home minding the babies. Someone interjected that probably there would be no babies. That would have been a calamity. What thoughts! In his remarks today the Treasurer did not say as much as was said in 1894, and they did not say much then. I now quote from *Theory and Practice of Modern Government* by Finer, and on page 230 it is stated under the heading "Who may choose representatives?":—

Property and educational qualifications.—The main qualification for the franchise in the nineteenth century, that which limited the numbers enjoying it, was the possession of property. Two main reasons were advanced for this. One was that the possession of some property was a trustworthy indication that its possessor was educated and therefore competent to pronounce upon public affairs.

Did not the member for Wallaroo show that a woman who had obtained a degree at a university could not vote at Legislative Council elections because she did not own property, yet the most unintelligent female could vote if she had property? The article continues:—

The other was that if those who had no property were enfranchised there would be an end of private property.

Both the books I have quoted show that right back to the eighteenth century the qualification for voting was based on property ownership, and we still have it. Federally, I do not know that we could have a better electoral system. The United Kingdom in recent years has given local autonomy to various countries previously in the British Commonwealth of Nations, and in many of them there is now universal suffrage.

Mr. Ryan—We are always last.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, but I hope it will not be long before we will be first in some things. On page 233 of that book there appeared the fol-

lowing under the heading "Sex Qualifications":—

Female sex was an almost universal exclusion from the vote until a generation ago; the prohibition lasted longest (until very recently) in France, Italy and many other, especially Latin, countries. Female disfranchisement arose out of no rational consideration of women's need to participate in political activity, but out of the general social position of women, as determined by sexual role, family life and religious tenets. It was assumed that man was, or should be, the head of the family and the lord of women, and that women's place was the home; it followed that women were "represented" in politics by their husbands. They were put off with cant about their beauty and modesty. But with the insistence of natural rights theories upon the uniqueness of individual experience, women found a way into political life. Among the pioneers of reform were men like John Stuart Mill and Charles Bradlaugh, not Christians in the ordinary sense of the word. The mass of men, securely installed in authority, were proof against argument until women formed militant organizations and worried and shocked them out of their domineering complacency. Some statesmen have ascribed their conversion to the efficient services of women in World War I. We cannot entirely exclude one other consideration: Party competition to bid for the votes of the newly enfranchised.

In two World Wars we have found that women and men have rallied to the defence of the country. Where they have had the good fortune to return they have been given the right to vote at our Council elections, but that right has not been given to anyone in a family where a member lost his or her life. On page 399 there appeared under the heading "Origins":—

We must distinguish. Legislatures are bi-cameral for two broad and different reasons: as part of Federalism, and as the result of a desire to check the popular principle in the Constitution.

Under the heading "The Defence of Possessions" the author said:—

Secondly, quite apart from the need for mature deliberation, second chambers have come into existence for the same reason as so many other institutions: those who have power and possessions create all possible barricades to prevent their loss.

This State in 1836 set up a Council to look after the landed interests of those days and after, and the only people who then had a vote were landowners. Later, the right to vote was extended to people who rented property, but the right to vote when the two Houses were set up was given only to people with property with the object of creating all possible barricades to prevent the losses of privileges. That is the position today. Members opposite are trying to prevent any loss of privilege on behalf of landed interests. In a book entitled *Modern Political Constitutions*, by C. F. Strong, the following statement appears:—

A very broad franchise is therefore characteristic of all existing constitutional States. The older States have carried out electoral reforms which have led to either adult or manhood suffrage, while the newly established States almost invariably wrote into their Constitutions a clause bestowing universal suffrage irrespective of sex.

As the Leader said, and as I said in reply to the member for Port Adelaide, the newly created countries that have obtained their freedom from the British Commonwealth and have achieved their own status as nations have instituted universal suffrage. The author of the book from which I have quoted set out strongly that the newly established States almost invariably wrote into their Constitutions universal suffrage irrespective of sex. Why cannot we likewise write this into our Constitution? What is wrong with the women of our State? Do they suffer from any disability that should deprive them of the right to vote? Are they immature? Are they disenfranchised because it is felt that they have not sufficient intellect to cast an intelligent vote? We have seen this implemented in recent times in Australia by a Country Party Government supported by Labor: I refer to legislation introduced in Victoria in 1950. The Party opposite calls itself the Liberal and Country League. I do not know whether there are any country interests in that league, but it purports to represent country interests. The Victorian Bill was introduced by the Country Party. In giving the second reading explanation on the Legislative Council Reform Bill, the then Chief Secretary, Mr. Dodgshun, said:—

There has been no redivision of the boundaries of the Legislative Council since 1936. When honourable members study this measure they will find that it embraces certain principles that were laid down in the legislation of that year. Because of the general trends throughout the world we feel that we can help to safeguard democracy by giving responsible people the right to elect their representatives to Parliament. In the community there are men and women who saw service with various arms of the fighting forces. They were prepared to lay down their lives to safeguard those at home and to preserve the principles for which this nation stands. Because of restrictions in the present Act many of those ex-servicemen and women, together with other members of the community, have no voice as to who shall represent them in the Legislative Council. This Bill proposes to rectify that anomaly.

It was recognized in Victoria that it was an anomaly, and it was rectified. We are asking

this House to do likewise. The Victorian Chief Secretary continued:—

The Country Party believes in the bicameral system of government that operates in Victoria and will endeavour to preserve it. The principal purpose of the Bill is to provide for the election of members of the Legislative Council of Victoria on the basis of universal adult franchise instead of the restricted franchise which is in operation at present. Coincident with the liberalizing of the franchise, it is proposed to revise the qualifications for membership of the Council, first by rescinding the legal requirement that a member of the Upper House must be in possession of freehold property in Victoria having an annual value of not less than £25, and, secondly, by bringing the qualifications generally into conformity with those required for membership of the Legislative Assembly. The introduction of adult franchise for the Legislative Council will permit the use at Upper House elections of joint Commonwealth and Assembly rolls, which are prepared on a system of compulsory enrolment and include the names of all residents of Victoria who have attained the age of twenty-one years and who are otherwise qualified as electors for the Legislative Assembly. We have advocated repeatedly that one roll and one card should suffice instead of the present inefficient system of having two rolls and two cards. The Leader of the Victorian Country Party used the same argument when explaining this Bill. He continued:—

To enable the Assembly rolls to be used for Council purposes, it is essential, of course, that the subdivisions which form the unit of Assembly enrolment should be uniform with the subdivisions of Legislative Council provinces. Clause 3 of this Bill provides that any person qualified and entitled to register as an elector for the Legislative Council shall be qualified to contest an election for that Chamber. Clause 4 provides that all British subjects over 21 years of age who have lived continuously in the Commonwealth for at least six months and in a Council district for at least one month immediately preceding the date of registration of his Council claim shall be entitled to vote for the Legislative Council. Clause 5 provides for a qualification of three months, in lieu of six months' residence in South Australia. I commend the Bill to the House.

We should not only give a right to vote for the Legislative Council to property owners or occupiers of property; we should consider persons instead of property. Also, we should not place our women in the same category as section 22 places criminals by not giving them an entitlement to vote. Eventually, of course, this House will accept the principle in this Bill; whether it is done now or not, it will be only a matter of time. We have been gibed by members opposite about our policy of unification and other matters and today there has been an organized attempt to upset the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) when he was speaking. All sorts of interjections were thrown at him about Labor Party principles. He was asked whether he supported unification and whether he wanted the abolition of State Parliaments, and so on. Eventually there will be unification in accordance with the policy of the Labor Party. It is coming fast. We believe not in the abolition of State Parliaments, but in unification in certain instances. My mind goes to the Commonwealth Parliament which has just passed through the House of Representatives the Uniform Divorce Bill introduced by the Liberal Party. Eventually, South Australia will follow the lead of the other States, but are we always going to be the last?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Would you take policy-making away from the State Parliaments?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member knows well what my Party policy is: that on matters of national importance concerning all States there should be a Commonwealth Parliament, while the State Parliaments would look after matters of a purely State character, such as roads, reservoirs, and so on; but things like divorce, workmen's compensation, and industrial laws that concern all of us should be the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—What powers now belonging to the State would you give the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member might tell me instead whether his Government accepts the principle of uniformity in the divorce law.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—That is in the Constitution.

Mr. LAWN—I am not asking whether it is in the Constitution: I am asking whether the Minister subscribes to it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—It is written in the Constitution.

Mr. LAWN—He cannot answer. In conclusion let me quote from the book of Galatians, chapter 3, verse 28:—

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

I ask the House this afternoon to remember those words and give the same right to the females of this State as it is prepared to give to the males. I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—In opposing this Bill, let me say at once that I did not intend to speak until I heard this afternoon some extraordinary and extravagant comments. For sheer humbug some of today's remarks take a lot of beating. Certain assertions made against members on this side should be refuted. This serious matter strikes at the very constitution of our Parliamentary system of Government in South Australia, the representation of the people. It is one that should not be treated in the fiery and extravagant way that we have witnessed today. We have listened to much humbug and cant. Boiled down, the allegations made amounted to this: that members on this side of the House had a lien on the voting powers in the Legislative Council; in other words, that supporters of this Party were members who were always returned to power in the Legislative Council, and were the only ones likely to be returned to power.

I point out that under the Constitution equal rights are given to people eligible and entitled to vote, whatever their Party and whatever their political faith. In other words, supporters of the Labor Party have equal opportunity with supporters of the Liberal Party of being returned as members of the Legislative Council and also of returning members to the Legislative Council. Throughout the speech of the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) it was apparent that he was suggesting that the Liberal Party members had a first claim on being returned as members of the Legislative Council and a first claim on those who were entitled to vote. It is, or should be, apparent to us all that every person in this State eligible to vote for the Legislative Council has an equal opportunity to vote for his selected condidate, if he takes the trouble to go to the poll and vote. That is the essence of it all. When we view it this way, I suggest few people are not entitled to vote for the Legislative Council if they take the trouble to become enrolled.

To take only two examples, the freeholder and the leaseholder, we know the conditions attaching to a freeholder, a man who owns a house or property, and those attaching to any person who pays rent or occupies a house. No matter where in this State he may live, he has the privilege and right of becoming enrolled as a voter on the Legislative Council roll. Any man who either owns or rents a house may enrol to vote for the Legislative Council. That applies equally whether he prefers to vote Labor or Liberal. I say that deliberately because allegations were made by the member for Adelaide—and the bias is there right through his speech—that the people who voted for members on this side of the House were those who in most cases were privileged to vote for the Council and not those who voted for the Labor Party. However, all those people entitled to vote, a wide section of the community, can vote as they wish if they take the trouble, not only to become enrolled, but to vote.

The plain fact is that at election after election both political Parties have gone into the field and canvassed most strenuously. In most districts most votes have gone to the Liberal Party candidate. For instance, in the last election for the Northern district of the Legislative Council held earlier this year, the Labor Party deliberately ran a "stooge" or "dummy" candidate for the seats of Whyalla and Stuart, for the express purpose of enticing more people to vote for the Labor candidate for the Legislative Council than would otherwise have been the case. If the Labor Party had not contested the House of Assembly seats in those two instances, there would have been a smaller Legislative Council Labor vote. Despite this, the Labor vote did not increase materially and the sitting Legislative Council members were returned. The Labor Party has an equal opportunity with the Liberal Party of gaining representation in the Legislative Council. It is a question of organizing within the Party and, not only that but more importantly still, of getting one's supporters to go to the poll. The opportunity is equal for both Parties. The Labor Party has fallen down in the past because it could not get its adherents to the poll. We know the conditions under which one may be enrolled and we know of the privilege extended to ex-servicemen, which provision has my wholehearted support. I am enrolled in Legislative Council Central No. 1 District as an ex-serviceman, and I suppose many other members of the House are enrolled under the same provision, but I do not expect ever to be represented in that district by a Liberal and Country Party member.

Mr. Quirke—Can you give the House one reason why it should be limited to a property vote?

Mr. COUMBE—It is not limited to a property vote.

Mr. Quirke—Give me one reason why the vote should be limited to a woman who has property, as against one who has not a block of land.

Mr. COUMBE—If you come down to fundamentals, it can be argued that a woman often has the same right as a man. Either the man or his wife having property may vote, or it may apply to both. If the honourable member wishes to develop his argument, I may maintain that he has been in this House many years and he may give his reason if he likes.

Mr. Quirke—Why don't you say that the block of land makes the difference?

Mr. COUMBE—A woman has the same right as a man to have a block of land. Take my case, for example. Both my wife and I have a vote, and no doubt the honourable member enjoys the same privilege. If a woman is a leaseholder or pays rent, she is entitled to a vote. My main reason for speaking was to refute the extravagant charges made by Mr. Lawn, and the points I have made in that regard cannot be refuted. Mr. Lawn referred to Queensland, and for what it is worth I suggest that when Mr. Gair was Premier of that State before being defeated he would have welcomed a Legislative Council. That was when he was facing defeat a couple of years ago at the hands of some of his former colleagues. I agree with the lowering of the age whereby a member may become eligible to take his seat at 21. My only other suggestion is that it would be to the advantage of this State and of Parliament if the number of members of both Chambers was increased. That would have a beneficial effect and give greater representation. This would probably meet some objections of honourable members opposite regarding representation. I intend to vote against the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.48 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

By arrangement with the Commonwealth Government an area in the vicinity of Eight Mile Creek was developed and improved by the Government under a scheme for War Service Land Settlement, and thereafter the land within the area was allotted to settlers in accordance with that scheme, each settler receiving a holding under perpetual lease. The development and improvement of the area in question included the provision of a drainage system without which the land in that area could not be successfully cultivated or brought into a state of production. The drainage system is essential for preserving the area in a state of production, and its maintenance and upkeep has been undertaken by the Government on the understanding between the Government and the Commonwealth that when the rentals for the holdings are finally fixed, an appropriate charge would be made on each settler, in respect of his holding, as a contribution towards the maintenance costs of the drainage system.

A charge of that nature could be added to the rental of a holding as long as that holding is the subject of a lease, but recently the two Governments decided to permit war service settlers to freehold their holdings upon certain conditions and, if and when this right is exercised, it would not be appropriate to recover that contribution by way of rental in respect of the freeholded land, and it would not be fair on the remaining settlers to recover the contributions only from them for a service which benefits all the holdings in the area. It is felt that the fairest means of raising the contributions would be to levy a rate on all the holdings in the area irrespective of the nature of the tenure, and the object of this Bill is to declare the responsibility for the maintenance of the drainage system to be a State responsibility, and to confer power on an authority to declare and levy a rate in order to raise the contributions from landholders and occupiers of holdings in the area.

Clause 2 of the Bill contains the interpretations necessary for the purpose of the Bill. The definitions of "drainage works" and "drains" are designed to restrict their application to works and drains constructed by or on behalf of the Crown and such other watercourses as are included in the drainage system. A "holding" is defined so as to apply to a holding allotted in the first instance to a settler under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme, whether a change of tenure has occurred since allotment or not. A "landholder" is defined so as to catch up the owner of land within the area whether the land is held under lease, licence or agreement, or in fee simple. All other definitions in the clause are self-explanatory.

Clause 3 imposes on the Minister the duty to maintain the drainage system in a proper state of efficiency while the expenses connected therewith are payable out of moneys to be provided by Parliament. The clause also provides for moneys derived from the drainage rate provided for by the Bill to be paid to the Treasury. Clause 4 imposes on the Director of Lands the duty to declare and levy an annual drainage rate in order to raise moneys which the Minister considers to be a sufficient contribution towards the cost of maintenance of the drainage system.

Clause 5 (1) provides that in order to determine the drainage rate—

(*a*) the average annual expenditure to be incurred on such maintenance should be determined by the Director, and

(*b*) the Land Board must make and lodge with the Director a valuation of the land (exclusive of structural improvements) comprised in each holding within the area.

Clause 5 (2) provides that in making a valuation the board may consider reports of competent persons, and requires the board to submit a written report with each valuation, setting out the matters taken into consideration in arriving at the valuation. The board's valuation (which is subject to appeal) and its report are to be served on the landholder or occupier of the holding in question.

Clause 6 confers on landholders and occupiers served with the valuations a right of appeal on the grounds stated in that clause. The earlier requirement that the board should furnish with each valuation a report setting out the matters taken into consideration in arriving at the valuation is designed to enable an appellant to specify his grounds of appeal. Clause 7 provides that an appeal must be made in the first instance to the Minister and from a decision of the Minister to the local court. Clause 8 deals with the machinery provisions relating to an appeal to the Minister. Clause 9 deals with the machinery provisions relating to an appeal to the local court. Clause 10 in effect is an interpretation measure which defines the valuation of a holding for a rating period where the original valuation has been varied on appeal.

Clause 11 (1) imposes on the Director a duty to declare the annual drainage rate in respect of each rating period, and sets out the matters to be taken into consideration in determining the rate and the maximum rate that could be imposed on any holding. Clause 11 (2) requires the Director within 14 days of the declaration of the rate to cause a notice of the rate so declared to be served on the landholder or occupier of each holding. Clause 12 sets out when the rate is payable and when it is recoverable for the first year of a rating period and for any succeeding year of that rating period. Clause 13 provides for interest to be added to overdue rates, with power to the Minister to remit the whole or part of that interest in cases of undue hardship.

Clause 14 (1) specifies the Director or a nominee of the Minister as the person to whom rates are payable and by whom they are recoverable. Clause 14 (2) declares that unpaid rates are a charge on the land, and clause 14 (3) specifies from whom the rates are recoverable. Clause 15 invokes the aid of section 95 of the Waterworks Act and the Crown Rates and Taxes Recovery Act where rates and interest under this Bill are unpaid on the one hand or overdue for not less than three years on the other. Clause 16 provides that the liability for and the right to recover rates are not suspended by appeal, but where on appeal it appears that an excess amount has been paid by way of rates, that amount must be forthwith refunded. Clause 17 contains necessary regulation making powers.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 24. Page 1812.)

Clause 12—"Exemption of farmer's tractors and implements."

Mr. SHANNON—I should like to give a few details from the *Australian Insurance and Banking Record* of 1957-58—the last issue of statistics available—relating to third party

insurance. The gross premiums in South Australia were £1,488,000 and claims, £1,071,000 which, in insurance parlance, revealed a loss ratio of 72 per cent. To relate those figures to the actual position one must consider the expenditure incurred in writing the business and in maintaining offices and must exclude tax and contributions to fire brigades.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—What amendment is the honourable member moving?

Mr. SHANNON—At the moment I am discussing third party insurance as it may be related to farm implements.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! Will the honourable member move his amendment so that the House will know what it is?

Mr. SHANNON—I do not intend to press my amendment and I am outlining my reasons. The net result in South Australia, after allowing for expenditure, was 104 per cent or a 4 per cent loss.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! I only called on the honourable member because he had an amendment on the file. If he does not intend to go on with that amendment I will call on the next amendment on the file.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not intend to press my amendment because I do not consider it necessary or desirable to impose third party insurance on certain types of farm implements. The auto-header is the only self-propelled farm implement that could perhaps be covered by third party insurance. I examined the possibility of amending the definition of "farm implement," but that is not easy to accomplish and in the circumstances I will not press my amendment because I realize that this legislation will be before us next year when the Act is consolidated and amendments can be made then. Some members are worried about the penalties and, as a result of discussions with the Parliamentary Draftsman, I believe those difficulties can be satisfactorily overcome in relation to third party insurance on tractors. In respect of third party insurance South Australia was not the worst off. Western Australia headed the list with 143 per cent—which meant it lost £43 on every £100 it wrote—New South Wales was next with 122 per cent, Victoria 116 per cent, Tasmania 109 per cent, and Queensland 108 per cent. There would be no profit in such insurance to the companies.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move to insert the following new subclause (3a):—

(3a) A self-propelled farm implement may be driven without registration or insurance on roads within twenty-five miles of a farm occupied by the owner of such self-propelled farm implement: Provided that if there is no workshop where repairs can be efficiently carried out to the self-propelled farm implement within twenty-five miles of the farm occupied by the owner of the self-propelled farm implement the self-propelled farm implement may be driven as aforesaid on roads more than twenty-five miles from that farm for the purpose of proceeding to the nearest workshop where such repairs can be efficiently carried out and returning to the farm from that workshop.

Since the introduction of the original Act new types of machinery have been invented which perform the work previously done by a tractor dragging another implement and this amendment provides that the privileges that applied to the combined implement will also apply to this particular implement.

Mr. HEASLIP—I support the amendment, but believe that the amendment carried last night has rendered this clause ridiculous. Farmers will be compelled to insure tractors that will be allowed to draw uninsured farm implements, which will be four times as dangerous as a tractor on its own. The auto-header is self-propelled, but would be only used for one month of the year. For every six ordinary headers there would be only one auto-header. It is proposed to allow a self-propelled farm implement, a header of which there are few in use, to be driven on the road without registration or insurance. Previously we decided that in other instances farmers must insure towed vehicles. Although I support it, I think clause 12 is ridiculous.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The auto-header is a massive affair, yet it is proposed to allow it to be driven 25 miles on the road, and if there is no workshop within 25 miles of the farm it can be taken a further distance to the nearest workshop. I supported the move that tractors should be insured and I cannot see why this implement should not be insured. Unless I get a satisfactory explanation on this matter I will move to delete the words "or insurance" from the new subclause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think this matter comes back to the decision that we made last night. A few moments ago Mr. Shannon indicated that he would not proceed with his second amendment, after we had accepted his first one last night. Previously the Bill provided that tractors and farm implements behind tractors should be exempt from registration and insurance, provided certain conditions were complied with. Last night the Committee said that tractors that move quickly were a danger on the road, although

statistics did not prove it. The auto-header cannot move quickly, and can be used for nothing but harvesting. I do not know what the insurance rate on such a header would be, but I do not think there is any need to insure it. I cannot understand Mr. Heaslip saying he wants it insured. In ordinary circumstances it would not be taken from the farm, and it would go only if more than a maintenance repair were needed. I suggest that last night's amendment went as far as we should go in the matter. I noticed a change of heart on the part of Mr. Shannon tonight. Now that the primary producers are having a bad spin it is unnecessary to impose additional obligations on them. If the matter assumes any importance by next year we can examine it further then.

Mr. STOTT—It is obvious that there is confusion in this matter. I was pleased that Mr. Shannon did not move his second amendment because there would have been difficulty in administering the matter in relation to a self-propelled implement. The auto-header is a large implement, so large that when on the road it may require a police escort. We have already decided that an unregistered tractor must be insured, and subclause (3) of clause 12 says:—

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

The definition of "farm implement" is:—

An implement or machine for ploughing, cultivating, clearing or rolling land, sowing seed, spreading fertilizer, harvesting crops, spraying, chaffcutting, or other like operations and includes a trailer bin constructed for attachment to a harvester for the purpose of collecting grain in bulk, but does not include any other vehicle wholly or mainly constructed for the carriage of goods.

If this amendment is accepted, these will all be excluded. Self-propelled machines are mainly those used for harvesting. I suggest that we leave the new subclause moved by the Treasurer as printed.

Mr. LAWN—I cannot see any reason for distinguishing between a tractor, an implement being drawn by a tractor and a self-propelled vehicle. I understood the member for Barossa to say that farmers could carry their own insurance up to £10,000.

Mr. Laucke—I said they were a responsible section that could assess whether they could carry their own risk.

Mr. LAWN—Yet the Treasurer just said that they were in such a parlous state that it would be a grave injustice to ask them to pay the few shillings that would be necessary for a third party insurance policy. I suggest that we follow the principle we agreed to last night of insisting that implements and the vehicles towing them be insured. I understand there is no difficulty about having implements and motor vehicles insured.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am happy with this amendment. Last night the Committee said that tractors should be insured, and I agreed with that. A farm implement may, without insurance, be drawn behind a tractor. In the event of an accident it would have to be decided whether it was the tractor or the implement that caused the accident. It is highly improbable that a self-propelled harvester will ever be drawn along roads for great distances, except when being taken to a farm in the first instance or to a showground, because there are mobile plants that can effect repairs in the paddock. I do not think there is any necessity to insist that such machines must have a separate insurance policy. Headers are a different matter, as they are more unwieldy. However, most are over the maximum width and a police escort must be obtained to take them on roads. So long as tractors are covered by insurance, I think we should let the rest pass.

Mr. HALL—I disagree with the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn). The same principle does not apply to implements and tractors, as tractors are used all the year, but implements are used only during the season. A farmer may have 20 implements which, under this law, would have to be covered by insurance. This would create an impossible situation; I therefore think the insurance should be left entirely on the tractor.

Mr. JENKINS—I support the amendment as it stands. I agree that safeguards must be taken when these implements are taken on the road. However, some members seem to be working on the premise that any accident involving an implement would be the fault of the primary producer, but that may not be so.

Mr. STOTT—I should like one point clarified. In the interpretation clause "motor vehicle" means "a vehicle, tractor or mobile machine driven or propelled . . ." In this amendment the words are "A self-propelled farm implement may be driven . . ." Do the words "mobile machine driven or propelled" come within the meaning of the words

"self-propelled farm implement?" How does this relate to clause 103?

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

After "bulk" in subclause (4) to insert "and a wheat elevator."

If honourable members will look at subclause (4) they will see that:—

In this subsection "farm implement" means an implement or machine for ploughing, cultivating, clearing or rolling land, sowing seed, spreading fertilizer, harvesting crops, spraying, chaffcutting, or other like operations and includes a trailer bin constructed for attachment to harvester for the purpose of collecting grain in bulk, but does not include any other vehicle wholly or mainly constructed for the carriage of goods.

Honourable members will see that, by reason of changed circumstances and the fact that we now have bulk handling, it is necessary to revise this definition.

Mr. QUIRKE—There are elevators for all sorts of purposes, not only for wheat but for baled hay and for grain. Some are used in front of the truck and some are fixed on the side of the vehicle. Would not the word "elevator" alone be sufficient?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It has been held that a wheat elevator is not used for harvesting crops. That is the only reason the word "wheat" is included. However, I think the honourable member has made a useful suggestion, that we should not tie it down to wheat. Therefore, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I now move—

After "bulk" in subclause (4) to insert "and a grain elevator."

Mr. HEASLIP—"Grain elevator" still does not cover the position. Elevators can be used for grain and for baled hay. The word "grain" would indicate that that type of elevator could be part of a farm implement, whereas the word "elevator" by itself would cover the two. Also, many farmers have welding plants mounted on wheels behind tractors. It would be just as essential to include in the clause a definition of "welding plant" too.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 and 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Permits to use vehicles without registration between farm blocks."

Mr. STOTT—I move to insert the following new subclause:—

(1a) The Registrar may at his discretion without fee grant to any primary producer a permit to tow by means of a registered tractor an unregistered trailer owned by him and for transporting goods the produce of the land of the primary producer from that land to any place not more than fifteen miles from such land for the purpose of the packing, processing, delivery to a carrier, or sale of such goods.

It is necessary for me to go back to last night when there was some misunderstanding about my previous amendment which the Treasurer said was moved in the wrong place. My advice was that it was moved in the correct place, but now in this clause its intention is different. It now means that a person must apply for and secure a permit from the Registrar before he can tow a trailer behind a registered tractor. The point is that the tractor would be registered, and it cannot be registered unless it is covered by third party insurance. With a permit, a farmer will be able to attach a small trailer to a registered tractor for the purpose of going up to 15 miles to a fruit-packing shed for the processing of his goods. There is no danger in that. The tractor is covered by insurance, and if he meets with an accident, everything is well covered. Many orchardists have three, four, or more small trailers, which are loaded with cases of fruit and taken to the packing shed by the tractor. At Moorook, Kingston and, to a lesser degree, Loxton, registered tractors are used to go to the railway station to pick up goods. All that the amendment does is to allow an orchardist to apply to the Registrar for a permit, which could be refused. There will be no harm in allowing the towing of a trailer behind a tractor that is insured. I spoke to the legal adviser of the Motor Vehicles Department and he said my suggestion would be all right provided that it was carried out under a permit system, and the Parliamentary Draftsman also said that it would be all right.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Under clause 5 "motor vehicle" means, among other things, a trailer. Wherever the word "trailer" appears in the Bill it will have to comply with all the provisions dealing with a motor vehicle. Honourable members should also look at clause 35, which provides that the registration fee for a motor tractor shall be one-quarter of the prescribed rates. Under it a primary producer is permitted to transport his produce to the nearest railway station or to a port if that is nearer. The honour-

able member mentioned little trailers, but his definition does not mention that. Such trailers could be used to cart wheat all over the place by a tractor registered at quarter rates. The trailer would be unregistered and uninsured. The honourable member said that the Registrar would have authority to grant or refuse a permit, but with such a permissive clause the Registrar would feel obliged to grant a permit unless there was something in doubt, as, for instance, whether it was a primary producer's vehicle or some other condition of the clause had not been complied with. If he did not grant a permit he would immediately come up against the criticism of honourable members that he had been given permission to grant permits under these conditions but had not carried out the wishes of the House. This amendment is far too wide. We have provided extremely generous concessions to primary producers under this legislation.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It could almost be called the Primary Producers' Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I remind the honourable member that clause 103 says that, "A person shall not drive a motor vehicle . . ." and that "motor vehicle" includes a trailer unless it is insured. I ask the Committee not to accept this amendment, which I think goes much too far. It would put many large trailers upon our roads that would not be paying any contribution towards the upkeep of the roads. The only contribution would be one-quarter of the normal tractor registration fee. The amendment would result in harm being done to the roads and in very unfair competition to people making their living by carting crops.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Permits for unregistered biddies."

Mr. STOTT—This clause allows the Registrar to grant to any person without fee a written permit authorizing him to draw unregistered biddies on roads by means of registered and insured motor vehicles. What is the difference between these biddies and the vehicles mentioned in the amendment I moved a few minutes ago?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—These vehicles are used only upon the wharves for the removal of commodities thereon. Technically, they cross over a road, but in actual fact they are never used away from the wharves.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—"Registration without fee."

Mr. SHANNON—I move—

After "water" in paragraph (*i*) to insert "or the conservation or damming of water."

Such a provision existed in the old Act, particularly in relation to the construction of dams. I believe the wording I have suggested is a little different from that in the Act, but it covers the point. It should be the duty of Parliament to encourage the conservation of water wherever possible. This amendment would provide for the appropriate machinery to be registered without fee where it was engaged in clearing drains and constructing drains to take water to the dam.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I hope this amenment will not be accepted. I would not object to an amendment that dealt with plant used exclusively for the conservation of water but under this amendment any motor lorry could claim freedom from registration merely because it carried a few loads of material to dam up a creek. It is far too wide, and I hope the Committee will not accept it. Any motor vehicle under one guise or another could undoubtedly qualify. If the amendment referred to plant or equipment designed solely for use in the conservation of water I would not object to it, but the wording of the amendment is far too wide.

Mr. Shannon—Can the Treasurer tell me how a boring plant is carried to the site?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Registrar either inspects the boring plant or requires a certified picture of it to satisfy himself it is a boring plant. If any member went to any water conservation scheme he would see motor lorries and every other sort of equipment being used, and if the amendment were carried it would mean that any modern implement used for earth moving would be free from registration under this clause. Perhaps the honourable member would have another look at the definition; I suggest we pass the clause now, and if he brings along a more satisfactory definition I shall be quite happy to recommit the clause later if he so desires.

Mr. SHANNON—The suggested provision was included in the old Act, and I consider it should be included in this Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A bulldozer could be used for damming water and for a hundred other purposes. Any plant could be exempted under this amendment because it need not be solely used for the

purpose. The amendment is too wide. I suggest that the clause be accepted and that if the honourable member later has an amendment to limit the exemption to plant used solely for the purpose I shall be happy to recommit the Bill.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not see why we should go to that trouble because surely we can tidy the amendment up and restrict it now. Before 1945 dam-sinking plants were not exempt, but in 1945 I was successful in having such plant exempted. This has been particularly important in my electorate and in other far-flung parts of the State where a number of these plants move long distances on station tracks that are classified as roads. If they have to be registered a heavy burden will be placed on the unfortunate primary producers who depend on the owners of these plants not only for excavating new dams, but for cleaning old ones and for keeping drains repaired.

Mr. SHANNON—If members study the original Act they will understand what I am attempting to achieve by this amendment. It provides that the Registrar may issue permits in respect of mobile machinery and plant used for excavating and cleaning dams. I think the Treasurer is unduly apprehensive because the Registrar will have a discretion.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—There is no discretion whatever.

Mr. SHANNON—I did not realize that. Why has the discretion been eliminated? This becomes stranger. Under the original Act the Registrar had discretion and I think that is a proper way in which to grant permits. What I seek to achieve is important to the man in the outback who must rely on dams for water.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I would be prepared to accept the old definition relating to mobile machinery and plant used for excavating and cleaning dams, but would suggest that the word "solely" be included, because that would exclude the possible dangers I foresee.

Mr. SHANNON—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. SHANNON—I move—

In paragraph (i) after "water" to insert "or of mobile machinery and plant used solely for excavating and cleaning dams."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Frequently a motor car with a caravan attached is taken to the site where such operations are performed. How will this amendment affect that position? Will such a vehicle and caravan come within the definition of "plant and machinery"?

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 32 to 36 passed.

Clause 37—"Registration fees for dam-sinking machinery."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Because we have provided for free registration in this respect in another clause, this clause should be negatived.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 38 to 54 passed.

Clause 55—"Cancellation of registration and refunds."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In subclause (3) "fourteen days" is mentioned. Why has there been a change from the "twenty-one days" mention in the principal Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In this matter there has been another change, and the obligation is now on the other party, who would know the position earlier.

Clause passed.

Clauses 56 to 81 passed.

Clause 82—"Restricted driver's licences."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

In subclause (3) to strike out "to grant him" and to insert "to the applicant" after "licence."

This is the only place in the Bill where the term "grant" is used. The normal term is "issue or renew." There is no difference in substance; the amendment is moved only for the sake of uniformity.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 83—"Power to refuse licence to convicted and unfit persons."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—As far as I can see, this clause brings a new principle into our law. It allows the Minister to refuse a licence to a person who has been convicted for offences for which, presumably, he has already been punished. This may be a good provision, although I am not convinced that it is. However, as it is a new principle, I should like an explanation from the Treasurer before I am prepared to accept it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not know where the honourable member got the idea that there is nothing like this in the Act. This power has been in the Act for years and I have exercised it on occasions against people continually convicted of driving while under the influence of liquor. It has

been a beneficial provision. Obviously, it would not be exercised arbitrarily, and no Minister would exercise it without having the strongest grounds. If the person concerned applies for a licence, sometimes it is approved. There has been no public complaint about this provision.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I accept the Treasurer's assurance, but I hope he is not confusing this with the indefinite suspension provision exercised by the courts.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, that is a different provision.

Clause passed.

Clauses 84 to 93 passed.

Clause 94—"Notice of disqualification of drivers and suspension of licences."

Mr. KING—What steps can be taken by a person disqualified from holding a licence if he can show reasonable cause for having the term of suspension reduced? People serving long terms of imprisonment can obtain a remission for good conduct; could such a principle be used in this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—From the point of view of administration, this clause is clear. There is no power for the Executive to alter any suspension; that can be done only by a court of appeal. It would involve showing that the conviction was proper, because the provisions of clause 103 are very definite. The only way that a suspension could be lifted would be by showing that the original conviction was not a proper one.

Clause passed.

Clauses 95 to 97 passed.

Clause 98—"Duty to produce licence at court."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—This provision is not, I believe, in the old Act. It obliges a driver charged with an offence to produce his licence to the court at the time of the hearing of the charge. I presume this is a development of old section 67 (1), but the present position is that, if the police intend to ask the magistrate for the suspension of a defendant's licence upon conviction, the defendant before the hearing is served with a special notice requiring him to bring his licence along. He does not have to produce his licence in every case when charged with an offence. That is a more desirable procedure than the proposed one because on minor traffic charges a defendant often appears not in person but by solicitor. If he appears by solicitor it may be that the solicitor can produce the licence for him. Frequently, however, the defendant neither appears himself nor is represented by a solicitor, and the case is heard *ex parte*—that is, in his absence. He is convicted and fined, if the offence is proved, without his going near the court.

If we pass this clause, it will mean that he will be committing another offence if he does not manage to produce his licence to the court at the time of the hearing. It cannot be that the police are afraid that they have no power to see licences because clause 97 empowers the police to require the production of a licence either upon request or within 48 hours. I may be wrong here, too, but I do not think so. This clause 98 seems to be a new and undesirable departure. Why has it been inserted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Sir Edgar Bean has gone through this legislation and consolidated the Act and brought it up to date. There has been no direction from the Government for any alteration. In fact, the alteration, if there is any, is so minute that it would escape the eye of anyone except the member for Mitcham. It is an entirely proper provision that a person should be asked to produce his licence in court. I notice under the clause that, if he does not produce his licence,

it shall be a defence to a charge under this section to prove that the defendant has a reasonable excuse for not producing the licence.

So there is a defence provided for him. Previously, he was compelled to produce the licence.

Mr. Millhouse—No, only on request.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—But the request was always made, which amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Obviously I have not made my point clear. It is that many defendants do not bother to go to court on the hearing of a charge, and they are not represented by a solicitor. There is no reason why they should go to court unless they want to. I find it hard to read much meaning into subclause (2) but, by passing this clause, we should be making it obligatory on a defendant in every case to go to court on the hearing of a charge.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It would be a reasonable excuse if he did not have a licence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not want to be sidetracked too much, but in this clause we are obliging all defendants to go to court whereas at present they are not obliged to attend or

to be represented. At present, the police can go ahead, prove the service of the summons, and then prove the commission of the offence. The man charged is convicted and fined and subsequently he is notified of the fine and has to pay. But that procedure will now be different, and everybody will have to go to court to produce his licence.

Mr. Coumbe—Can a man produce his licence beforehand?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. When an alleged offence is detected the police always ask for the licence to be produced, and it must be produced, if not at once, within 48 hours. That happens before the hearing of the case when an alleged offence is reported. But here we are obliging every defendant to go to court whether or not he wants to, simply to bring his licence for no purpose at all.

Mr. JENKINS—I cannot agree with the member for Mitcham. He said that a charged person must come to the court to produce his licence.

Mr. Millhouse—He must.

Mr. JENKINS—Not necessarily. I have been sitting on a bench on several occasions when a party has not been represented by a solicitor and has not appeared himself, but he has sent a letter to the court, to be presented to the magistrate or justice, in which he has stated the facts. He can enclose his driving licence if he wishes to.

Mr. Millhouse—But what if he does not want to write a letter?

Mr. JENKINS—He does not need to appear; he can send his licence in the letter explaining his case.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Committee is at a deadlock on this amendment. Many people charged with minor traffic offences go to their member and ask what they should do. We may say, "To save a day's wages, write into the court." The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) says that a licence can be enclosed with the letter, but of course then the defendant lays himself open because on that very day he may be asked to produce his licence within 48 hours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

To strike out "shall" after "vehicles" and to insert in lieu thereof "may be required to."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 99 to 102 passed.

Clause 103—"Duty to insure against third party risks."

Mr. SHANNON—I move—

In subclause (1) before "disqualification" to insert "(except where the motor vehicle concerned was a motor vehicle of any of the classes specified in section 12 and was being driven for any of the purposes and under the conditions described in that section)."

This will affect a section of people who now have to take out third party insurance on tractors and will give the court an opportunity to impose a fine of less than £20 for a first offence, and order disqualification for a period of less than three months. It could be for a day or a week, or whatever period was warranted in the opinion of the court. The position could occur of an employee taking an uninsured tractor on the road for purposes connected with farm operations when the owner was absent. Why should he lose his driver's licence and seriously embarrass his employer, who would lose his services as a driver? Such an offence would not warrant delicensing, certainly not for a first offence, and in most cases it should never apply. I want to water down the penalties provided in section 12.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As I read the amendment, a person convicted under this clause would not be disqualified. The suggestion that the magistrate should have power to reduce the penalty is not a valid one because he is expressly instructed not to reduce it excepting in exceptional circumstances. This provision has a long history behind it, and I have yet to find a case where a magistrate has found exceptional circumstances which warranted his reducing the penalty for a person driving an uninsured vehicle. If the honourable member can tell me of any case where a magistrate should exercise that discretion, I should be pleased.

Mr. Shannon—I just gave one where an employee drove an uninsured tractor while his employer was away.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That would not be accepted by the court as a case where the fine should be reduced. Take, for instance, a person driving on a road in parts of the district represented by the Leader of the Opposition, where an uninsured vehicle would not be driven over the roads perhaps once in 20 years, and yet the driver would be guilty of an offence. He might not be detected, but actually he would be committing an offence. I would have thought that the penalty of £20 for merely crossing a back road from one part of a farm to another,

without the magistrate having any discretion to reduce it for a first offence, was too heavy a penalty. Incidentally, we are creating a new offence, something which up to now has not been an offence. I think the penalty is far too heavy, but I suggest the honourable member's amendment does not do what he intends. It covers disqualification, but it certainly does not cover any alleviation of the fine. The magistrate has no option; he must, for the first offence, provide a fine of, speaking from memory, £20.

Mr. Millhouse—What does the proviso in new subsection (2) mean?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have never seen that proviso in subsection (2) effectively used. I have seen some cases where what look to be justifiable causes were cited. I believe the honourable member may have—and I hope he has—a slight alteration to his amendment to make it clear that in the first instance the magistrate would have some discretion regarding the fine.

Mr. SHANNON—This is not an easy question to resolve quickly. It would appear to me that this clause, under which the court may in special circumstances reduce the fine to less than £20 and the period of disqualification to a period of less than three months, could and perhaps should be linked up with clause 12, which would draw the attention of the court to the fact that in the opinion of Parliament the penalties in this matter should not be so harsh as they are in other matters. No suitable wording has yet been provided to link this matter with clause 12, but I think we could link that up. If necessary, the Treasurer could recommit the clause.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 104 to 112 passed.

Clause 113—"Liability of insurer when judgment obtained against insured."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I move—

In subclause (2) to strike out "insurer" and to insert in lieu thereof "insured person."

This is to correct a typographical error.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 114 and 115 passed.

Clause 116—"Claim against nominal defendant where vehicle not identified."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—My colleague, the member for Norwood, has an amendment to this clause, but unfortunately he is indisposed and unable to be present tonight. It is rather a complicated amendment, and I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the member for Norwood, so I suggest we pass the clause on the understanding that the Treasurer will recommit it in order that it may be discussed on the member for Norwood's return.

Clause passed.

Clauses 117 to 121 passed.

Clause 122—"Notice of accident or claim."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The member for Norwood has an amendment to this clause also, and here again I suggest we pass the clause on the understanding that it will be recommitted to enable discussion on the amendment on the member for Norwood's return.

Clause passed.

Clauses 123 to 133 passed.

Clause 134—"Duty to notify change of address."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Under this clause it is the duty of the owner of a motor vehicle to notify the Registrar within 14 days of a change of address. I suggest that we should also provide that he notify the third party insurer, which would be a great convenience to insurance companies.

Mr. Quirke—What about the penalty?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—If the Committee desires the penalty could be altered as well, but this would be a convenience and I submit it for consideration.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I hope members do not accept this suggestion. So far as the insurance companies are concerned, their liability is not altered one iota whatever the owner's address. Immediately the owner has an accident he must report to the police and, according to his insurance policy, he is obliged to notify the insurance company. What does it matter to the insurance company whether a man lives at 5 Smith Street, or 7 Brown Street?

Mr. Millhouse—What about when the company sends out the renewal notice?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If it is sent to the old address it would be forwarded by the postal authorities, but in any event a man cannot have his registration effected unless he is insured. The suggestion is not reasonable, particularly as the penalty applies to failure to comply with the clause.

Clause passed.

Clauses 135 to 143 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 26, at 2 p.m.