

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Thursday, July 30, 1964.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****TONSLEY PARK SPUR LINE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: An article in this morning's *Advertiser* stated that the proposed Tonsley Park spur line would be commenced soon. I understand that at one time provision was made for this line to be extended beyond Tonsley Park for passenger services. Can the Premier say whether that scheme will be implemented now or whether it is likely to be proceeded with in the future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There are two matters involved in this that were not fully covered in the press report: the matter the Leader has raised and another matter about which I am not sure what arrangement the Railways Commissioner is making. It is not proposed at this stage to take the line beyond the Chrysler factory at Tonsley Park. I believe that the original plan contained a provision for two passenger stations on the spur line. I think the Commissioner is going ahead with this arrangement, but I am not certain of the position.

**LICENSING.**

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Premier say when it is expected to have effect given to the new provisions of the Licensing Act providing for the serving of alcoholic beverages with light meals in hotels after six o'clock?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. Quite frankly, I would have expected that provision to be in operation before now. I know that the Hotels Association has been negotiating with the licensing authorities, but those authorities are most anxious that this proposal should not operate in a way that would give offence to anybody or constitute any abuse of the law. I fancy that the delay has arisen because of their desire to see that everything will be done in a way that this House would desire. I believe that there have been conferences and that a considerable amount of work has been done in framing the necessary regulations. I will see if I can get a report for the honourable member.

**EMERGENCY HOUSEKEEPING SERVICES.**

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Premier say whether for some years the Commonwealth

Government has made available to State Governments an annual grant of about £15,000 for emergency housekeeping services? Is the South Australian Government the only Government that does not receive the benefit of this grant? If this is so, why does the Government refuse to accept its *pro rata* share of this grant for the benefit of the people needing this important social service?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have to get a report on this matter for the honourable member. I believe that the Commonwealth Government has some such scheme in operation and that it was commenced after two organizations had started doing the work here. I think there was some difficulty about accepting the Commonwealth proposal. However, I will obtain a report and inform the House in due course.

**FENCING WIRE.**

Mr. HARDING: I wish to repeat a question that I asked the Minister of Agriculture late last session. My question is prompted by the poor galvanizing of wire. I understand that American aluminium-coated fencing wire with a life of 50 years or more can be obtained at a cost of about 10 per cent more than that of galvanized wire. Is the Minister aware of this, and will he inquire of the manufacturers of the wire what advantages, if any, it has over the standard galvanized wire?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a report from the Senior Agronomist at the Department of Agriculture that was prepared in answer to the honourable member's question of November last. I do not know whether the position has changed greatly since then, but I will read the report. It states:

Aluminium-coated fencing wire does not appear to be available in Australia. It would have to be specially imported. Aluminium-coated wire is said to have a normal life of 50 years or more. It costs 10 per cent more than ordinary coated wire in the United States of America and is used mainly in districts in which corrosion of fencing wire is a serious problem. Australian fencing wires are coated with zinc, which varies in thickness according to the method and grade of galvanizing. The ordinary wire used is coated with zinc of a wiped galvanizing grade. A full galvanizing quality wire, which has much greater resistance to corrosion than the ordinary wiped grade wire, is available at a cost 20 per cent more than the same wire in the wiped grade of galvanizing. According to the pamphlet *Farm Fence Construction* issued in 1961-62 by the Victorian Department of Agriculture, the life average of wiped galvanizing grade plain wire in Australia varies from 30 years for 12½-gauge high tensile wire to 50 years or more for 8, 9 and 10-gauge standard wire.

Full galvanizing quality grades of plain wire are shown as having a life of 110 years or more. Barbed wire life average for wiped grade wires is shown as 20 to 30 years with an expectation of 90 years in the case of the full galvanizing quality grades. Near the sea coast, and in other places where corrosion occurs, the life of all grades of wire would be much less, but the relative advantage in life of the full galvanizing quality wires would be maintained. The information available suggests that full galvanizing quality wire offers most, perhaps all, of the advantages which might be expected from aluminium-coated wire.

#### GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: My question deals with the standardization work taking place on the line between Cockburn and Port Pirie. Several surveys have been carried out this year by the Commonwealth Government between Cockburn and Broken Hill, and it was anticipated that the Commonwealth Government might take over the line between Cockburn and Broken Hill from the Silverton Tramway Company. Has the Premier received any word from the Commonwealth authorities about whether this line, which is at present operated by the Silverton Tramway Company, is to be taken over by the Commonwealth Government and, if it is, whether it will be handed to the South Australian Government?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Two questions are involved: first, whether the new line will be on the same route as the existing line; secondly, how the line will be owned and controlled when it is altered to standard gauge. The first question, of course, has some bearing on the second. The standardization agreement, which was signed many years ago and ratified by both Parliaments, provided then that the line would be purchased from the Silverton Tramway Company, but that it would be standardized and handed over to South Australia and be owned and run by the South Australian Government. That was the original agreement. Since that time we have seen much water flow under the bridge, and problems about the enforcement of the original agreement have arisen. In fact, the High Court decision made it quite clear that the agreement as such could be carried out only with the concurrence of both parties from time to time. The present position is that the State Government, acting under authority from the New South Wales Government and with the concurrence of the Commonwealth Government, is surveying from Cockburn to Broken Hill to see whether there is an alternative shorter route than that at present

being used. That survey is now taking place. It has not been completed and I cannot tell the honourable member yet whether it is even likely to succeed in establishing a desirable shorter route.

In the meantime, we have had some discussions with the Commonwealth Government, and discussions between the Commonwealth Government and the company and between the Commonwealth Government and the State of New South Wales have also taken place. My surmise (and it is only a surmise) is that the Commonwealth Government will either purchase, or subsidize the Silverton Tramway Company for the loss of, its assets, and that the State of South Australia will have the line from Cockburn to Broken Hill handed over to it for its ownership and control. On one occasion the Commonwealth Government asked me what I thought would be a fair financial adjustment between the Commonwealth and the State in this matter, and I expressed the view, which appeared to be accepted, that the State Government should not be involved in any expenditure for the present Silverton Tramway Company's assets (in other words, we would not be up for compensation for the acquisition of the Silverton tramway) but that it should pay its fair share of the costs of standardization in accordance with the original agreement, which was in fact vague in its meaning. That would mean that the Commonwealth Government would provide the money, the State would do the work, and the State would be responsible for the debt charge of one-third of the cost of the new works. The matter is being delayed largely on the question of an alternative route. When that information is available, I am sure the project will proceed quickly, because discussions have already taken place with the various authorities and substantial agreement has been reached.

#### SHEPHERDS HILL ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 10, I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, about the refusal of the Minister of Roads to supply certain information to the Blackwood Progress Association concerning the repair and maintenance of Shepherds Hill Road. I asked the Minister if he would request his colleague to reconsider his decision. I understand that so far the progress association has not received a reply. Can the Minister of Works say whether his colleague has reconsidered his decision and, if he has, will the information be given direct to the association or in answer to my question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When I answered the honourable member's question earlier this session I said that this was a problem for the Minister because he was dealing with the Mitcham council on the one hand and with his own department on the other, and that he could not give information to the progress association until he had completed negotiations with the Mitcham council. I do not know whether that has been done, but I will ask the Minister to inform me on that point. I think the important thing is for the honourable member's constituents to know what programme is being considered for the reconstruction and maintenance of the road. I will ask my colleague for a report.

#### PORT PIRIE AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Premier obtain a report from the Minister of Mines about the department's survey on air pollution at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

#### TORRENS RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works obtain information from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, about bridges across the Torrens River? It has been reported that Hackney bridge is being redesigned. Will the Minister ascertain how far these plans have progressed and when it is expected the work will commence? Will he also ask his colleague what progress is being made under the recently enacted legislation on the building of the Morphett Street bridge, which is being controlled by the Adelaide City Council?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask my colleague for a report.

#### ANZAC HIGHWAY.

Mr. LAWN: I noticed in the press this week that the median strip on the Anzac Highway is to be dug up and the trees replanted. The article stated that delay in the work was being caused by the need for investigations into future lighting of the highway. For years I have been concerned that when driving along the Anzac Highway at night in the lane nearest the median strip it is impossible to see the kerbing of the strip and the driver has to judge how far he is from it. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads whether, in the redesigning, consideration can be given to the lighting of the kerb (phosphorous paint could be the answer) along the median strip?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understand there is a particular arrangement existing as to the cost of lighting on Anzac Highway.

I am not sure what that arrangement is, but I will direct the honourable member's request to the Minister of Roads and obtain a report.

#### WAROOKA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked him recently in respect of water supplies west of Warooka?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief states:

A detailed search for underground water on lower Yorke Peninsula by the Department of Mines has revealed that supplies of good quality ground water occur as relatively small isolated basins of shallow depth. The most promising of these water-bearing areas is in the hundred of Carribie where test bores have indicated the existence of a small basin. The Director of Mines has advised that from the results of the pump testing on individual bores, which has been carried out for a relatively short period, it is expected that adequate development yields of up to 30,000 g.p.h. of good quality water could be obtained. The purpose of the investigation was to ascertain whether sufficient quantities of good quality water could be obtained to augment the present Yorke Peninsula scheme to allow extensions of mains to farmlands in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula where applications have been received for a reticulated supply of water.

The basin in the hundred of Carribie is approximately 30 miles from the farming area where the extensions to the Yorke Peninsula scheme are required, and to use the water for augmenting the Yorke Peninsula scheme would necessitate a very large expenditure. The Department of Mines geologists have investigated the country in the hundreds of Moorowie and Melville, but they are of the opinion that no basins of any magnitude with good quality water exist in this area and they consider that the only possibility is the basin which they have located near the western part of the hundred of Carribie. Before any large expenditure is incurred in harnessing this supply, the quantity of water available over a lengthy period must first of all be ascertained and this will necessitate sinking pumping bores and conducting prolonged pumping tests. This is at present being looked into. An estimate of the cost will have to be prepared so that approval for the necessary expenditure can be obtained.

#### SCHOOL OVALS.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education additional information concerning the question I asked last Tuesday about his department's policy on the grassing of school grounds?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The policy is as follows:

- (a) The Government undertakes to provide the land required without cost to the school council or school committee, provided this land is already portion of the school site.

- (b) The Government agrees to meet the cost of such ground formation and grading as may be necessary and approved.
- (c) The Government agrees to meet half the cost of such installations for water reticulation and watering as may be necessary and approved.
- (d) The Government agrees to meet half the cost of such grassing of lawns and soiling of flower beds as may be approved.
- (e) The Government accepts no responsibility whatever for meeting the cost of maintenance of these grounds and facilities. Before approval is given for the payment of subsidy on the construction of grassed ovals and turfed wickets, or lawns and flower beds, an undertaking will be required that the school council or school committee concerned will maintain them without further cost to the Education Department.

#### METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: I understand that the proposition put forward by the Government some time ago concerning a metropolitan drainage authority is likely to receive the support of all the municipal councils concerned. I am particularly concerned because my district is involved rather heavily in this matter. Formerly, some domestic arrangements and commitments were made. Will the Premier inform the House how these existing commitments can be honoured and how they can generally fit into the intended scheme?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had no official report that the proposals have been accepted, although I have heard unofficially that they have been accepted generally, in principle. A number of projects were being drawn up, upon which agreement had been reached in the councils as to the contributions that should be made. I think that two of these projects have been reported upon and recommended by the Public Works Committee, one in the honourable member's district, and another probably in the district of the Deputy Leader. Such projects, where anything has been finalized or nearly finalized, will go ahead without any hindrance on the part of the new authority under the conditions agreed on. The establishment of the new authority, if it is established, will not mean that such projects will have to be reconsidered. Once they have been approved they will proceed on the conditions previously agreed on, and they will

probably be placed on the Loan Estimates this year to enable them to proceed straight away. The answer generally is that any proposals that have been formally agreed on will proceed under the old arrangement and that any new authority set up will be responsible for the new proposals.

#### SOLDIER SETTLEMENT RENTALS.

Mr. CORCORAN: Certain soldier settlers in the South-East had the rents of their blocks fixed 18 months ago. As a result, many objections were raised by the settlers, and the Minister of Lands set up a committee to investigate those objections. Following the committee's report to the Minister, I believe certain recommendations were made to the Commonwealth Government regarding these rents. Can the Minister say whether any notification has been received from the Commonwealth Government in this matter?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The honourable member has not hesitated to ask questions in the past, and I think he has received favourable replies. His statement is quite correct. Cabinet has approved of the scheme that has been drawn up following the protest of the soldier settlers, and that scheme has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government, but it has not yet forwarded a reply either accepting or rejecting. Such reply, however, should not be long delayed now.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Education a question about the public buildings in Mount Gambier, including a courthouse and Government offices, and I received the following reply on February 25:

The Attorney-General has informed me that the siting of the various Government buildings at Mount Gambier has been approved. Working drawings of the office block are in course of preparation and sketch plans of the courthouse for estimating purposes are being completed. Will the Minister ask the Attorney-General to indicate the progress being made on those two buildings?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

#### UNLOADING DISPUTE.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Marine is fully aware that the Harbors Board is the successful tenderer to the British Phosphate Commission for the unloading of phosphate rock at Port Adelaide. He is also probably aware that today there is a complete stoppage on the Port Adelaide waterfront owing to certain obnoxious conditions relating to the unloading of this cargo on a particular ship. The Phosphate Commission, as owner of the cargo, has agreed

voluntarily to pay a rate above the normal rate for the handling of obnoxious cargo. I have been told that the Public Service Commissioner's Department was going to refer this matter to the Minister for consideration. Has the matter been referred to him? If so, has a decision been made, and why is the Harbors Board not prepared to pay the increased rate that has been voluntarily agreed on by the owners of the cargo?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter came under my notice, not that of the Minister of Marine. It was reported to me that the phosphate ship had been declared black and that a serious industrial dispute was occurring. I inquired whether there was any default by the Harbors Board or any other State authority in giving effect to any Commonwealth award, and I was informed that Commonwealth award conditions were being closely followed. I was also informed that in some ports the Phosphate Commission did pay rates in excess of those in the Commonwealth award. In these circumstances, if the waterside workers at Port Adelaide are dissatisfied and believe the award is not correct they should apply to the appropriate Commonwealth authority for a variation of the award. If honourable members look at the conditions under which the State Budget is approved each year, and particularly the Bill that gives effect to the Budget, they will see that the Government is empowered to pay the amounts determined by any appropriate authority: Parliament does not permit the Government to pay rates in excess of those determined. These men are working under a Commonwealth award, and the Government is observing the terms of that award. It hopes that the dispute will be amicably settled. I doubt whether this dispute will benefit anyone involved, as such disputes generally benefit no-one.

Mr. RYAN: The Premier said that he inquired whether any award had been broken, and why the men concerned had not applied to the tribunal set up to hear these complaints. I think the Premier may have been misinformed to a degree. The court itself has set up certain conciliation machinery to deal with these complaints, but the South Australian Harbors Board is not part of that machinery. The British Phosphate Commission voluntarily offered to pay a rate of 3s. 2d. an hour on this particular obnoxious cargo in every port in Australia except Port Adelaide. The machinery that has been set up by the Arbitration Commission makes provision for agreements between employer and employee and encourages

that particular method. Once again, I ask the Premier why it is that the South Australian Harbors Board, as an employer, is not prepared to use the machinery set up by the Arbitration Commission for private negotiation between employer and employee, which has been requested on numerous occasions and which, in this case, is at the request of the owner?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the matter was reported to me this morning, the ships at Osborne are worked by two authorities. Some of the work is done by the waterside workers under a Commonwealth award, and other work is done by employees of the Harbors Board who are not under a Commonwealth award. I understand that the dispute arose in connection with the work being done by the waterside workers under a Commonwealth award and that the ship was declared black by the waterside workers.

Mr. Ryan: By the Trades and Labor Council.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The information I received was that the dispute occurred in connection with a Commonwealth award. I believe that information is reliable and if it is correct the reference obviously should be to a Commonwealth authority.

#### FINES FOR OVERLOADING.

Mr. CURREN: Recently there has been much publicity concerning the need for funds for road maintenance. Many fines have been imposed on heavy transports for overloading, which causes damage to the roads. Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Attorney-General how much money was collected last financial year for fines of this nature, and into which fund such money is paid?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I will ask my colleague if he can obtain the requisite information for the honourable member, and as soon as I have obtained it I will let him know.

#### POLICE RESIDENCE.

Mr. BYWATERS: Earlier this year I asked a question regarding a house in Montgomerie Avenue, Murray Bridge, formerly owned by the Police Department, and the Minister undertook to obtain a reply. Has he a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. When the honourable member asked the question the matter had not been resolved, but I can inform him now that the matter appears to have been resolved. The property he mentioned was no longer required for police purposes and was available for disposal. On May 25, approval

was given for the acceptance of an offer from a certain party to purchase this residence, and a letter is now in transit to him, informing him that his offer has been accepted. This will remove the problem the honourable member referred to and finalize the whole transaction.

#### FLINDERS GUMS.

Mr. RICHES: It has been reported to me that some of the stately gums in the waterworks reserve at Spear Creek, in the Flinders Ranges, have been ring-barked. This area is used extensively by people from Port Augusta and the surrounding districts for picnic purposes, and the gums in question are some of the most stately in the ranges. I consider that the Flinders Ranges gums rank with the best trees in the world, and this is nothing more or less than a sheer act of vandalism which should be prosecuted to the utmost if the perpetrators can be found. Although I have no reason to believe that this act has been committed by anybody associated with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, will the Minister of Works have the report investigated with a view to taking appropriate action?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will certainly inquire. It is rather sad that trees such as this that have been a century or so in growth should be despoiled in a few minutes by what appears to be an act of vandalism. Unfortunately, of course, once such a thing is done it cannot be undone. I will get an immediate report on the question and let the honourable member know what action is possible, whether any action is being taken to attempt to apprehend the people responsible, and to what extent damage has occurred. I will inform the honourable member as soon as I can get a report.

#### FIRE DANGER IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. LANGLEY: In view of the fire danger associated with children using timber frame classrooms, will the Minister of Education, as a safety measure, consider having children using such rooms instructed in regular fire drill?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Personally, I think that the allegations of fire danger are grossly exaggerated and, indeed, quite unwarranted. I have yet to learn of any dangerous situation arising owing to a fire in a prefabricated classroom during the day-time: in nearly every instance fires have occurred at night, and they have been the result of deliberate arson or vandalism. On the other hand, for some considerable time now the Education Department has taken the

precaution of having the children at schools instructed in fire precautions, and I understood that those instructions were of general application and were continuously in operation. However, if the honourable member can give me any information as to what particular school is neglecting its duties, I shall be very pleased to bring the matter before the Director of Education or the appropriate superintendent.

#### EGG MARKETING.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am very much interested in the question of a rationalization plan for the egg industry. This is a subject on which many questions have been asked in this House in the last year or so. Yesterday I listened attentively to a reply given by the Minister of Agriculture to a question asked by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), who sought information as to when a poll might be held regarding the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan. The reply given by the Minister gave me certain impressions, which impressions are not borne out in the reports I read in today's press. Will the Minister amplify the remarks he made yesterday and also comment on whether the report in the newspaper is as he expressed himself in the House?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The report is not as I intended it. Possibly I did not make myself clear enough. I thought at the time that it was understood that the Government intended to hold a poll on the question of the C.E.M.A. plan, irrespective of the details as to who would be affected by the plan. The Government proposes to hold a poll of those producers who will be called upon to pay a tax under the plan. What I thought was impracticable (and I still think so) was that so many small producers should be involved. I have written to the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities suggesting that it lift the minimum number of birds from 20 to 100, so that the very small producer then will not be asked to pay the tax nor will we have to go to the trouble of preparing this very large roll of names. The intention is to hold a poll upon the scheme when these questions have been decided.

Another matter mentioned in the report, although perhaps it is not quite so important, does not seem to be quite correct. I did say that the requirement of the scheme was that a tax would be prescribed annually. The tax itself does not have to be paid 26 times over: it will be 26 instalments adding up to the amount prescribed. I hope that that has made the position clear.

## MEMBERS' VISITS TO INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 17 last, during the debate on the Estimates, I asked the Premier whether he would ask his colleague, the Minister of Health, to arrange for members of this House and the other place to visit the various mental hospitals in South Australia, particularly Parkside, Hillcrest (as it is now known), and the Enfield Receiving House. Arrangements were made for that visit to be undertaken early this year, but it had to be cancelled because many members went to another State to play cricket and bowls, I think, and nothing further has been heard of it. Will the Premier again take up with his colleague the question of arranging a visit to these institutions by members of Parliament?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the honourable member raised this question I took it up with the Minister of Health and he informed me he would be only too happy to make the arrangements. They were made, but I understand they broke down because insufficient members were available to make the visit worth while. Since then, I believe many members have visited the institutions privately. However, if the honourable members who desire to make a visit will let me have their names I shall then take up the matter with the Minister of Health and make the necessary arrangements.

## SCHOOL BOARDING ALLOWANCE.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a more detailed reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning boarding allowances for children attending schools, both private and departmental, outside their home towns?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yesterday, when the honourable member asked whether the Government grant of £25 was available to parents of children attending private schools in the metropolitan area because no direct educational facilities were available to them in the country, I assumed that he was referring to paragraph 48 of Regulation XX made under the Education Act, which empowers the Minister to approve of the payment of a boarding allowance of £25 per annum in the case of any child in a primary grade whose family lives more than 25 miles from the nearest school or school bus route and who in the opinion of the Minister is compelled to live away from home in order to attend primary school.

As I informed him, a limited number of applications have been received this year for these allowances to be paid where children attend private schools and, when all the conditions of the regulations have been complied

with, they have been allowed. However, the honourable member has since informed me that he also desires information on the allowances payable to secondary students attending private schools in somewhat similar circumstances. Students who are compelled to live away from home in order to attend an approved secondary school are eligible for a boarding allowance under certain conditions. The allowances and qualifications are:

- (a) £75 per annum for a period of up to three years after the completion of primary schooling.
- (b) £75 per annum for Leaving students who have passed at least five Intermediate subjects in either the Public Examinations Board, technical high school or area school examinations.
- (c) £100 per annum for Leaving Honours students who hold the Leaving Certificate of the Public Examinations Board.

It is considered that a student is compelled to live away from home if he or she resides five or more miles from a departmental school, or a bus route serving a school, which provides an Intermediate course leading to matriculation, a full matriculation Leaving course or a Leaving Honours course as the case may be. In accordance with paragraph 3 subparagraph (4) of Regulation XX an approved secondary school is any departmental secondary school and any private secondary school which may be listed from time to time in the *Education Gazette* as an approved private secondary school. I might add that many, if not most, of the private secondary schools have been so approved and listed and a very large number of applications have been granted.

Mr. RICHES: At the last meeting of the Parents and Friends Association of the Port Augusta High School I was asked whether I could obtain the good offices of the Minister of Education to inquire whether boarding allowances payable to country children could be paid earlier in the year in the case of the first payment. It was stated that some families had been embarrassed because first cheques for boarding allowances had not been received until they had mounted up to about £35. It is realized that this will not be easy but, if anything could be done to break down the waiting period for the receipt of the first cheque, particularly in the case of parents making some sacrifice for their children attending teachers' training colleges, it would be a gesture much appreciated.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: If I may say so, I consider that an eminently sensible suggestion. There may be some practical difficulties in the way of implementing it but I shall be pleased to take it up with the Director of Education and the Accountant in the Education Department to see whether the request can be met, either wholly or in part.

#### PHOSPHATE ROCK.

Mr. HARDING: Last year I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning the quantity of phosphate rock known to be on the mainland. It is well known that the phosphate rock on Nauru Island is limited and my question last year drew honourable members' attention to that. I asked the Minister whether he would write to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, which he did, and he received a reply stating that it was known that there was a quantity of phosphate rock in the vicinity of Rum Jungle, but that it was not known whether it was of suitable quality. Will the Minister take up the matter again with the Minister for Primary Industry and ascertain whether known quantities of phosphate rock have yet been discovered on the mainland?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be happy to do so.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, a reply to my question of June 11 regarding the manner of appointment of justices of the peace?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: My colleague has advised me as follows:

All nominations for appointment as justice of the peace received from members of Parliament, on behalf of their constituents, are examined by the Attorney-General. If, after due consideration, the Minister proposes not to recommend certain nominations, the members concerned are notified accordingly. On the other hand, the nominations which the Minister recommends are forwarded for the approval of His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council and after acceptance the members are advised. Members will appreciate that appointees must be furnished with their oath form and book of instructions direct from the Attorney-General, so as to ensure that the oath of office is taken by each appointee.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would ask the Minister of Education to convey to his colleague, the Attorney-General, my sincere thanks for going to such trouble to prepare an answer—which everybody knew anyway. I would also ask the Minister to remind his colleague that the point

of my question was studiously avoided and that there is something wrong with his chronological knowledge. The rather lengthy explanation of my former question was to the effect that those who were not recommended for appointment to the Commission of the Peace had to be told this by the member of Parliament for the district after those who had been appointed had been officially advised by the Minister himself. On that occasion (I have not referred to *Hansard* on this) I also referred to the fact that I thought the Minister in this House was rather sympathetic to my views, because I had heard him complain about the same thing himself. Will the Minister refer the matter back to his colleague for a more satisfactory answer?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer to my colleague the Attorney-General the three questions of the honourable member and the eloquent speech he made in support thereof.

#### ASSESSMENT APPEALS.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked last Tuesday about appeals lodged against the betterment assessment applied to the Western Division of the South-Eastern drainage scheme?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board reports as follows:

The South-Eastern Drainage Board has arranged to commence the hearing of the appeals against the betterment rate assessment and the drainage rate assessment of the land benefited by the construction of the Western Division drains on Monday, August 17, 1964. The appeals will be conducted in the South-East, commencing at Millicent. A total of 193 appeals, involving 150 individual landholders, were received. At this stage it is difficult to estimate the length of time likely to be occupied in hearing the appeals, but the board is hopeful of completing the work within four months. It is the intention of the board to release its determination of the appeals progressively.

#### PORT PIRIE TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to a question that I discussed with him regarding progress on the Port Pirie technical school.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Since the honourable member first asked his question earlier this week, I have looked into the matter. The tenders for this work were to have closed last week but an extension of time was requested, apparently by somebody intending to tender or for some other reason. The extension was granted, so that the tenders



closed earlier this week. I can tell the honourable member now that even since I spoke to him tenders have been received. I have seen a preliminary schedule of tenders that are to be considered by the Public Buildings Department, for the Director to make a recommendation to me in the usual way. I hope that the tenders can be considered by Cabinet on Monday.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption of the Address, which Mr. Frank Walsh had moved to amend by inserting the following new paragraphs:

2a. We express regret at the failure of Your Excellency's advisers to make any reference to the upward spiral of prices and the inflationary cost of living.

2b. We desire to inform Your Excellency that in the opinion of this House, a committee of five comprising the Deputy President of the Industrial Court and Public Service Arbitrator (Judge L. H. Williams) to be Chairman, the Auditor-General (Mr. G. H. P. Jeffery), the Prices Commissioner (Mr. E. A. Murphy), one member nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, and one member nominated by the Chamber of Manufactures, should be appointed to inquire into all aspects of price increases in South Australia since July 1, 1963, and to report to this House on Tuesday, October 6.

(Continued from July 29. Page 126.)

Mr. COURCE (Torrens): I referred yesterday to certain paragraphs in His Excellency's Speech about various developmental aspects of the State's activities. Although those comments may have been brief, the comments I shall now make will be even briefer.

Paragraph 8 of the Speech mentions the near-record value of minerals throughout the State. Special reference is made to the discovery of natural gas in the far north-eastern corner of the State at Gidgealpa, which is at present being drilled by a combination of companies, some of which have a South Australian interest. This is the first discovery of a modern natural gas resource in South Australia. It has exciting possibilities, especially in a State with but meagre natural resources of its own. This could be of vast importance to this State and its people in the near future, not only financially but also in providing an alternative fuel and source of power and energy.

So far as I can gather, the discovery so far has indicated the presence of natural gas in that field of a high quality, about 1,100 British thermal units, but the quantity of

output has yet to be proved. I visited this field recently to see at first-hand what the potential was and what its likely use would be. I understand that one or two other members have done likewise. I believe that this is the most important discovery for South Australia in this connection since the initial development of the Leigh Creek coalfield some years ago. It has distinct possibilities and could have a great potential, but it must be proved. Drilling already carried out has indicated that it may be of significant value to the State. The discovery, expansion and use of natural gas in all parts of the world, particularly Canada, California and Holland—

Mr. LAWN: Why do you need more gas? You have enough on your side now!

Mr. COURCE:—indicate how important this discovery could be to the people of this State.

Mr. LAWN: Aren't you a director of the South Australian Gas Company?

Mr. COURCE: I am talking now as a member of this House and as a South Australian. I presume the member for Adelaide shares those sentiments.

Mr. LAWN: You are in the right place on that side.

Mr. SHANNON: You should tap the member for Adelaide. He is not a bad source of gas.

Mr. COURCE: The member for Adelaide is not a bad source of natural gas. For years the traditional source of energy in this State has been black or brown coal. In Australia in 1953 primary energy was derived in the proportion of 66 per cent from coal and 27 per cent from petroleum products, the balance being made up from wood and hydro-electric power. In the last 10 years the proportion derived from coal has decreased to 52 per cent and that derived from petroleum products has risen to 39 per cent, indicating the present trend away from the traditional method of energy raising. With modern advances and technological research, we are coming closer and closer to the use of other fuels, which are gaining in dominance over the old-fashioned use of coal. I am not suggesting that coal will be totally replaced; for many years it will continue to play a vital role.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How do the British thermal units of Gidgealpa gas compare with those of the gas supplied by the South Australian Gas Company?

Mr. COURCE: The comparison is 1,100 to 500. The impact of this fuel source on the State could be remarkable and could affect future planning. The reference to it in His

Excellency's Speech is, I think, an understatement. Although it is contained in one small line, it is of real significance. I know that the member for Frome, in whose district the area is contained, is watching this as avidly as I am. If this product could be piped to Adelaide at a comparative tariff, it could possibly be used at the Torrens Island power station, which is now being built, and by other large industrial users. Possibly *en route* it could be tapped to supply large industrial towns in the northern areas. I strongly suggest that this discovery requires active encouragement by the Government and all members of this House; that close liaison must be maintained between the Government departments and the drillers or promoters; that the latest developments must be watched closely; and that the Government needs to watch carefully its legislative position in dealing with this new resource. It must be handled for the benefit of the people of this State and to the advantage of the State as a whole. Everyone hopes that this project will come to fruition, and I believe that if this happens it will have a far-reaching effect on the future planning of this State, because it is the most important discovery made in this State since the Leigh Creek coalfield was developed.

Some years ago several members of this House visited the upper reaches of the Torrens River, and were shown the reaches above the Hackney bridge by a committee comprising members of the various councils whose districts adjoin the river. Members were shown the ravages of floodwaters and the neglect that had occurred in the upper reaches of the river to the detriment of the stream itself. The committee impressed on the members present its desire to improve the banks and the stream of the Torrens River. This suggestion was pursued for some years and now, following suggestions I made with the concurrence of the Torrens River Improvement Committee, the Government has agreed to set up an advisory committee to investigate and report upon the condition of the stream as it is today and on how it can be improved. The Kangaroo Creek reservoir, when completed, will deny water flowing down the river except in times of exceptional flood. The only river Adelaide has at present may dry up if it is not given some protection; it would certainly do so if there were no springs in it.

Mr. Shannon: Don't forget the Onkaparinga!

Mr. COUMBE: I am talking about Adelaide. When the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is

completed the only waters flowing into the stream, except during floods, will be one or two minor creeks in the foothills and some life-saving springs in the stream itself. At present the councils are eager to have this work done and the Government has agreed to appoint a first-rate committee. The committee's personnel indicates the importance that the Government attaches to this project. The chairman will be the Commissioner of Highways, and members will be the Engineer for Irrigation, the Town Planner, a Treasury officer and two members of councils whose areas abut on either side of the river. I understand that these members have definitely been appointed and the committee can now proceed with its investigation. This will be welcome news. However, there are many problems to be resolved, as the members for Norwood, Enfield, Burnside and Barossa know—not only the diversion of the river but the building of freeways and many other matters. The Premier, in conjunction with the Minister of Local Government, has suggested the setting up of a drainage investigation committee, which, for want of a better name, I shall call the Metropolitan Drainage Committee. The Premier invited representatives of all metropolitan councils to meet the Minister of Local Government and himself and to make suggestions regarding drainage problems in the metropolitan area. Those representatives are meeting today and will shortly return to the Premier. I understand that the aim is for the committee to co-ordinate drainage and flood-water problems in the metropolitan area so as to avoid duplication, overlapping and wastefulness through one or two councils proceeding with projects that could be much better planned jointly with other councils. At that meeting, the Government offered to contribute 50 per cent of the cost of approved schemes. This welcome move was long overdue. Problems exist in my district as well as in the district represented by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), who has something upon the Notice Paper to that effect. Only yesterday a deputation from three councils was introduced by the members for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) and Enfield (Mr. Jennings) and myself as the member for Torrens.

Mr. Loveday: Are there many districts where there are no problems?

Mr. COUMBE: I believe many metropolitan districts have such problems, and that some big problems will arise in the future.

Mr. Hutchens: Of course, the problems increase with more building.

Mr. COURCEL: Yes. For instance, in the northern suburbs of the metropolitan area, where once it did not matter how heavily rain fell because the water soaked into the fields, now it falls upon paved roads and roofs, and major drainage problems are created. If this committee comes to fruition, I think a greater co-ordination of this work can be achieved. There is another aspect that I hope will come out of this committee. At present, if a council wishes to proceed with another on a joint scheme costing, say, more than £100,000 (as happened with Henley and Grange and Woodville councils two years ago, as well as with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme) a Bill has to be introduced into this House and a reference made to the Public Works Committee. Under the present legislation this could mean a delay of 18 months or more for urgent works. In the meantime, the work is not being done, and if it misses the time for the money to be placed upon the Estimates it is just too bad. The work is not done. I am not trying to avoid references to the Public Works Committee—and I am speaking as a member of that committee now—but I hope that out of this suggested committee will come some suggestion whereby different legislation can be introduced this session to cater for the rather anomalous position that has arisen, which in urgent cases causes real hardship and delay. I hope we shall hear from the Government before very long what its policy will be on this matter. I should like to hear the Premier say, following the final meeting that he will have with the representatives of local government, just what the Government intends to do about this bottleneck.

I mentioned a committee that had been set up by the Government to investigate the Torrens River. I suggest that another similar committee could be established to investigate the future of the Islington sewage farm, about which the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) and I in particular have been concerned. The sewage farm, as we all know, will go out of use before many years. We believe that provision should be made now for its future. At the deputation introduced to the Minister of Roads yesterday, it was pointed out that councils in that area were faced with the problem of getting floodwaters through the sewage farm. Last session I suggested that an expert committee of Government officers be established to plan for the future of that farm. I realize that probably the eastern part will be required by the Railways Commissioner for yards when standardization demands it. We know that certain

areas are required by the Highways Department, as well as by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, most of the remainder on the western side should be available not only for housing, factories and plenty of recreation areas but for such purposes as education. Now is the time to plan these things.

Surely the Railways, Highways, Engineering and Water Supply, and Education Departments know just how much area they require, and can say so! This is a remarkable piece of land; it is three or four miles from the G.P.O., it contains hundreds of acres, and it is the last piece of land of its kind available so close to the G.P.O. It is right on the railway line and abuts roads leading to Port Adelaide, Adelaide and northern suburbs. It is ideal for industry and there is plenty of room for fringe housing, recreation facilities and educational purposes. I should like to hear the Minister say why it cannot be planned. When I asked the Minister this question and suggested this committee to him he said it could not be done, but gave no reasons. I should like him to say straight out why it cannot be done. I should like to hear reasons why such a committee could not be set up to plan this area now before it is too late, because I fear that the moment will arrive, before we know where we are, when this land will be ready to be cut up.

Mr. Shannon: It is Government land, surely!

Mr. COURCEL: I know it is.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You had better watch out or I shall make a wild life reserve out of it.

Mr. COURCEL: The honourable Minister had better not do that! The land is ideal for the facilities I have mentioned and now is the time to set up a committee consisting of representatives of the Railways, Highways, and Engineering and Water Supply Departments, the Town Planner, possibly local government, and the Treasury, too, if so desired. It could be planned as a well balanced scheme. I should like the Minister to say this can be done, and done now!

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): First, I join our Leader in conveying my sympathies to the families of those former members, and one other member, who passed from our midst last year, and support him in his very able speech of yesterday. The member for Torrens said that 100 Bills were passed last session and I think he claimed that as a record. Although I am not

prepared to debate whether that is so or not, it seems to me that at the end of last year, just before the adjournment, some measures were rushed through with what I will term indecent haste, and this afternoon I will talk particularly about one that bears all the marks of indecent haste. In the light of present knowledge it did not receive sufficient examination by the Government as to its impact on a very important part of the State. I refer to the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

Since that Act became law protest meetings have been held, but the interesting thing is that there seems to have been a veil of silence over the remarks of the primary producers at those meetings. I have not seen anything in the press in any great detail as to their feelings about the financial impact upon those in a particular area. The Ministers who have dealt with this subject have been fairly faithfully and lengthily reported in the press, but the detailed views of primary producers have been remarkable by their absence. This is easily seen when we turn to consult all the things said in the press regarding this matter. For example, there was a headline in the *Advertiser* recently regarding a Liberal and Country League protest against the road tax. The report stated:

The Wallaroo L.C.L. committee regards as iniquitous the ton-mile road tax which came into force yesterday.

It went on to say that this committee had submitted its resolution criticizing the road tax to the L.C.L. country convention to be held in the Liberal Club hall. From then on, however, we heard nothing more about that resolution. The *Advertiser* of July 3 stated:

State Ministers will doubtless have been rather astonished to find the Wallaroo committee of the L.C.L. describing as "iniquitous" the ton-mile tax which came into operation on Wednesday. The primary producers' committee of the L.C.L. is also asking for a discussion on this new transport charge.

Then we have recorded in the *Port Lincoln Times* a description of the meeting of the Flinders committee of the L.C.L. held at Tumbay Bay on July 6. The report states that the Hon. C. D. Rowe captivated his audience at each session, particularly with his after-dinner speech, and that in the evening he gave a clear and comprehensive explanation of the legislation. I am informed, although I do not know with what truth, that some primary producers went to this conference of the Flinders district committee of the L.C.L. determined to raise the strongest protest about this matter, but they were persuaded to hold their hand regarding their resolution until they

had heard the explanation from the Minister, which was given in the evening. But we heard nothing about the resolution being put, carried, or rejected.

Then again, we had an announcement just recently, in the *Advertiser*, that the Attorney-General had told the Australian Primary Producers Union that the Government could not agree to a request for an exemption from the ton-mile tax on heavy transport. He went on to say that by far the largest proportion of the tax under the Act would be levied against the interstate carriers, who use the largest vehicles and who do the most damage to the roads.

I shall deal at length with this subject. I think there are many things I could talk about in reference to the Governor's Speech on matters pertaining to my own district, particularly Whyalla, but I feel that this matter deserves considerable attention and, therefore, I will deal with it thoroughly. However, I believe that these protests, which appear to have been rather heavily muffled—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You didn't give the matter that much attention last year when the Bill was before the House.

Mr. Riches: We were given assurances—

Mr. Shannon: What?

Mr. Riches: —that it would not affect the primary producer.

Mr. Shannon: What are you talking about?

Mr. Jennings: You listen for a while and you'll understand.

Mr. Shannon: I have listened before to this sort of tripe.

Mr. Jennings: Well, try to understand it this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am sorry if the honourable member for Onkaparinga is rather annoyed about this matter. It seems that he is getting unduly agitated before I have given members some details that I am sure will interest them. Referring once again to the protests, which have been heavily muffled, the interesting thing is that since they have been made the Parliamentary Library volumes dealing with the corresponding Acts in the other States, and the relevant *Hansards*, have become more popular reading than *Forever Amber*.

On July 17 I attended a meeting at Port Lincoln by invitation from a joint committee of the A.P.P.U., the Wheat and Woolgrowers Association, the Port Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, and the Eyre Peninsula Carriers Association. The Minister of Works and the

Hon. G. J. Gilfillan were present, as were about 300 farmers and some carriers. Some came from as far afield as Ceduna. The Minister, Hon. G. J. Gilfillan and I were asked to make this matter in no way a Party-political one, to which we readily agreed, and the meeting was lengthy. The Minister spoke first, and went to considerable lengths to explain the full details of the Act. I followed him, and then the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan spoke. The Minister claimed that the Act was reasonable and justified. He said it did not constitute a serious burden on primary producers on Eyre Peninsula. I explained the Opposition's attitude: first, we fully supported making interstate hauliers pay adequately towards road maintenance; secondly, we accepted the Government's assurance that the 8-ton capacity limit would virtually exclude primary producers from the Act; and thirdly, we had had no complaints from primary producers' organizations as such prior to the Bill's introduction or during the debate. As members will remember, this debate took place in the two weeks immediately prior to the adjournment. There were only four speakers in this House, two from each side. In another place there were eight, one from the Opposition and seven Government members, all of whom were primary producers. Apart from a few minor matters in connection with the Bill, none of these primary producers seemed to find much wrong with it. Eyre Peninsula was mentioned by only one of them, and that was in connection with the carriage of stock from Eyre Peninsula to the market. They supported the Bill without any serious question regarding its provisions. The only objections that members in this House had to the Bill came from the Transport Association. The alternative provisions submitted by it were obviously matters relating to the Commonwealth and not to the State. During the debate on this question at Port Lincoln these matters were pointed out to the farmers and carriers present. I want to emphasize that it was a very hostile meeting, which was unanimous in its attitude. Many questions were asked and the Minister admitted that carriers carting primary produce would pass on all costs to the primary producers, and that he did not know the costs of collecting the tax in other States or the number of interstate hauliers operating in South Australia. On the other hand, the Attorney-General, speaking at Tumby Bay, is reported as saying that there were 500 interstate trucks on our roads every day.

The Minister also said that the Government's decision to introduce the legislation had been

finally determined on learning that it was proposed to cart the ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie by road, which could mean a heavy loss of revenue to the Railways Department. Representatives of the A.P.P.U. and the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers Association addressed the meeting and challenged the Minister in some of his figures and on his attitude. He had come armed with figures prepared by his officers and he mentioned the "average farmer" on Eyre Peninsula. However, the position of the "average farmer" is of little comfort to a farmer who is not average. I suggest that many farmers on Eyre Peninsula do not come within the category of the "average farmer" as described by the Minister. At the close of the meeting the following three resolutions were carried unanimously:

1. That this meeting protests against the Road Maintenance Contribution Act as it adversely affects the development of Eyre Peninsula owing to the big travelling distance involved.

2. That no tax shall be paid by any carrier not competing with the Government transport service.

3. That all primary producers be permitted to cart or have carted all produce, stock and fertilizer free of tax.

I was satisfied, after hearing the explanations given by speakers who came from various parts of Eyre Peninsula, that, in view of the longer distances involved in the delivery of grain, superphosphate, wool and stock on the peninsula itself and the delivery of stock to the Adelaide markets, and the fact that secondary roads in many instances were in a bad state of repair compared with the rest of the State, and the proportion of sealed roads being much less than in other parts of the State, the impact on Eyre Peninsula would exceed the impact on other parts of the State. On the eastern side of the peninsula large quantities of grain are delivered to silos at Cowell and Arno Bay by farmers; carriers with large vehicles covered by the Act take this grain to the Port Lincoln terminal silo. These carriers will pass the entire cost on and the Wheat Board will raise the differential cost to the farmers at the silo. I understand that this is the regular practice. I believe that the Prices Commissioner sets the formula for the Wheat Board, whereby the actual cost is passed on through the differential to the farmer at the silo. So, even if the farmer on the short haul to the silo delivers his wheat himself, he is still caught by the carrier with the heavy vehicle carting his grain from that silo to the terminal silo. I point out that the great majority of farmers on Eyre Peninsula have trucks that are not of

sufficient load capacity to come under the Act and when they cart grain they invariably use a trailer for the very good reason that they have not the time to waste making the necessary trips because of delays at the silos. To conserve manpower and time they use the trailer and thus come within the ambit of the Act.

On the western side of the Peninsula, grain from the Elliston area, and south of it, is carried by Port Lincoln contractors who have large vehicles. The producers find it is cheaper to do that rather than cart the grain 50 or 60 miles to the railway and then have it railed to Port Lincoln. North of Elliston large quantities of grain go by road or by road and rail to the Thevenard terminal silo using trucks or trucks and trailers which would be charged under the Act. Superphosphate for the whole of the area is carted from Port Lincoln, much of it by road on large vehicles exceeding 8-ton capacity.

If members looked at a map of Eyre Peninsula they would see the long distances involved and the situation of the railways in relation to the eastern and western sides, and they would notice the importance and effect of what I am saying. One farmer in the Cowell area, for example, produces 3,060 bags of grain for delivery to Port Lincoln, at least 100 miles distant. Supposing that his goods are carted by a Tumby Bay carrier who has four large trucks, two of which have a tare weight of about 11 tons with a load capacity of 15 tons. His road tax is almost 6d. a mile—5½ pence to be exact. The 3,060 bags, with 180 bags a load weighing 15 tons, would require 17 trips for a distance of 200 miles and there would be a £5 tax a trip, the total on 17 trips being £85. The cartage of 60 tons of super for the same farmer would cost £20, one load of wool £5, one load of lambs or stock £5, making the total road tax £115 a year.

A farmer who is only 30 miles from Port Lincoln grew 4,500 bags of grain last season. A large truck would cost £4,000 and would be uneconomical to keep idle for many months of the year. If he employed a carrier to take his grain to Port Lincoln, it would take 25 trips at a cost of £1 10s. tax a trip, a total of £37 10s. These calculations are on the basis of a truck carrying up to its correct load capacity, but in many instances overloading is resorted to and therefore the road tax would be less as the overload is not taken into the calculation. For example, in the case I mentioned of the 3,060 bags, with a 20 per cent overload (that is, 18 tons) the cost to the

farmer would be £71 on that long haul of 100 miles, instead of £85.

There are some interesting estimates of costs. The Tumby Bay carrier estimates that on his usual mileage haul he would pay £2,500 to £3,000 a year in tax, which he must pass on. He deals essentially with primary producers' goods. The road transport that operates from Port Pirie to Port Lincoln with a 580 miles return trip will be paying £14 10s. a trip with a similar vehicle.

At Port Lincoln a carrier operating up the western coast and elsewhere told the meeting that he estimated he would pay £10,000 a year tax on his usual mileage. He also carries for primary producers.

Mr. Harding: How many vehicles has he?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I do not know exactly, but I think he would have several. I have been informed that a firm at Port Lincoln has been advised by the Adelaide Steamship Company that an increase of 12s. a ton will be imposed because of the road tax on those vehicles using the roll-on-roll-off *Troubridge*.

Mr. Ryan: That has already been done.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Whether this statement from the company to the firm is correct (as regards this extra charge of 12s. a ton being entirely due to the road tax) is something I am not aware of. However, I am putting it to the House as a statement that has been made in reference to what has come from the Adelaide Steamship Company to this firm.

It is interesting to note that of the 18,000,000 bushels of grain grown on Eyre Peninsula it is estimated that 5,000,000 bushels, bulk and bags, goes by road. I think when we are considering this matter we should have in mind the relationship of Eyre Peninsula production to the total State production, because then we can see whether or not this particular question is important to the whole of the State. When we look at the figures, we see that the production on Eyre Peninsula represents a very important proportion of the State's total yield in wheat, barley, sheep, cattle and pigs. The production of wheat on the peninsula equals one-third of the State's production; barley equals one-quarter of the State's production; and 2,400 farmers sow 28 per cent of the State's total crop area. These figures come from an article published in the *Port Lincoln Times* by the Minister, so I think we can assume that they are correct. Sheep increased from 1,330,000 in 1947 to 2,360,000 in 1963; cattle increased from 15,086 in the period 1947-51 to 17,543 in the period 1959-63; and the

number of pigs increased at an even higher rate, from 7,403 in 1947-51 to 17,543 in 1959-63. It will be of interest to members that, although last year was a record harvest on Eyre Peninsula, the railways shifted all grain successfully before this season's seeding, except malting barley awaiting ships and milling wheat at Kimba for the Cummins mill.

I turn now to a letter which was written by the Chairman of the District Council of Franklin Harbour (Mr. H. A. Schiller) to the Minister of Agriculture, because I think the letter sets forth in very good and clear terms the impact of this legislation on Eyre Peninsula. Mr. Schiller states:

On behalf of the farmers, consumers and carriers (who will be forced to pass the charges on) in the area of the District Council of Franklin Harbour, I wish to protest against the charges to be levied from them by the Road Maintenance Act which came into force on July 1. I also emphatically protest at statements circulating in the press and elsewhere, emanating from official and Government sources, that the tax will not adversely affect the average farmer. It has been stated that most farmers' trucks will be exempt; though this is partly true, it is also misleading. In areas such as Eyre Peninsula, where long distances predominate in aspects of farm management, it is uneconomical for farmers to deliver their products to market in these smaller trucks that are useful on individual farms. They are obliged to make use of carriers who, with their large vehicles, can operate more economically and efficiently in most instances. Unfortunately, all of these carriers will become liable for ton-mile tax all the time they are on the roads. Carriers and hauliers generally claim their present profit margin is too small to enable them to do other than pass the increased costs involved in all aspects of ton-mile tax on to the consumer. The effect on this district will be as follows:

1. Cowell silo is situated 100 miles from Port Lincoln by road and depends solely on road transport to lift grain to the terminal at Port Lincoln. In addition, all barley and oats are road-freighted to the only outlet for this part of Eyre Peninsula—Port Lincoln. The extra cost is expected to be 1½d. a bushel.

If one works this out on the basis of the farmer whom I gave as an example, having 3,060 bags, the cost would be £67 to £70. I have allowed for some variation in the weight of the individual bags. Mr. Schiller's letter goes on:

2. Practically the whole of this district's superphosphate requirements, amounting to some thousands of tons annually, has to be delivered by carriers to the farmers. The ton-mile tax is going to add 5s. a ton to the cost of this.

Taking the same farmer as an example, at 5s. a ton for superphosphate it would mean a cost of £15 a year. The letter continues:

3. Further, the only outlet for livestock is by road to various markets, the extra cost of which has not been calculated yet.

It is safe to say that 80 per cent of all consumers' commodities, together with most general merchandise, is freighted into the district by road transport which will become liable for ton-mile tax. In this district there is little alternative. The only other service is a fortnightly ketch from Port Adelaide, which would not account for 20 per cent of the heavy freight and is subject to the vagaries of wind, weather and other factors. Road transport has played a tremendous part in the important job of developing Eyre Peninsula's areas which are not served by a railway line and also many that are. It is most unjust to inflict this tax on areas which have no alternative means of transport. There is very definitely a serious anomaly between districts served by the Railway, where in many cases products and produce are freighted at concessional rates, and districts such as Franklin Harbour entirely dependent on road transport through no fault of its own. This aspect should be examined thoroughly to consider how the already unjust effect is going to be increased by the ton-mile tax. The case of Franklin Harbour area is just one of many on Eyre Peninsula which, because of its long distances and high primary production, will feel the effect of the tax more than the areas closer to Adelaide and in other parts of the State. It is felt by the writer that the effect of this tax is going to be felt more by areas such as Eyre Peninsula than by the interstate hauliers whom it has been mainly designed to affect. The social structure of smaller country towns may be affected by the ton-mile tax, as increased costs will force farmers to accept the cheapest way out, possibly by using large transport firms and the like, thus depressing the business of many local carriers, and many of these give a really good service. The result could be that drivers will be put off in some cases and other adverse effects on towns noticed. The tax is in direct contradiction to the policy of decentralization from the metropolitan area, local carriers having often provided much permanent and casual employment. Its whole effect will be to push up costs, making life a little more difficult for many families, thus defeating efforts of decentralization. I am of opinion that consideration should be given to providing exemption for the carriage of all primary produce of every description grown or produced on Eyre Peninsula.

I want to pass now to some of the details regarding the Acts in other States, because I think the history of what took place in the other States should be recorded in *Hansard* so that when this matter comes up for further consideration (as I feel sure it will) these points will be on record. When one examines in *Hansard* the debate that took place in this House, one can only conclude that the information we were given by the Government was of a very scanty character. After listening to the

Minister at Port Lincoln and looking back on the debate that took place in this House and in the other place, I cannot help feeling that members were very inadequately informed on the whole question. Had they been better informed, I am certain that more consideration would have been given to this matter and possibly something different done. The Victorian Commercial Goods Vehicles Act, 1955, was the first of these Acts to obtain payment from interstate hauliers and it was based on the requirements set out by the Chief Justice of the High Court, Sir Owen Dixon, and I think it is of value to set out the statements upon which this particular piece of legislation was primarily constituted. Sir Owen Dixon made this statement:

For the purpose of that provision (section 92) it may perhaps be said with some confidence that if a charge is imposed as a real attempt to fix a reasonable recompense or compensation for the use of the highway and for a contribution to the wear and tear which the vehicle may be expected to make, it will be sustained as consistent with the freedom section 92 confers upon transportation as a form of interstate commerce. But if the charge is imposed on the interstate operation itself, then it must be made to appear that it is such an attempt. That it is so, must be evident from its nature and character. *Prima facie* it will present that appearance if it is based on the nature and extent of the use made of the roads (as, for example, if it is a mileage or ton mileage charge or the like); if the proceeds are devoted to the repair, upkeep, maintenance and depreciation of relevant highways; if interstate transportation bears no greater burden than the internal transport of the State; and if the collection of the exaction involves no substantial interference with the journey. The absence of one or all of these indicia need not necessarily prove fatal, but in the presence of them the conclusion would naturally be reached that the charge was truly compensatory.

In explaining the Bill in the Victorian Parliament, Mr. Bolte said:

However, it will be seen that the provisions of this Parliament fall within the four requirements enunciated by the Chief Justice of the High Court as follows:

1. The charge is based on the nature and extent of the use of roads being assessed on a ton-mile basis. It is less than the full charge that might properly be made for the actual wear and tear caused by the vehicles.

2. The proceeds are devoted solely to the maintenance of the highways concerned. They will be completely used for that purpose and will require to be supplemented from other sources.

3. Interstate transport will bear the like burden to intrastate transport, or rather a less burden because of freedom from licensing and permit fees.

4. The machinery for the collection of the charge is as simple as possible and involves no interference with the journey of vehicles.

The Victorian Act contains some exemptions other than the 4-ton load capacity. The first exemption in the schedule referred to the carriage of berries and other perishable products in the same way as the South Australian Act. The second part in the schedule related to the carriage of livestock and this was wider than the provision in the South Australian Act. The Victorian Act in the second section of the schedule reads:

The carriage of livestock to or from agricultural shows or exhibitions or direct from farm to market or from market to farm, or from farm to farm or to and from agistment.

The additions in the Victorian Act in this case are carriage direct from farm to market or from market to farm, and to and from agistment. They are not included in the South Australian Act. All moneys under the Victorian Act are to be paid into the Country Roads Board Fund to Special Roads Maintenance Account.

The Queensland Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Act of 1957 came next, based on Victorian experience but with no exemptions. Primary producers protested and two months later the Act was amended exempting the carriage of milk or cream, and on the return trip any empty containers used on the outward trip for the carriage of either such commodity. Local authorities, including electricity authorities, were also exempted. They had been included in the first Act. There were no other exemptions. In Queensland moneys are paid into a special Treasury account for road maintenance. The New South Wales Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act was passed in 1958 and was also based on Victorian experience. The Act was amended in 1964 to tighten up provisions concerning certain vehicles and the obligations of managers of corporate bodies. One-fifth of receipts goes into the County of Cumberland Main Roads Fund to Special Road Maintenance Account. Four-fifths goes into the Country Main Roads Fund to Special Road Maintenance Account. There are no exemptions, except the 4-ton capacity limit. Referring to the load factor of 40 per cent, Mr. Bolte said:

The figure determined as the average is well within the maximum charge that could be assessed and it is considered a fair average assessment.

A much more lengthy statement was made by the Hon. A. G. Warner, the Minister of Transport. He dealt at length with the question of how that was arrived at and, as the question of the impact upon carriers has been argued at considerable length in the press, I think the



reasons underlying the fixation of this particular matter are of considerable interest. Therefore, although Mr. Warner's statement is lengthy, I think that it should be recorded. He said:

First of all, the Government worked out how much was required to bring the roads to a certain minimum maintenance standard. Having ascertained that figure, we then calculated, by means of an engineering formula, the amount of wear attributable to each type of vehicle using the roads—light motor cars, heavy motor cars, buses, trucks, taxi-cabs, and so on. In determining the wear factor, average mileage for each vehicle and the speed of the vehicle were taken into consideration. It was then possible to assess the contribution that each vehicle should make as its share towards road maintenance. By checking trucks and cars in certain areas, the average weight of the loads carried was obtained. This information was somewhat surprising. One would expect that the average load of a vehicle would be approximately 66 per cent of its total carrying capacity, but checks established the figure at only 40 per cent. The average percentage loads varied according to the size of the vehicle. From that information, it was possible to calculate the sum of money that should be contributed for each vehicle towards road maintenance. The following figures were arrived at:

Weight of Vehicle.	Amount of Contribution. £
Up to 5 tons . . . . .	182
From 5 to 6 tons . . . . .	283
Over 6 tons . . . . .	330
Semi-trailers . . . . .	514

The annual registration fee of the particular class of truck was then deducted and they were credited with half of the petrol tax received back from the Commonwealth as that money is returned to the States for the construction of new roads and maintenance of existing roads. This figure was divided by two, and we calculated how much should be contributed, based upon fuel consumption for each class of vehicle. One of the facts that emerged from the study of the position was that the bigger a truck, the greater efficiency it has in petrol consumption per ton-mile. The possibility of raising finance by means of increasing registration fees was considered, but it would have been necessary to increase the fees only on the heavy vehicles, with the result that they would have been registered elsewhere and the State would have lost the charge against such vehicles which were causing wear and tear to the road.

Mr. Riches: Do you think that the same conditions would prevail in other States as in this State?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am not suggesting that the conditions would be the same; they probably would not be, considering the different railway systems and the distances involved. Obviously, there would be no similarity to Eyre Peninsula and many other areas

of South Australia, but these points are of considerable interest in knowing how the Victorian Government arrived at its decisions, as the other States have all based their Acts upon the decisions of the Victorian Government.

When introducing the Bill to amend the Queensland Act, the Minister for Transport in Queensland (Mr. Chalk) made some remarks about how the Victorian Act ran the gauntlet of the court. Honourable members will remember that the Victorian Act stood the challenge of the High Court, which decided by four to three in favour of that Act. Mr. Chalk had this to say on that matter:

It is true that the exemptions included in the Victorian Act ran the gauntlet in the High Court and, to a lesser extent, in the Privy Council. However, one aspect which was ventilated in the evidence before the High Court—and no doubt considered seriously by that court—was that the quantum of fees waived by virtue of the exemptions was not unreasonable in relation to the total amount expected to be realized; and furthermore there was no attempt made because of these exemptions to increase the charges to be levied on other users in order to recover from them the amount waived by the exemption. The court accepted that viewpoint.

Mr. Chalk gave an analysis of the collections in respect of the first month's operations of the Act in Queensland. As I explained earlier, in Queensland the first Act was in being for only about two months before it was amended as the result of protests by primary producers, so that he was able to give the Queensland House some figures regarding the first month's collections.

He disclosed that of a total of £45,830 only £8,225 came from interstate hauliers. It must be remembered that this is with a 4-ton load capacity exemption whereas here we have an 8-ton load capacity exemption, and we would expect the proportion to be obtained from interstate hauliers to be much higher because of that difference. He estimated the annual administration costs as being £60,000 out of a total estimated revenue of £600,000 per annum in 1957-58. Victoria and New South Wales each expected to get £3,000,000 revenue, and New South Wales estimated its administration costs at £250,000. Of the £3,000,000 revenue, New South Wales expected that about £800,000 would come from interstate hauliers. I think this shows that a large proportion of the revenue of those States, at any rate, is not coming from the people the Act is designed to catch in particular.

The Premier in his second reading explanation told us that the gross amount expected to be realized in South Australia was between £150,000 and £200,000. He gave us no estimate of the costs of collection. Of course, we recognize that the costs of collection would probably vary proportionately with the diligence with which the policing was attended to. If we policed the Act seriously and efficiently, then of course the costs of collection would rise.

Mr. Ryan: On the basis of the figures quoted by the Premier of collections from interstate hauliers in other States, what would be the percentage of collections from interstate hauliers in this State?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I think that is impossible to say at the moment, although we had an expression of opinion a few days ago by Mr. Lewis, the President of the South Australian Road Transport Association. He made a statement, as reported in the press, to the effect that in his opinion interstate hauliers would pay at least £5,250 a week. This works out at £273,000 a year.

Mr. Ryan: Which is more than the Premier anticipated.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Exactly. He estimates that from the interstate hauliers alone a sum will accrue far in excess of what the Premier estimated for the whole State. The Attorney-General was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that by far the largest proportion of the tax payable under the Act would be levied against interstate carriers. I do not know how this sort of prediction can be arrived at at this stage because, if in the other States the proportion has come about as was estimated (and on this point we have at the moment no information; it is information we should have but it has never been presented to the House), then of course the big chances are that the amount that we shall get from interstate hauliers, even with the 8-ton load capacity exemption, will be considerably less than what we get from other people in the State. That remains to be seen, but this House should have been informed of what has happened in the other States—for example, over the last three years in regard to their operations—before we were committed to this particular measure. It is interesting to note, referring to the debate in the two Houses here, that most of it occurred in the House of Review, where seven out of the eight speakers were primary producers.

Mr. Ryan: Where is the House of Review?

Mr. LOVEDAY. Has the honourable member not heard of the House of Review?

Mr. Ryan: That disappeared years ago, didn't it?

Mr. LOVEDAY: It may well have done. Summarizing, let me say emphatically that from what I have heard of Eyre Peninsula the impact is far heavier there on primary producers and other people than elsewhere in South Australia. Obviously, the heaviest impact falls on the carting of grain, particularly on the eastern and western sides of the peninsula. In fact, as Jock Halbert, who writes a column called "Laughter and Tears" in the *Port Lincoln Times*, remarks, "The tax goes against the grain."

There seems to be no reason why the same exemption regarding the carriage of stock in Victoria should not apply to the South Australian Act. As the Victorian Act stood the challenge of the High Court, surely there is no reason why those exemptions (which, if one examines the impact, are of a minor character, compared with the total impact of the tax, although, nevertheless, it is an important impact for primary producers) included in the Victorian Act should not be included in the South Australian Act. We should know far more about how this corresponding legislation has worked in the other States. This information is a "must" for this House before another debate on this matter takes place. I am sure that something will be done about amending this Act because it is so unsatisfactory for many primary producers in South Australia—far more unsatisfactory, I think, than the Government realizes. That, in itself, shows a lack of sufficient investigation of the impact of the tax. I consider that the circumstances of this Act's imposition in South Australia should draw us to the point where we should urge that all States make a concerted approach to the Commonwealth Government on this matter. If it were not for section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, this cumbersome and unwieldy legislation would not have been enacted by any State. It is obviously cumbersome and costly to police, and the main impact does not fall on the people upon whom it is supposed to fall. Surely there is a better way of doing this, and the State Governments should get together with the Commonwealth Government and decide on some sure way of obtaining from interstate hauliers the fair dues they should pay for using the roads. They are virtually escaping altogether at present, and I am sure, from the debates in both Houses, that the main objective is the interstate haulier. This should be the approach rather than to keep patching up this

unsatisfactory legislation. A way should be found whereby the impact can be placed directly on the person most concerned and on the one who should be paying his fair dues.

Mr. Shannon: Irrespective of section 92?

Mr. LOVEDAY: I am sorry the honourable member was not here when I made my earlier remarks. If he reads *Hansard* he will see what I said and learn my approach to the matter; I am not inclined to repeat my remarks at this juncture for his benefit.

Mr. Bywaters: That shows how stupid his interjection was.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This matter deserves the most careful study, particularly of the details and history of the legislation as it was introduced in other States, to enable good and firm consideration to be given to a totally different approach to this matter.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I am pleased to support the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally moved, especially as this is the last Address in Reply before the next election. In considering this motion we should, of course, record with pleasure the Government's achievements since the last election.

Mr. Ryan: Then you are going to be brief!

Mr. HALL: I congratulate the mover and seconder. This morning I read their speeches and was impressed with their remarks and with their description of the activities and resources of their districts. The references by the member for Eyre to his district gave a clear picture of the progress that has taken place on what is known as the West Coast. I had heard of these facts from conversations, but they were further impressed upon my mind after reading his speech. I was pleased to learn of the permanent improvements in production that have occurred on the West Coast. With the member for Eyre, I visited that area for the first time a few weeks ago and spent a pleasant three or four days there. Having looked at the Poldas Basin and the development that has augmented the major water supply, I am sure that everyone will be amazed at the ease with which good water can be obtained and distributed through the existing system to users on Eyre Peninsula.

The speech made by the member for Stirling was a worthy effort, and I was impressed by his association with organizations in his district, especially the Workers' Educational Association. I am sure that his experience will greatly help him advise and assist that body. I listened with pleasure to his remarks about the financial aspects of agriculture, although I cannot agree with all of

them. I am sure we will hear many interesting speeches from the honourable member. We were treated to an amazing display by the member for Whyalla, who demonstrated his usual able capacity to analyse a position.

Mr. Corcoran: It was a penetrating speech.

Mr. HALL: It was penetrating, but entirely in the wrong direction, and he was confused with details as much as we were on this side of the House. I am sure there was no other explanation for the sudden reversal of form from the Opposition than that some political advantage was seen in the introduction of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill to this State. It was pointed out by interjection that the member for Whyalla did not speak on the measure when it was before the House. He implied that members had not had time to consider it fully. I have never been deterred from speaking by any limits put on the time I have to devote to any measure, so I cannot see how the member for Whyalla can say that he had insufficient time to consider the legislation. It is interesting to note that some other members on that side of the House did speak.

Mr. Riches: The member for Whyalla was not stampeded into supporting it.

Mr. HALL: It is fortunate that other members on the other side did have the time to speak to this legislation. We are indebted to their views, as they showed the original attitude of members opposite to the primary producer, not the synthetic one of the political advantage with which we were confronted today—the one that is handed to the members of the Opposition by their masters outside this House. I am sure that the first and foremost expert on the other side of the House on all matters is the Leader of the Opposition and I am sure that that is how members of his Party regard him. He spoke on this matter, and I wrote down some of his remarks. He said that he has always expressed the view that owners of heavy transports do not wish to evade their responsibilities towards a fair share of the payment for road maintenance in this State. In another passage of this important speech he said, "I do not approve of hauliers dodging the road tax." That is a plain statement. It is coming from the Leader of the Labor Party who sits opposite, so we should easily see what is meant. In concluding his speech the Leader implied that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) was an expert on this matter: he was vitally concerned with the railway to Broken Hill and he would add

valuable information to the debate. For the information of the member for Whyalla I should like to recall some of the remarks of the member for Frome. He said that it was a mistake to introduce legislation such as this and that it could have far-reaching effects upon a large section of the community in this State. He was referring to the Railways Department, a public utility that had to be safeguarded. Further, when I asked him whether he advocated a 4-ton limit, he replied, "Definitely." I do not know whether two constructions can be placed upon the word "definitely", but that was the reply in answer to a fair question when this Road Maintenance Act was debated, without a limit upon the time for that debate. The actual answer to my question was:

Definitely, because it would conform with Eastern States' conditions and I believe wholeheartedly in Commonwealth uniformity.

Of course, we know that is in line with Labor Party policy on many matters. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) then asked a question:

Even to the disadvantage of some of your people?

The reply was:

No. It would not penalize anyone, for in the Eastern States it has worked well.

Mr. Shannon: Little does he know.

Mr. HALL: I am, of course, referring to the 4-ton limit.

Mr. Riches: How does that tie up with what the member for Whyalla said?

Mr. HALL: I should like to give the member for Stuart a little more of the information that was given last year. The member for Frome said:

The honourable member is inferring something that I have not said. The primary producer is protected under the Victorian and New South Wales legislation. Many primary producers own vehicles of less than four tons. A 4-ton truck can transport 60 bags of wheat. After all, a primary producer does not use the roads extensively. He does not travel hundreds of miles to deliver his wheat to the silo. The primary producer is entitled to protection. He has to market his goods, and the most effective way he can do so is by using the roads. The member for Frome has said that the primary producer must be protected and that he is sufficiently protected by a 4-ton limit under the Act. We went further and said it required eight tons to protect the primary producer and other users of the roads in South Australia, yet we have this synthetic proposal put to us that we have now done wrong, but we have gone twice as far as the member for Frome advocated in this House—and he is a country member!

Mr. Riches: What relation has that to anything the member for Whyalla said?

Mr. HALL: I think the member for Whyalla got into so much detail that we could relate his speech to any part of the Act. I am sure that what I am saying is wholly pertinent to whether or not this matter is a just one and whether or not we have considered the primary producer in passing this Act. The opinion, less than 12 months ago, was that this legislation went too far (in this instance expressed by both the Leader and a person nominated by the Leader as an expert), but now we are told that we have not gone far enough, all for the sake of political expedience.

Mr. Riches: They are two totally different questions. You have missed the point entirely.

Mr. HALL: I think we can leave that portion of confused Labor policy to its own contradiction.

Mr. Riches: The confusion is with you.

Mr. HALL: I am sure the primary producer knows the attitude of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) as stated in this House: that he would have increasingly heavy death duties on estates valued over £6,000.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Pull your head in!

Mr. HALL: The honourable the Leader can read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Frank Walsh: And the rest of it.

Mr. HALL: If the honourable the Leader disagrees with the attitude of the member for Norwood violently enough, no doubt we can read about it in the paper, but at least it is on record. There is no doubt at all that the primary producer knows that such an extreme policy may impinge upon him because, if the Labor Party platform is ever instituted, it will have dire effects. He also knows now whom he will support and whom he will choose to make laws affecting his livelihood.

Mr. Riches: He knows all right.

Mr. HALL: The Address in Reply has many features that affect each member in his own district. I suppose that roads again would be one of the most important matters in my area.

Mr. Riches: Aren't you going to reply to anything said this afternoon?

Mr. HALL: We are happy in Gouger, along with other neighbouring Liberal districts, that the road-building programme has been instituted and is being carried out. The roads being built today are of a high standard.

Mr. Riches: Is it different in Liberal districts?

Mr. HALL: The only difference between the Liberal and the Labor districts is that Liberal members appreciate theirs. We will never satisfy a Labor member in his district; no matter how fair the treatment he receives, he never seems to think a fair share is enough. The roads in my district are indeed in good order, and each year we are creating a permanent asset in the new bitumen highways. It is gratifying to know that these structures are to be of such a high standard that they will last for many years. This has not always been so: we have had roads that have seriously deteriorated in my short lifetime. One of the main problems in my district concerns education at Para Hills. Here we have an illustration of a successful private building venture. This again will probably be regarded as obnoxious by my friends opposite, but at Para Hills we can see the results of private enterprise entering upon a scheme (with no guarantee of success and involving certain risk) of planning and building to provide houses for people wishing to live in that area. Although at a certain stage in this scheme the company in charge was changed, on the demise of the Reid-Murray Group, the building project and the general setting up of Para Hills as a town adjacent to the metropolitan area has progressed to such a degree in the last few months that it has staggered everyone associated with it, including the company controlling the scheme. Equally, no-one has been more staggered than the Education Department, to which I have made representations seeking sufficient facilities at Para Hills in time to meet the demand. However, of course, this demand has more or less outstripped the available facilities on occasions, although I should add that this has been no real fault of the Education Department. In fact, the local school committee was unable to estimate the total number of children that would come to that district, and we have had an amazing upsurge of numbers in this 12 months. Nevertheless, one or two unfortunate features have been associated with this school. One is the fact that it took about five weeks to have a block levelled to take a building, the erection of which had been approved by the Education Department. When schoolchildren are coming in at the rate of just under 100 a month, it is impossible to run a school if it takes five weeks to have a block levelled. Such matters inhibit the proper supply of education facilities in one of the fastest growing schools in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: You are not satisfied with it?

Mr. HALL: Although there are many reasons why we are not happy, we are happy that the town is growing.

Mr. McKee: I thought from what you said a few moments ago that the Liberals were always satisfied.

Mr. HALL: These people are streaming to South Australia, and I do not think they are streaming here because of the policy enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, in this instance they are coming here to a town built by private enterprise.

Mr. McKee: I am interested in your contradictions. You say you are satisfied and then, in the next breath, you say you are dissatisfied.

Mr. HALL: We are satisfied, but we would like to see the need met at the earliest opportunity. We also have a peculiar water supply problem to Fisherman's Bay.

Mr. McKee: Another complaint! You're full of them.

Mr. HALL: About 250 holiday shacks have been built with no connection to a water supply, except to the water tanks they can fill from their roofs. With about 250 shacks adjacent to each other on small blocks 30ft. x 30ft. and without a proper water supply, health and hygiene hazards are created.

Mr. Riches: They are too close together, anyway.

Mr. HALL: At Fisherman's Bay a peculiar land ownership system exists. The majority of shacks are on private land that is owned by people representing half a dozen families. The water district is perhaps three-quarters of a mile from Fisherman's Bay; therefore, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has no authority or capacity to serve the bay, as it is outside the water district. There is a great need for a water supply because of the health problem. The group of owners cannot get together and agree to guarantee a scheme in an area that is outside the water district. In addition, the district council does not consider that it can subsidize private land owners in this case. The private land owners have the financial benefit from the letting of these shacks, and the district council, without a guarantee from the private owners, does not consider that it should come into the picture and guarantee the owners without any justification being given to the ratepayers.

Mr. Bywaters: What are they doing about the health hazard?

Mr. HALL: This is on private land, and most of these shacks have been up for some years. In those circumstances the private landholder has had the right to do that.

Mr. Riches: Since when can you subdivide on that basis?

Mr. HALL: I am sorry if the honourable member says it cannot be done, but it has been done. One other item leads me to refer to the construction of the Government. I refer to a local matter at the area school at Snowtown. Last year, in this House the Minister of Education promised me that a Leaving class would be instituted at the Snowtown Area School. This news was welcomed by local parents and students, and I appreciated that this class would raise the standard of education in the areas of Port Broughton, Brinkworth and Snowtown if students within a reasonable distance could come into the Snowtown Area School. Unfortunately, however, only four students enrolled for the Leaving class from those districts. The decision to establish the class was made some months prior to its beginning. It began, but it was cancelled within two days after students had been enrolled, and after they had received their books.

Mr. Clark: Did you say only four students were enrolled from these three areas?

Mr. HALL: Yes, but the staff at the school was not increased, nor was staff taken away after the class was cancelled. There may have been a reason for the cancellation. The reason given was that the class was too small but, as I said, no extra staff was required. The decision to disband this class was not made by the Minister, and I am sure he would not have made such a decision. The decision to disband that class was made by the Director of Education (at least he accepted that responsibility) and, after the disappointment had somewhat abated, I was still of the mind that the Director of Education had no right to cancel that class without reference to the Minister or to me as a party to the promise in this House. I decry the Director's action in abrogating the agreement without reference to the principals concerned in it.

One reason for this is that we have too small a Ministry in South Australia. Our Ministers are heavily overworked, and I believe that a decision such as the one I have outlined as an example shows that there are too many important details for a Minister to consider fully at this time. If there were a good reason, should not the Minister who gave me the promise in this House have been informed

of this action? That is what should have occurred. I use this example, and I could use others, such as the block at Para Hills that took five weeks to level in the face of an urgent need for classroom facilities. Items such as this are not the fault of any particular individual. In the case of the Education Department and its decisions, we are being subjected to more and more bureaucratic control, because the Minister, as with his colleagues, has too many functions to fulfil to ensure that political control is kept where it should be. There is need for more than one extra Minister. If we compare the Ministry in this State with those in the other States we find that New South Wales has 16, Western Australia 10, Tasmania 9, Queensland 13 and Victoria 15. We are the smallest with only 8. We do not hear many calls from the Opposition to increase the number, because its members are responsible for keeping it where it is.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They voted against it last year.

Mr. HALL: They did that. This is a most un-South Australian attitude when we consider the development in this State compared with that in Tasmania and the extra industrial strength we have compared with Western Australia. It cannot be denied that our Ministers are being overworked. If we are to maintain our political control and not subject this State to bureaucratic control, we must increase the size of the Ministry so that its members can handle their work without overtaxing themselves, as some of them are doing. Members on this side are aware that the hours they are putting into their work are far more than we should demand. It is too much to ask them to do all that they are doing.

For the sake of the proper political control of the Administration in South Australia, I urge that we agree to at least one additional Minister in the Legislative Council and at least two in this House. If the member for Enfield heartily agrees with this, I hope that he will support any legislation to bring it about.

Mr. Riches: Let us have a bigger Parliament and I shall be right with you.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition touched on many subjects, including one which we could call a social issue. He more or less tried to trap the Minister of Works into admitting something about a subject that he kept to himself for several minutes. Later we found that he was speaking about off-course betting in South Australia. We

finally got an interpretation of what he was talking about in the *News* today. I really cannot blame the *News* reporter, because I doubt whether any accurate interpretation could have been placed on the Leader's remarks. A big heading appeared on the second page that a challenge had been issued yesterday. At the time it was a puzzle that was being put to the House.

Mr. McKee: Are you prepared to accept the challenge?

Mr. HALL: I am prepared to listen to the honourable member's views when he speaks on this debate. The chief proponents of the totalizator agency board system in South Australia are the racing and trotting clubs. They presented their case to members by way of literature. We know that they interviewed the Premier, I think on several occasions. You, yourself, Mr. Speaker, have been involved in public statements on this question. I should think that some of the statements of some bodies interested were not altogether wise and were not always couched in the most diplomatic language. I believe that some criticism was induced because of remarks by some proponents of the proposed system.

It is difficult to get the views of a clear-cut cross-section of the community regarding the issue. On one side are the supporters of the T.A.B. system, on another the church; on still another side are the people of the State, and on the fourth side are members of Parliament. In my view the placing of money on horses is a mug's game. At one stage I used to think that the Government would be well advised to keep away from the ramifications of gambling, but one only has to look at the annual report of the Betting Control Board to realize that this Government and other Governments in Australia are heavily involved in betting and racing. The question of whether or not they become involved was settled long before this question was raised in this House. South Australia was involved to the tune of £765,000 in 1962-1963.

The attitude of the churches in this matter has been entirely honourable, as one would expect, and I am thankful to receive their opinions so freely expressed on the issue. The points they raise concern us vitally as to the direction in which our youth will travel in future, and there is also the question of community moral standards. I wonder how long Parliament should suppress the activities of a group of people who conduct their own sporting or so-called sporting affairs. We do not stop a young man from buying a motor car costing

£1,000 on a deposit of perhaps £200. We do not interfere with the spending of a private person's money so long as his action does not impinge in some way so as to be injurious to the rights of other citizens. The State has been unsuccessful in suppressing off-course betting. There would not be many of us who did not know the name of an off-course bookmaker.

Mr. Freebairn and I last week spent a couple of days in Melbourne studying the Totalizator Agency Board's operations and we were grateful for our reception and the help given by officials of the board. I am sure the people in Victoria would be quite happy to show any member over the system. When we were there we were supplied with financial information, and we found (as we expected to find) that it was a well conducted system of off-course betting. As possibly all members know, it is truly an agency which collects bets from all over Victoria that have been telephoned through before the start of each race. Those bets are then placed on the totalizator at the racecourse.

Mr. Ryan: Would you like to see the same thing here?

Mr. HALL: The operation involves many minor details which I would not weary the House with now. Anyone can find out for his own benefit if he wishes to go there and see it. One thing that surprised (and impressed) us in Victoria was that on-course betting appeared to have been largely unaffected by the introduction of an off-course system; in fact, it has substantially increased in recent times. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that bettors who use the off-course system there either are new bettors or else they used to patronize illegal bookmakers. One of the estimates given to us was that new bettors constitute 25 per cent of those using the off-course system. Incidentally, the average bet at an agency in Victoria is just over 12s. and the average telephone bet is about 21s. or 22s. We were also impressed, in seeing the agencies in operation, by the fact that only a small percentage of customers were under the age of 30 years.

Possibly members have read the Betting Control Board's report to this Parliament on the operation of the Victorian and Queensland systems. Although the board said that such a system could work here, it raised serious doubts as to whether it would work, because of the effect of the winning bets tax, which in 1962-63 amounted to £519,000. I consider that the report was somewhat in error in omitting to mention that Victoria has a turnover tax on bookmakers' turnover of 2 per cent

on metropolitan tracks and 1½ per cent on country tracks. In my mind, there is no doubt that the introduction of such a tax here would somewhat offset any alteration to, or abolition of, the winning bets tax in the event of the establishment of the T.A.B. system. The figure for legal betting turnover in South Australia for 1962-63 was just over £30,000,000, of which £28,000,000 was turnover by the bookmakers and £2,290,000 passed through the totalizator. We are all aware that a huge unknown sum was wagered throughout the State illegally, and no contribution came from that either to the Government or to the racing clubs. Undoubtedly, the racing clubs have a claim for a share in taxation revenue. As we all realize, betting itself relies entirely on the subject matter, and it is quite in order in my thinking that a racing club should insist that it receive a contribution from all racing revenue.

I consider that this Parliament has a request to answer. The position has been somewhat clouded at times by the issues between the proponents and the opponents, but the request has really been fairly put. I believe that it has lacked a financial explanation; the proponents of the T.A.B. system have not put before me or the members that I know of a proper financial assessment of what the effect on the State's finances or the racing clubs' finances would be. They have not taken into account,

in my view, the winning bets tax, nor have they mentioned bookmakers' turnover, therefore I believe the proposal has been deficient in that important aspect. However, that does not alter the fact that a request has been respectfully put to us.

The Leader, quite unfairly, referred to my recent question on this matter as a "Dorothy Dixier". I insist that the question the Leader referred to as such was a genuine question to the Premier, who genuinely replied that he was at present negotiating with the racing clubs concerning off-course betting in this State. I will most certainly await with interest the Premier's reply, and I trust that members opposite (who, if they like, can entirely tear to pieces what I have said) will endeavour to take the matter on from here and give us their views on what they think should happen about off-course betting. At the same time, I remind them that, as the Premier has said, the matter at this moment is under active negotiation. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as originally moved.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, at 2 p.m.