

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, September 16, 1964.

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

**QUESTIONS.****RAILWAY RENTALS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The tenants of railway cottages that contain a sink and drain-board have been paying an extra 6d. a week in rental. I have been informed that where that equipment has become obsolete it has been replaced with a sink and drainboard of stainless steel, and that the tenants will be asked to pay an extra 1s. a week for this amenity. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, say whether it is Government policy for this to be done, or whether a review will be made regarding these extra payments?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report for the Leader.

**MILK TANKERS.**

Mr. McANANEY: Some time ago the Jervois Dairy Co-operative asked that milk tankers be calibrated. Can the Minister of Lands say what progress has been made on this application?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: For some time now there has been a demand for measuring equipment for the calibration of bulk containers such as milk tankers. Such equipment has not been readily available in South Australia and, because of the demand, action has been taken by the Warden of Standards to put in new equipment and he has now on hand most of the equipment needed. A standards officer is expected to be appointed within the next few weeks, and after one month of intensive training in another State with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and verification of the accuracy of the new equipment, the department expects to be able to meet its obligations to these people.

**KIMBA AREA SCHOOL.**

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the purchase of certain areas at Kimba for agricultural science instruction?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A proposal for the purchase of an area of about 12 acres of land adjacent to the Kimba Area School for the teaching of agricultural science

is still being investigated. The Inspector of Agriculture in the Education Department has reported that the land is suitable for this purpose. The docket has been forwarded to the Land Board for a valuation of the land after which it will be submitted to Cabinet for consideration.

**KANGAROO MEAT.**

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the sale of kangaroo meat?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director-General of Public Health reports that regulation 9 of the Food and Drugs Regulations provides that pet meat, which is not of human consumption standard, may only be sold in food shops when packed in a sealed container, the outer surface of which is clean. This regulation is currently being enforced by local authorities. The Director-General states further that it has been found that this provision does not give sufficient protection in the home in the handling and storage of pet meat that may not be up to human consumption standards. The matter is at present being discussed with trade organizations and it is proposed to recommend that regulation 9 be amended to provide that all pet meat sold in food shops shall be handled and be of the same standards as meat for human consumption. The sale of pet meat in pet meat shops where human food is not sold is also being reviewed.

**KAPUNDA HIGH SCHOOL.**

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the building of the new science block and craft centre at the Kapunda High School. At present the science block is complete except for the plumbing, and the craft centre is almost complete. The plumbing involved in a science block is of a specialized nature, and it appears that the plumbing staff attached to the Public Buildings Department have a back-log of work. The Kapunda High School Council is anxious to have the use of these facilities this term, particularly the use of the science block. Will the Minister of Works expedite this building project and, if necessary, engage private plumbers for the purpose?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am unable to say, offhand, whether this building is being erected by a private contractor or by departmental labour.

Mr. Freebairn: By departmental labour.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In that case, the plumbing would almost certainly be done by the department, although not necessarily so.

There could be a subcontract for plumbing only. I will inquire, and ensure that no undue delay occurs. However, the pressure on building tradesmen generally is great at present, and I doubt whether, unless it is a local circumstance, an outside plumber would be available to do the work at short notice.

#### SNOWTOWN COURTHOUSE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works information about the proposed time table for the building of the new police station and courthouse at Snowtown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of Public Buildings states:

Provision has been made on the Loan Estimates this year for a new police station and courthouse at Snowtown. As soon as detailed requirements for this proposed building are received from the Police Department, planning will proceed. At this stage it is not possible to state when construction might commence.

#### HALBURY SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the building of a new school residence at Halbury?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that major repairs and renovations on the Halbury school residence are not practicable, but that minor repairs, which are necessary to make it safe until it can be vacated, will be carried out. It is at present occupied by the head teacher, a single man who has been unable to obtain suitable accommodation elsewhere at Halbury. The need to replace the old residence is appreciated and a new one will be provided as soon as practicable. It is hoped that this work may be included on the list of school residences to be provided in the next financial year.

#### WATER CONSERVATION.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the inclusion in our school curricula of studies covering the vital importance of water conservation?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: From reports received from the Education Department superintendents, it is apparent that this matter of water conservation is already covered at all levels in our departmental schools. In primary schools, a prescribed topic for grade 4 in the social studies course is "Rainfall and Land Uses in South Australia". The recording of rainfall, irrigation, and the importance of an adequate water supply are

all treated under this topic, to which about 48 lessons are devoted. In grade 7 the matter is dealt with on the national basis. In technical schools all classes study social studies at first year level, and one topic of the syllabus is "The Australian Climate, particularly the rainfall, its restrictive effects and the need for conservation". Those who study geography at higher levels make a thorough examination of the limiting effects of the lack of rainfall on the country's economy. In high schools water conservation and reticulation is a constantly recurring theme in the geography syllabus at all levels. They are also treated extensively in the syllabus for agricultural science and social science. In rural schools, primary classes give the same attention to this topic as do normal primary schools, and in the secondary grades the social studies course includes similar topics that are treated at greater depth for senior students.

#### POTATO MARKETING.

Mr. SHANNON: The regulations that have been tabled in connection with the Potato Board's activities in South Australia apparently make it impossible for a potato washer to be also a merchant or a potato merchant to be also a washer. I should like to know the board's reasons for this differentiation.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should obtain the concurrence of the House to make a statement.

Mr. SHANNON: I now ask for that permission. I should like to know why the Potato Board should deny a joint licence in those circumstances. We shall be dealing with this regulation in Parliament shortly, and the problem arises as a result of an application by the potato co-operative (comprising about 230 members, I understand) which has a licence to wash potatoes but not to market them. That organization desires a licence to be a merchant. Can the Premier explain this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have to obtain the information for the honourable member, although I shall refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture first. I do not know the reason for the differentiation but I assure the honourable member that the regulation arose from within the Potato Board itself; I do not think it originated in the Agriculture Department. The matter will be examined and the honourable member informed.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION)  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963. Read a first time.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I thank the House for giving me the opportunity to move the second reading. I did not intend to speak to the Bill today, but in view of the notice of motion given earlier this afternoon by the Premier I realized that if I did not do so now I would not have much opportunity later. My first amendment strikes out the words "or used by" in the definition of "public road" in section 3 of the principal Act. This amendment ensures that people are free to cart stock on roads in the north, many of which are unmade. After all, this part of the State is largely outside of local government areas and contains many bush roads. I think the amendment is reasonable. My next amendment adds new paragraph (c) to section 4 of the Act, as follows:

Any vehicle while being used in that area of the State bounded by the city of Port Augusta on the east, the Commonwealth Transcontinental railway line between the said city and the Western Australian border on the north, the said border on the west, and the coast on the south.

This excludes the whole of Eyre Peninsula from the operation of the Act. The railway line has been used to define the boundary because, when people cross the line they will be outside the jurisdiction of the Act. This excluded area can be easily defined. The next amendment strikes out paragraph 2 of the first schedule to the principal Act and inserts a new paragraph 2, as follows:

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. That amendment can be easily understood. The amendments enable people in the Frome district to cart stock without incurring the charges prescribed in the principal Act. A consequential amendment, in terms of the amendment to the First Schedule, is necessary in the Third Schedule, and that is provided for in the Bill.

It has been pointed out in this House that Eyre Peninsula produces one-third of the State's wheat but, because of its isolation, Eyre Peninsula is different from other parts of South Australia. Wheat and other cereals may be grown in certain parts of the peninsula,

whereas other parts are not suited to the growing of cereals although sheep may be kept there. 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 cheaper to do that rather than to cart the grain 50 or 60 miles to the railways 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 the 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.

I understand a cereal grower must deliver his grain to a specified silo. The grower delivering grain to Cowell or Arno Bay must meet his commitments at the silo, but the distances on Eyre Peninsula are great and these involve more commitments. Under the Act, tax may have to be paid on a journey of 200 miles. Therefore, the cereal growers on Eyre Peninsula are situated differently from those in other parts of the State. My Party met to consider proposals concerning this matter and, as a result, attention is drawn to the following points:

The full implications of the ton-mile tax in so far as the West Coast is concerned with its long distances of unsealed roads and lack of shipping outlets is not appreciated by the Government, the representatives of the area in either House, or the Opposition when the Bill was before the House. No other part of the State is exactly comparable. It may be argued that the provisions of the Bill could be excluded to meet other situations peculiar to the districts, and we see no reason why members should not do this in speaking on the Bill. It would be unwise to attempt to correct all the anomalies of the Government Bill in a simple amendment such as the committee recommends.

The suggested amendment will not adversely affect any other area—it will not have effect at all in any other area, nor will it have any great effect in the State's finances.

When Parliament considered the original legislation, Government members had not fully considered its effects. We were told that the legislation was aimed at interstate hauliers, and I do not think that any member would object to making those hauliers pay a reasonable contribution to the upkeep of our roads. However, the Minister told us nothing of the

probable effects of the legislation on the primary producers on Eyre Peninsula. If a carrier wishes to take a load greater than eight tons past Port Augusta to Eyre Peninsula, under my Bill he must pay road tax from Adelaide to Port Augusta, but he is free from tax for that part of his journey that is on Eyre Peninsula. It may be asked what will be the position when the roads are improved sufficiently for a haulier to make the journey economically from Adelaide to Perth. At present, an interstate haulier puts his truck on the Transcontinental at Port Pirie Junction and it is carried by rail to Kalgoorlie. With the standardization of that system goods will go direct to Perth and road hauliers will not be used. When this matter was first introduced I believed that we were more concerned with interstate hauliers than with anybody else, and I believe that today. However, the South Australian Railways should have a pick-a-back system operating to other States. Equipment should have been developed so that this could have been done, but apparently neither the Government nor those controlling the railways were interested in obtaining this business. Was any positive attempt made by Broken Hill Associated Smelters to use road haulage for ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie? If it was, apparently it was one reason for the introduction of this legislation. I believe that, because of the geographical position of Eyre Peninsula, because of its fewer opportunities to deliver its grain for export to terminals, and because of the extra long distances of haulage that farmers have because of their isolation, Parliament would be well advised to accept this amendment in the interests of the people of the industry.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): In seconding the motion, I shall outline, in a different way, the reasons for these amendments. Each amendment has a different purpose. The first amendment, deleting "or used by" in the Act where the words "public road" are defined, gives relief to carriers who travel over bush tracks. A large area of this State is covered by bush tracks, most of them in the districts of Frome and Whyalla. It was never intended that there should be a tax on vehicles, whether interstate or intrastate, travelling on such bush tracks. In the north-west and north of my district many bush tracks wind everywhere and cover an enormous area, and the grading of them from time to time, has been done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

After wet weather those tracks are impassable for days: they are rough, travel is slow, and because of gutters, damage is caused to the suspension of vehicles. No-one would suggest that a tax was justified on vehicles travelling on this type of road. The amendment allows for a correct interpretation of "public road", so that it means any street, road, lane, bridge, thoroughfare or place open to the public for the passage of vehicles. It indicates that a public road is one that has been constructed, not a bush track. People using these bush roads are, in the main, primary producers, because they have large numbers of stock brought down in large vehicles from time to time over this class of road. When the original legislation was introduced members were assured that it was framed in such a way that it would have little impact on primary producers. That was the object of differentiating between the 8-ton capacity and the 4-ton capacity, which is provided in the Acts of other States. On that assurance, we supported the legislation, but I do not think members appreciated its impact on Eyre Peninsula and on the north and north-western areas where bush tracks exist.

Referring to the amendment to exclude Eyre Peninsula, I point out that this amendment defines the area clearly. It starts at Port Augusta where there is a bridge, thus enabling a point of distinction to be made clearly. On the north the transcontinental railway line is used, a point of clear definition, which cannot be crossed without a person being conscious of crossing it. Only a few crossings exist on this line. It excludes an area over which little interstate carrying is done, except by pick-a-back on the train to Western Australia, and that does not come within the amendment. In other words, the number of interstate carriers excluded are few, because few interstate carriers cross the Nullarbor Plain by road because of the nature of that road.

The third amendment relates to the exemption of stock-carrying vehicles. When the House dealt with the original legislation it intended to give an almost blanket exclusion to stock-carrying by primary producers. That is made clear by the schedule to the Act. The amendment extends an exemption on a par with similar exemptions in Victoria. There is no reason why this should not be done, because the Victorian Act, which has survived a challenge to the High Court, states:

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.

There is no reason why our schedule in respect of this matter should not be on all fours with that of Victoria. If it were we would be following the view expressed when it was said that the impact of this Act would be almost negligible upon primary producers. Therefore, it would be consistent with the intention of Parliament when the legislation was introduced. Nowhere else in Australia is there an agricultural area situated in relation to the rest of a State as is Eyre Peninsula situated in relation to the rest of South Australia. It has already been said that this area produces about one-third of the State's wheat, and there is no need to reiterate the importance of the production in the area.

However, it is definitely isolated geographically in a most unusual manner, but what is more, even if Eyre Peninsula were exempted, as we intend by this amendment, the people there would still have the burden of the tax on all goods carried in vehicles over an 8-ton capacity from Adelaide to Port Augusta, a distance of 200 miles. Of course, the same argument applies in relation to those people living north and north-west of Port Augusta in the areas to which I have referred and which have only dirt roads. It is not true to say that by exempting Eyre Peninsula the people there would receive an unfair advantage as compared with the rest of the State, because they would still be paying for commodities taken to the peninsula by road—and many commodities go by road. Of course, most of the goods that go to Eyre Peninsula by road are carried in large vehicles. Other goods go by sea, but even those goods are carrying some impost as a result of this tax. Therefore, it would not be true to say that by exempting Eyre Peninsula we would be giving those people a particular privilege. Another interesting aspect of this matter, having in mind our amendment, is the fact that in Western Australia no legislation of this type exists. Therefore, by making Port Augusta the finishing point for the application of this tax, it would follow that no complications would arise west of that point. Interstate carriers pick-a-back their loads by rail to the west. Another objection that has been raised to an amendment is the question of its impact on the railways. It was reported in the *West Coast Sentinel* on Wednesday, August 19, with reference to a deputation that waited on the Premier:

The Premier claimed that if the Government had not introduced the Act the B.H.P. Co. Ltd.—

and that would be incorrect reporting for it should refer to one of the Broken Hill mining companies—

would have abandoned the railways and carted 14,000 tons of ore a week from Broken Hill to Port Pirie in 40-ton road trucks. Mr. Bellenger stated.

This argument has been used on the coast at two meetings I attended, one at Port Lincoln and one at Cleve. It was argued that this would be the case, had the Act not been introduced. Although I was not present at any interview between the Premier and representatives of the mining companies at Broken Hill, I cannot understand how this threat could be taken seriously. Let us assume that ore was carted by road from Broken Hill to Port Pirie and that 30-ton trucks were used. I mention that particular vehicle because I happen to have the data concerning the working costs of such a truck. This is the sort of truck used by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Iron Knob and by mining companies elsewhere; they are a strong vehicle and are required for particularly rough work. I have checked on the costs of running such vehicles, counting mileage both ways. Using that method, I understand that the general cost of running such vehicles is 9d. a ton-mile. A Western Australian firm that carts ore 60 miles from a mine in similar vehicles (using two trailers) carries 100 tons a load and they have got the tax down to 4d. a ton-mile. I do not think it could be any cheaper than that. Lime sand was recently carted from Coffin Bay to Whyalla at 7½d. a ton-mile. Carting in the Iron Knob quarry with 30-ton trucks at 15 miles an hour requires constant use of the grader and a water cart; otherwise the trucks would be unusable within a short time. We could well imagine what would happen to the road from Broken Hill to Port Pirie if these vehicles were travelling at 40 miles an hour regularly. The road would be quite unusable after a fortnight's running.

In a large copper mine at Toquepala, South America, motor trucks are used from a point in the mine to the railhead by the mine, and the company concerned regards half a mile as the limit of lead that should be undertaken by road transport. From the mine to the seaport the distance is 30 miles. A railway was installed but it would not have been if road transport had been in any way competitive. The B.H.P. Company intends to construct a railway from Coffin Bay to Port Lincoln costing £1,500,000; a sealed road would cost between £260,000 and £300,000, and if it were economic to use road transport the B.H.P. Company would be putting in a road and not a railway. Of course, the railway will cost considerably more. In fact, the cartage of ore by rail usually costs no more

than 1½d. a ton-mile, and frequently it costs only a penny a ton-mile. Therefore, how one can seriously talk about considering a threat from the Broken Hill mining company to cart its ore by road, in preference to carting it by rail, I do not know!

There is no evidence to support the argument that such a threat could be considered seriously, and I do not believe that it would have anything to do with the introduction of this legislation. Nor do I believe that it should be advanced as a reason for not amending the legislation. One other aspect of interest is the capital outlay that would be involved if the mining company were to seriously consider carting its ore from Broken Hill by road. If it used 30-ton trucks without trailers working 300 days a year, or about six days a week, it would require 90 trucks for a daily delivery of 2,680 tons to equal 804,097 tons a year which has been brought down in 12 months recently from Broken Hill. On a run of 260 miles, one truck would need two days for the return trip or a change of drivers. Assuming that one truck did three trips every six days, 180 trucks costing £28,000 each would be required, plus some spare vehicles, so with a servicing and spare parts depot the total cost would be about £6,000,000. That would be the capital outlay if a mining company considered carting this ore by road, and that is a conservative estimate.

I think I have dealt fairly adequately with that aspect. The other objection that will be used to our amendments is that if these amendments are carried there will be a challenge to the High Court on the grounds that the Act is unconstitutional. I think the most important aspect of whether the Act could be challenged on a constitutional basis would be the question of whether such amendments cause discrimination, for it is laid down that there must be no discrimination between interstate and intrastate carriers. Let us examine this position. First, it is obvious that with the amendment relating to the extension of stock carrying there would be no discrimination. In fact, that matter has already been decided by challenge to the High Court, so we can rule that one out.

I come now to the question of eliminating the area where there are only bush tracks. Here again we are not discriminating between the interstate and intrastate carrier. We are simply saying that we are defining a road as a properly constructed road, and, after all, the intention of the Act is to get revenue that must be used for the construction of roads:

that is laid down as something which is essential, for the court has said that the money received from the tax must be used (and in the other States it is so used) solely for the maintenance and construction of roads. Obviously, if we get a tax from areas that have only bush tracks we are not necessarily going to use it on the maintenance of those roads, because they will not be constructed roads. For example, many approaches have been made for the construction of a road from Port Augusta to Woomera, but the State has made it perfectly plain that it regards that as a Commonwealth responsibility and will have nothing to do with it at all. By making clear that the definition of "public road" is a "constructed road" we are not doing anything by way of discrimination. In fact, we are doing something which is consistent with the intention of the Act and with the intention of the High Court.

This leaves only the question of the exemption of Eyre Peninsula itself, and here again we are not discriminating between the interstate and the intrastate carrier. We are exempting an area which we suggest has a special claim for exemption. It can be proved (and it has already been shown) that this area would suffer a far more serious impact than any other part of the State. That has been shown clearly from the figures given in this House and elsewhere. The lack of good railways, the distance of producers from the terminal silos, the fact that they use trailers in connection with their trucks which brings them within the ambit of the Act, the fact that heavy trucks are used to cart from silos at, say, Cowell and Arno Bay and then to the terminal silo at Port Lincoln, have all been emphasized. In other words, the impact on Eyre Peninsula in relation to the rest of the State is decidedly unfair. What we are suggesting will rectify what I am sure any court would regard as an anomaly, and we are not discriminating between the interstate and intrastate carrier.

Earlier I referred to a report in the *West Coast Sentinel* on August 19, which stated that the Premier had said that no exemptions could be made because the High Court would challenge any discrimination. What is the sort of discrimination to which the court objects? In the words of the Chief Justice, the sort of discrimination that has been laid down is the discrimination between the interstate and the intrastate carriers, and we are not by this amendment making any such discrimination: we are exempting an area, and we cover everybody in the area whether he be an interstate or an intrastate carrier.

At the same time, we are not lifting from that area a burden which should not be lifted. That area still has a burden which is not comparable with the burdens carried by other parts of the State, so whichever way it is looked at there is no discrimination. I think what the Chief Justice (Sir Owen Dixon) said should be recorded so that members will again have the opportunity of reading and considering it. His comments were taken notice of by the Victorian Government when it introduced its legislation. The Chief Justice said:

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-mile 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.

Mr. Bolte, in his second reading explanation of the legislation, paraphrased the Chief Justice's statement and set it down under four headings. I think this is important because Mr. Bolte put it in slightly different words, possibly so that it would be more easily understood from a different angle. He said:

However, it will be seen that the provision of this Part falls 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 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.

I believe that I have dealt adequately with the objections that may be raised to the Bill. It is introduced to correct an injustice that was done when the original legislation was passed by this House as a result of the ignorance of members towards the impact of this legislation in certain parts of the State. It is up to Parliament to correct what was done at that time in the light of subsequent knowledge. Members know from the evidence that has been received that the impact on Eyre Peninsula is unfair in relation to the rest of the State.

The Opposition believes this can be rectified safely without endangering the original Act. We are fully behind the impost placed on interstate carriers. If this Bill is passed interstate carriers will escape taxation only to a negligible extent as a result of it. I pointed out that trailers that go to Western Australia almost all go by pick-a-back over the railway line. In other words, very little revenue from the interstate carriers will be lost. Some will be lost from the intrastate carriers because of the carrying they do for primary producers on the Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Shannon: In other words, you say it is only a matter of degree.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The member for Onkaparinga gave an assurance that he would never support the original legislation if he was not satisfied that primary producers would suffer no injustice. He said that clearly and distinctly in his speech. He has no reason to object when we try to remove an injustice to primary producers on the Eyre Peninsula. He should be pleased with the amendment because it is perfectly in line with what he was saying when the original legislation was introduced. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I listened to the last speaker with much interest. The honourable member talked about the primary producers of Eyre Peninsula and I shall deal with that problem shortly. However, it is rather significant that the non-primary producers of the honourable member's own district are exempted by the Bill, although that may have been accidental. I apologize to the House for being somewhat unprepared in speaking on this Bill now, but in view

of the fairly early termination of the session this year and because of the pressing business on the Notice Paper I want to give an opportunity for discussion of the Bill.

There are three main features of the Bill: first, it excludes Eyre Peninsula from the provisions of the Act; secondly, it excludes certain outback areas; thirdly, it excludes the provision concerning the carriage of stock from farm to market. At present stock carried from farm to farm does not attract the road maintenance tax. I shall deal with the third particular. It is included in the Act purely and simply in the interests of protecting the railways.

Mr. Shannon: The Labor Party would not approve of that!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish to explain the difference between the procedure proposed for South Australia and that operating in Victoria, which has been quoted this afternoon by at least one member opposite. In Victoria all vehicles having a capacity of over 4-ton are subject to road maintenance tax. In South Australia all vehicles over 8-ton capacity are subject to road maintenance tax. In other words, a large group of vehicles exist between 4-ton and 8-ton that were excluded. When the Bill was introduced in the House there was some reluctance by the Crown Law Office to say that the Bill, as drafted, could not be challenged successfully. The argument could have been advanced that it was mainly directed at interstate carriers, rather than at the local small carriers, and the Crown Law Office was somewhat reluctant to give a completely unqualified assent to the opinion that this would be on all fours with the Victorian legislation, which had the merit of having been examined by the High Court and accepted by it. In Victoria, road transport control is still in rigid operation. While the road maintenance tax did give to an intrastate vehicle carrying stock in Victoria the right to carry it to market without attracting tax, the transport control authority in Victoria does not allow it. If we are going to have in South Australia, as we hope to have, a greater freedom on the roads it appeared to the Government (and it still does appear) that in the interest of the railways we cannot have what is going to be ultimately the abolition of freight transport control. The 8-ton limit allowed a producer to go to the market free of any maintenance tax. I ask any primary producer which is most valuable to him: to get rid of transport control and to pay for road maintenance for that portion of his stock that

goes to the market, or to suffer the rigid transport control that we have had in this State? In the district of Mount Gambier a large road carrier operates. How many times has he been allowed a permit to carry stock to Adelaide? The number is negligible, because the Transport Control Board has required that the stock should go on the railways. The charge for road maintenance on stock going to the market has been included for one reason: to give some protection to the railways. After all, these large transports use the roads and help to wear them out. The Government considered that it was not unfair in these circumstances to allow some protection to the railways. The Railways Commissioner does not approve of this legislation. If the honourable Leader's amendment on that provision is carried, no longer will much stock be carried on our railways. There will be no road maintenance charge and no Transport Control Board restrictions.

The first amendment provides that road maintenance shall not be charged on certain outback roads. About three years ago I travelled up the Marree track when it was in bad condition and before we had spent money on it. I travelled to Birdsville and was there generously entertained by the local council. I found that everyone over the border had to pay district council rates and had to maintain the roads. In South Australia (and I am not growling about this; I have no complaints with the member for Frome in this matter) this area is completely outside a district council rating area, with no charge of so much a mile for road repairs. Go to Queensland and see what is done there about charges! In the outback of South Australia no charge is made by the district council, **because** there is no district council. The Government is spending increasing sums on outback roads. Where is that money collected? It is collected in the metropolitan area, and will continue to be so collected. It is spent in an area where people object to paying a small moiety towards the cost of maintaining roads. This would be only a fraction, it would not be one-twentieth of the expenditure incurred on the roads.

Mr. Riches: This definition could take in tracks across pastoral areas.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has never been intended to tax those. I make that clear. The definition of "road" would not include them.

Mr. Riches: Well, it does.



The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Act has been, and will continue to be, administered with the greatest sympathy towards out-back areas. I object to having a privileged class. Often we hear honourable members opposite talking about a privileged class. The member for Whyalla, when speaking about the yields of primary producers on Eyre Peninsula is, of course, creating a privileged class in his own district. Last week the Party of which I am proud to be a member, had its annual conference, and resolutions were received from all parts of this State setting out what would be advisable in the interests of good government and progress. Two resolutions about the road problem on Eyre Peninsula were received and dealt with by the conference, in accordance with the usual custom of giving resolutions the utmost hearing, and were then passed. What were those resolutions? Were they to do with the proposal of the honourable Leader that had been announced simultaneously with the conference? No: they both urged that much more money be spent on roads on Eyre Peninsula. I do not care to whom one speaks on Eyre Peninsula. If that person is asked the question, "Which do you want: freedom from a road maintenance tax or a decent road?" the answer every time will be, "I want a decent road." Everyone knows how expensive it is to cart commodities, especially heavy loads, over poor roads. The Government has been spending on Eyre Peninsula about 10 times the sum that could be justified by the collection from that area of motor registrations and the share of petrol tax returned by the Commonwealth Government. At present a great highway is being constructed to Ceduna. The honourable leader did not say much about the Constitution, but left it to his able second-in-command. I should like to say a few words in a moment about the legal position in relation to this Bill.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You did not expect me to get involved in that, did you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Leader, if I may say so, showed much discretion in this matter and I give him full marks. I was only a little sorry that his supporter did not show the same discretion. As soon as I received the letter containing the Leader's amendments this afternoon I telephoned the Crown Solicitor to ask whether such amendments would leave the Bill open to attack and, without the slightest hesitation, the Crown Solicitor said that such an alteration would undoubtedly lead to that position.

Mr. Dunstan: Nonsense!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the member for Norwood will disagree, but I listened to the member for Whyalla who said that this would not affect the sums that were collected from interstate hauliers. There are no interstate hauliers of any moment in that area, so that what we are going to do is to keep the tax in the area where the interstate hauliers are affected and liberate ourselves from the area where the interstate hauliers are not affected. Do members opposite honestly think that the High Court would fall for that? Will interstate hauliers feel like paying that tax? Because they might challenge this—and they could challenge it on two grounds—this money must be paid into the Highways Fund, which must be used for the maintenance of roads used by the vehicles paying a road maintenance tax. The High Court has held that. If the amendments were carried, the Act would be challengeable on the ground that this was an attempt to free ourselves from taxation that we were imposing upon interstate transport. I believe that the Act would also be challengeable if we spent the money from the Highways Fund on Eyre Peninsula. On that issue the Crown Solicitor said that he would have to consider the decisions that had been given.

I believe the amendments are challengeable on the grounds that we would be collecting taxes for road maintenance but spending the money where road maintenance was not occurring. I reserve any further statement upon that matter until I have something more tangible than a telephone discussion. However, there is one other thing that I must mention, which was raised by the member for Whyalla. I understand a meeting was held in Cleve which the honourable member attended and at which it was said, "We were misinformed by the Premier about this matter; he told us that the interstate implications were very serious and we believe now that in view of subsequent information we were misinformed and shall have to do something about it." If that impression is not precisely correct I hope I shall not be taken to task. This afternoon the honourable member said he doubted whether the Premier had put up the cost of transporting ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie fairly and squarely before the House, or words to that effect. Then he went on to say that the costs have been proved and he cited a case at Iron Knob and certain other matters concerning road and rail costs. I have the docket here and I must say that there is

nothing like having a docket when one wants to discuss what has actually taken place, because one does not then have to rely upon memory. In addition, one is then not likely to be obliquely charged with not having told the complete story.

This voluminous docket relates to the correspondence from the Broken Hill mining companies seeking a reduction of ore freights from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. Many years ago the mining companies at Broken Hill entered into negotiations with the Railways Commissioner, and eventually a long-term agreement was drawn up for the cartage of Broken Hill ore to Port Pirie at a rate acceptable to all concerned. Two provisions existed in the agreement as to an increased rate, or a variation in the rate, to cover wages and fuel. Therefore, if wages and cost of fuel rose, a formula existed for adjusting the long-term rate. That rate has been honoured for many years. However, when the price of ore dropped the Broken Hill companies pointed out that the clause in the agreement concerning the variation had substantially worked against the company, and a request was made for a reduction in the rate. This matter before us today arose in the first place from a request by the Broken Hill companies for a reduction in the rate. The Railways Commissioner and the Government agreed to a substantial reduction; for example, when diesels were placed on the line, I think a reduction equal to 80 per cent of the total advantage of diesels was returned to the companies. However, the companies were not satisfied and pointed out that the rates of our railways were higher than the rates of some other railways. That is substantially true. As the member for the district will know, we have been operating a railway line which for many years was not very effective, and it will not be really effective until diesels can operate fully on it. After the negotiations had been going on for some little time representatives of those companies asked us to further reduce the rates. Incidentally, what they asked us was beyond the State's capacity to bear. However, they stated that they had some figures on the cost of motor transportation and that unless we were prepared to reduce our rates further they would go in for road transport.

One of the few things the member for Whyalla said that I can agree with was that the cost of maintaining a light constructed road (such as the one from Broken Hill to Port Pirie) for heavy transportation would be prohibitive. Apart from losing transportation over the railways, we would have the terrifi-

expense involved in that project. We would be constructing that road for heavy vehicles for the sake of about 14,000 tons a week, I think it is.

Mr. Casey: About 16,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. If honourable members opposite have any sense of responsibility at all, they must realize what the alternatives are.

Mr. Loveday: You haven't yet mentioned the comparable rates.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Whyalla is speaking from a privileged position at Whyalla. Honourable members know the Budget position for the State this year; no doubt they have had a look at the Budget statement and have studied the general financial position as disclosed not only by my papers but by the Auditor-General's papers. I ask honourable members: is there any alternative? South Australia traditionally has had a big advantage in having an open-road policy. Whereas other States have imposed all sorts of restrictions on transportation for many years, South Australia has maintained the policy of imposing the least possible restrictions, the reason being that we depend so much on interstate transport to take away the factory production of this State. We did not merely take the word of the company regarding its estimates, for our own Railways Commissioner examined road transportation costs and he came up with a request for a road maintenance charge.

I should like to quote a letter from the companies dated November 13, 1962, so that it will be recorded in *Hansard*. Honourable members will see that we did not rush into this matter. That letter is signed by Mr. M. L. Baillieu, who I think is well known as being the controlling factor of one of the big groups of mines at Broken Hill. In his letter, under the heading of "Road Haulage", he said:

It is noted that the Commissioner states that our estimate of 2.73d. per net ton mile for road transport costs is much too low. However, we are in a position to state at this stage that we are now seriously considering an offer at a lower figure than 2.73d. per ton mile for road transport of concentrate from Broken Hill to Port Pirie.

We had said that 2.73d. was too low, and they replied that they had had an offer of lower than that. The letter continued:

The fact is that we are not able to ensure the minimum necessary profitability on our operations on the freight rate offered, and unless a reduction is made on the lines I have now suggested we must inevitably consider a number of other alternatives. In the first

place, we will be compelled to take advantage of the lower rate for concentrate to Port Pirie and fuel and other return traffic which is available by road transport.

Does the honourable member now seriously say I deceived the House?

Mr. Loveday: I don't think that concludes the matter at all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Of course, the honourable member is not open to any conclusion. I could quote the recommendations of the Railways Commissioner on the matter if it were necessary.

Mr. Loveday: What is the Railways Department charging now: 1½d. a ton mile, isn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No; without looking it up, I think the present rate is about 3d. The fact is that the Government only came into this matter when it was necessary to protect our essential revenues. If one or two of our predominantly profitable lines in our railway system were taken away we could close the whole show up. It is all very well to say that the railways can carry the unprofitable commodities but, unless we put in a sprinkling of profitable undertakings into the railways, the State could not afford to maintain the railway system. This glib proposal to pass over to road transport would take away the most profitable of the railway undertakings. If honourable members like to see what is involved in this matter I can produce the precise figures. Honourable members have the alternative of having a road maintenance tax to help maintain our road system, or we can substantially close down our Railways Department. I make that statement without any fear of its being seriously challenged. We are at present subsidizing the railways by about £4,000,000 a year.

Mr. Frank Walsh: It is about £4,250,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No matter who was Treasurer, he would be confronted with this problem. If we want to close the railways down the quickest way to do it would be to abolish the road maintenance tax.

We in South Australia for many years have had some differential registration fees. They have been carried on over conditions that have fluctuated much from the time when the differences were introduced. The Government provided for a primary producer's registration licence of 50 per cent. I was a member of the House when this matter was last debated—and it was debated strongly. It was held at that time that there were no bitumen roads outside the metropolitan area. Of course, under those

circumstances, there was a strong case to consider the matter. I believe the member for Stuart spoke on the Bill. However, that has been carried on and will continue to be carried on as far as the Government is concerned. The primary producer's concession is a substantial concession to the very area to which honourable members wish to give additional concessions. When the Act was first passed there was not one mile of bitumen road north of Clare. Those privileges have been retained and I suggest that the Bill has no validity in fairness. The very area that needs more money spent on it is that for which a further concession is sought. I do not believe for one moment that this Bill is justified. I wish to say one or two things that require some research and I therefore ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TYRES).

Mr. HALL (Gouger) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1963. Read a first time.

Mr. HALL: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I realize that the subject matter of this Bill was debated last year when I introduced a Bill of similar intent which was somewhat dissimilar in form. At that time I expressed fully my feelings on the regrooving of tyres and their subsequent use on passenger vehicles. Some difficulties were pointed out concerning the wording of the Bill I introduced last year and there may have been some ambiguity about what was meant by a private passenger vehicle. There may have been other ambiguities concerning regrooved or worn tyres. After further consideration of this matter, I believe that the main objective is the prevention of the use of regrooved tyres by car salesmen and this will be prevented if the Bill is passed, for it makes it unlawful to offer to sell or to hire a vehicle that has been fitted with tyres of four-ply rating that have been regrooved. This means that a private person could fit regrooved tyres to his or her car, but I believe this would seldom happen because very few people want to fit regrooved tyres.

Mr. Nankivell: It is only for deception.

Mr. HALL: Yes, for the deception of unknowing purchasers when they attend a second-hand dealer's premises. Members do not yet have a copy of the Bill but they can consider it when a copy is supplied next week. Clause 3 states:

The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 162a thereof:

162b: A person shall not offer for sale or for hire a motor vehicle which has been fitted with a tyre of four-ply rating that has been regrooved. Penalty: £20.

The main offenders are second-hand dealers. I believe that in Victoria and South Australia a new type of machine is available whereby a tyre that is smooth can be regrooved on the vehicle without removing the tyre. Last year in the debate on my Bill the dangers of regrooved tyres were stressed. They are evident to anyone who has a vehicle. I introduce this Bill in the interest of the safety of those who may not be able to recognize the dangers of using regrooved tyres.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I have not had much time to look at this Bill, but I believe it deals with four-ply tyres, which are a lighter type of tyre and which would be the type of tyre that would be highly unsuitable for regrooving. There are heavier types of tyre. For instance, the Municipal Tramways Trust buys tyres manufactured for the purpose of being regrooved and there is no objection at all to their being regrooved. In fact, it would be safer to regroove them than to use them in a worn condition. I understand that the lighter type of tyre is unsuitable for regrooving and in the interest of safety I believe the honourable members amendment has considerable merit. It is possible, by regrooving, to make a tyre appear sound, but this could lead to an unsafe condition.

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That Orders of the Day be postponed to enable the matter before the Chair to be disposed of.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): The Premier has moved that Orders of the Day be postponed and taken into consideration after a Notice of Motion has been disposed of. I accept the motion with the concurrence of the Leader of the Opposition and of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have no objection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I concur in the postponement.

Motion carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: So far as I know, there is no objection to the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

## CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE).

Second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I regret that I am unable to say what I should like to say about this, as I should like to introduce legislation for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There should be a certain amount of co-operation in this matter!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: May I console the Premier, because I am assured that, if it were not for certain political implications, he would be 100 per cent with me.

Mr. Bywaters: You could have developed that much further.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not desire to do so. Section 12, which is to be repealed, provides:

No person shall be capable of being elected a member of the Legislative Council unless—

- (a) he is at least 30 years of age; and
- (b) he is a British subject or legally made a denizen of the State; and
- (c) he has resided in the State for at least three years.

Young people may defend this country in its time of need, and perform outstanding work in defence of this country, and it is time that the minimum age of 30 years for members should be removed. I would abolish the Legislative Council, but this Bill goes only part of the way.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: For many reasons. We expect the member for Mitcham to support this Bill, hoping that it will be defeated in another place, but that may be too much to ask.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't know. I haven't spoken on it yet.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I doubt whether the honourable member will.

Mr. Lawn: He may support it. He could have been in the Legislative Council today had it not been for that provision.

Mr. Jennings: He is over 30 years of age now!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: He has grown up since then. He hasn't even a snowball's chance of getting there now. He will never be old enough.

Mr. Heaslip: Get on with the Bill!

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): The Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: New section 12 provides that:

Any person qualified and entitled to be registered as an elector in and for any Council district shall be qualified and entitled to be elected a member of the Legislative Council for any Council district.

That is a democratic view, if this place is to be continued. Section 20 of the principal Act is to be repealed and re-enacted to provide qualifications of electors for Legislative Council elections, as follows:

Subject to the next three succeeding sections the following persons shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the Legislative Council, namely:

Every person who—

- (a) is at least twenty-one years of age; and
- (b) is a British subject; and
- (c) has lived continuously in the Commonwealth for at least six months and in a Council district for at least one month immediately preceding the date of registration of his electoral claim.

That provision allows for an almost universal franchise and will necessitate the completion of only one enrolment form to be forwarded to the Commonwealth division office. This means one roll for every election held in South Australia, whether it be a State, Commonwealth, single or dual election. Clause 5 amends section 21 of the Act by inserting the word "three" in lieu of the word "six" both in paragraph (d) and in the proviso. Section 21 provides, among other things, that a voter shall be at least 21 years of age, a British subject, an inhabitant of the State, and (at present) that he shall have resided in the State for at least six months prior to the registration of his electoral claim.

Much could be said if we were able to achieve a greater representation and give greater interest and rights to the people to take part in Legislative Council elections. That is the only reason for my introducing this Bill. I believe that this State would be better served by having one House instead of a bicameral system, such as we have today. These amendments allow for a more democratic set-up than exists at present.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): There can be no reason in the Constitution of a democratically elected State to provide that the second Chamber in any bicameral Legislature shall be elected by different people from those of the general electorate. Indeed, so to provide means that there is a minority within the community, however constituted, which may impose its will upon the remainder of the community. Even if we are to accept a bicameral Legislature—and I personally see no real advantages in such a Legislature—I believe that

already it has been clearly shown in New Zealand and in Queensland that no real advantage is derived from having a bicameral Legislature at all. Unfortunately, if we are to retain such a Legislature there is only one purpose in having an Upper House, and that is to see that that House is so constituted that it may give second thoughts to the Lower House, and that it may delay and suggest amendments to the Lower House's deliberations by its being elected by the same electors, but either from different districts or over different periods. That, of course, is the position that has been taken in relation to the Constitutions of the States of the United States of America by the United States Supreme Court in recent decisions in that country. The justices of the United States Supreme Court in a series of decisions have virtually said what I have just stated, namely, that to give a special section of the community, constituted on a property qualification, an educational qualification or an area qualification (or some other qualification of this kind other than that of mere citizenship), the right to impose its will upon the popularly elected House would thereby deprive the citizens and any democratically elected House of their very democracy.

If we give a right of veto to a minority in the community we then negate the very purpose of democracy. That, of course, is the position here, for we have a Legislative Council constituted by a small minority and elected by a small minority of the population. The way in which the Legislative Council is constituted has enabled this Government to produce in that Chamber a completely unrepresentative and undemocratic body. This is effected by an administrative manipulation of the present enrolment provisions of the Upper House and by providing the household suffrage, based either on the householder or property ownership, with some minor qualifications as far as the rights of servicemen are concerned, and a voluntary enrolment. This Government has seen to it that the number of electors enrolled for the Upper House is far smaller than the number of qualified voters. Although by arrangement with the Commonwealth Electoral Office, houses in this State are canvassed for enrolment of the Lower House of the State Parliament as well as of the two Commonwealth Houses, in the course of that canvass no mention is made to the citizen of his rights for enrolment of the Upper House of this State. Indeed, many citizens do not know how the Upper House is constituted nor precisely what is its position or power.

Mr. Millhouse: That is true, of course, of the Senate as well.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In the case of the Senate one is automatically enrolled.

Mr. Millhouse: The people still do not know much about it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: They know more about it than about the Legislative Council in South Australia. Indeed, even the officers of the Electoral Office—those part-time officers who are hired at election time—do not know how the Council is constituted. Election after election we have complaints on this side of the House that a poll clerk has turned away qualified electors for the Upper House because he does not know how the Upper House is constituted. That happened in my district at the last elections; I was called to the polling booth, the Rechabite Hall on the Norwood Parade, and four electors complained that they had been to the polling booth and had been asked whether they were owners of freehold property—an illegal question under the Act—and when they had answered “No” they had been told they had no vote and had been turned away from the poll. I went to the presiding officer and inquired, and he said, “They are not owners of freehold property.” I replied that they did not have to be, and I pointed out that numbers of other qualifications existed. He then admitted that I was telling him something. I told him a few other things at the same time! However, that is not an isolated case. What happens is that the Government sees to it that, by administrative provisions in the Electoral Office, this Constitution is furthered in South Australia. The popular vote in South Australia is overwhelmingly in favour of the Opposition Party, for the members on this side of the House represent 312,000 of the enrolled numbers in the House of Assembly elections in South Australia while members opposite represent only 212,000. This means that 100,000 fewer voters are represented by the Government in this Chamber. Despite that fact, there are in the Legislative Council 16 Government members and only four members of the Party that has the overwhelming majority of popular support in this State.

How is this done? Simply by seeing to it that the Electoral Office sends out invitations to go on to the electoral roll for the Upper House only to those persons who register transfers of property at the Lands Titles Office. Holders of property qualification No. 1 in the Legislative Council are the only people who are told anything by the Electoral Office about

their right to be on the Legislative Council roll. In the result, less than one-third of the qualified voters are on the roll for that place, and most voters entitled to be on the roll know nothing about their qualifications for it. This is deliberate electoral manipulation by the Government of this minority property qualification. Even if all the entitled electors were on the roll for the Legislative Council, it would still be unjust that this minority in the community (because it could not constitute a majority of the citizens of the State) should have an unqualified right to say “No” to anything desired by the House elected on adult suffrage.

I was chided last evening for suggesting that we look to the reason and logic advanced in the United States of America concerning the bases of democratic constitutions because, I was told, we were not an offshoot of that country. Well, reason and logic knows no country. If we turn to the country of which we are an offshoot—the United Kingdom—and look at its Constitution, we see that the second Chamber only has the right to delay for 12 months measures insisted upon by the Lower House, and thereupon the popularly elected House may insist upon its measure and it becomes law whether or not the Upper House agrees. Here in this community we find that a small minority of the population is able to say “No” to anything that the Lower House endeavours to pass into law; they have an unqualified right of veto, and far greater power than has the House of Lords, and in those circumstances it is an intolerable let and hindrance on the rights of the average citizen that he should be so denied his ability to carry into effect the policies he seeks through his elected representatives.

It has been suggested that members on this side (because on another occasion we would not agree to an utterly obnoxious Bill that contained extensions of the Legislative Council franchise as an incidental) are opposed to an extension of the Legislative Council franchise. If there is to be a second Chamber in this Parliament we believe that that second Chamber must be elected only upon adult suffrage. We want to give every citizen a right to vote for that House and for this House, and we want to return to one vote one value for both Houses. We want to see both Houses of the Legislature elected on a democratic basis, for then and then only will there be a proper basis for a second Chamber in this Parliament. There could be some arguments for it then, although I do not agree with those arguments,

but at any rate there would be some reasoning in an argument in favour of a second Chamber. As at present constituted, the second Chamber is a complete denial of any pretension to democratic right in South Australia, and therefore I believe we should pass this Bill to provide for adult suffrage in the Upper House. We should also see to it that any qualified voter in the Upper House has a right to election to that House. Under the provisions governing election to our Legislative Council, some of the greatest statesmen in the history of the British Commonwealth could not, at the age when they made their mark in politics, have gained election to that august Chamber in South Australia. They would have been debarred by age. It becomes a Chamber which is (apart from the liveliness that can be injected into it by the few Labor members there) for the most part overwhelmingly concerned with the cultivation of leisure with dignity. The only time that other members of that Chamber creak into action is when some property right is affected; then, it is true, they set out to look after the huntin', fishin' and shootin' at a very great rate. But for the rest, why, Sir, the average citizen in this community is not adequately protected. It is only the wealthy minority of the community whose interests are represented by the majority of members of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that inverted snobbery on your part?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not think so.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, I do.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The honourable member can call it what he likes. All I say is that I do not call it snobbery to deride the establishment in South Australia. I admit that I was brought up into it, and I admit that it gave me a pain in the long intestine. I do not believe that the Upper House in this Parliament should in its present form be retained, and the only measure that can do anything at all to justify the retention of an Upper House in this Parliament is to see that that Chamber is elected upon adult suffrage and upon no other basis. For those reasons I commend the Bill to the House and I hope that members will support it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill. I do so with a good deal of hope, for this afternoon I was told by the Premier that he was opposed to any privileged class, and if that attitude persists the Bill undoubtedly will be carried by the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. Bywaters: You wouldn't say it is a privileged class up there, would you?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Of course it is a privileged class, and it has been so to the detriment of the progress of South Australia ever since it has been in existence. I agree with those who say that it would be well to abolish the place. A considerable proportion of the electors of this House are in fact disfranchised because they have no voice whatever in the Upper House. Amongst those people we find some who are responsible for ensuring that this country remains a Christian country, for few ministers of religion own property and therefore few are permitted to exercise their voice regarding who shall represent them in the Upper House. This is a disgrace to a so-called Christian community. Of course, we will always pander to the women when we need their support; we have done that in time of war, when we have told them that they are the most wonderful creatures in the world if they give up their sons to fight for democracy, a democracy that never existed in South Australia, for five-sixths of the women that have a vote for this Chamber have no voice whatever in the election of the Upper House. They become the slaves of the dictators of a privileged class.

Mr. Shannon: How did that one woman get into the Legislative Council if they had no voice at all?

Mr. HUTCHENS: She is one of the small percentage of one-sixth.

Mr. Shannon: You now remember there is one up there?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, and there are a few old women here now.

Mr. Shannon: One is having a go now.

Mr. HUTCHENS: And when you stop it will be all right. If we are going to talk about democracy with our tongues in our cheeks we are not only going to endanger this country but also the British Commonwealth of Nations. Today, throughout the Commonwealth, many people are getting self-government for the first time, and they are looking at the system that has proved to be successful in the Commonwealth. If they look at South Australia, which is an alleged democracy but really no more than an autocracy, they would certainly reject democracy. However, where do they turn when they reject democracy? No-one knows. If however, we want to establish Communism or a dictatorship the way to do that is to retain our present system of election for the Legislative Council.

Much has been said in support of this Bill and no reasonable argument has been put forward against it, although some unreasonable arguments have been put forward. The fact is, of course, that a privileged class is enrolled for election of the Upper House. It is a restricted franchise. Often the Premier would be happy to be rid of the Upper House as it is constituted.

Mr. Bywaters: He would be, on the last night of the session!

Mr. HUTCHENS: Not only then. If the Labor Party were elected as the Government in the more popular Chamber, its intentions would be nullified by the minority of the people and that could never be called democracy. In the interests of democracy, of the progress of Australia, and of the development of the British Commonwealth of Nations I believe that this Bill must receive the wholehearted support of the House.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I add my support to the remarks already made by the Leader and the members for Norwood and Hindmarsh. They have covered the subject fairly adequately. All people who elect their representatives in the House of Assembly must feel a sense of shame when they realize that all of the efforts put forward in this House can be completely nullified by the Upper House as it is now constituted. Frequently I have parties visit Parliament, as do other members, and I take them through this House first and then to the Legislative Council. I explain the set-up in this House and the set-up in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Clark: You try to explain the set-up in the Legislative Council!

Mr. BYWATERS: I explain it as it is and do not seek to justify it. Although I have often offered a prize to any visitor who can name his four Legislative Council representatives, I have never had a taker. I think that would apply to practically every district. People know their House of Assembly member (and this applies to both sides of the House) but when it comes to the Legislative Council they do not know who their representatives are. Frequently I have had it put to me that the best representation cannot be given by a member of the Opposition and that better representation will be given by a Government member, who will be able to achieve more for the district. However, people who say this forget that there are four Legislative Council members with the same representative rights as Assembly members. They do not realize this

because Council members are not known as well and take very little interest in what is going on.

Mr. Lawn: Do Government members say that the Government serves them better?

Mr. BYWATERS: That is frequently said, and other country members have had the same experience, I am sure. This sort of thing is put up from time to time. I agree with other speakers that it is regrettable that this Bill cannot abolish the Legislative Council altogether. However, I feel it will do something towards bringing about a slightly more even distribution of representation between the two Houses. This will enable us to be able to tell the people of South Australia that they have the same right to vote for both the Assembly and the Legislative Council. I think that would be a step in the right direction. The situation in the Legislative Council is rather funny at times, particularly towards the closing stages of the session, and I have noticed this repeatedly.

Mr. Clark: Funny peculiar or funny humorous?

Mr. BYWATERS: Peculiar. The position is that Legislative Council members, at the end of a session, make some effort to justify their position by moving innocuous amendments to Bills that have been passed in this House. They debate the amendments at some length and send them back. Sometimes they are accepted here and sometimes they are not but, in the main, they are usually so trivial that it does not matter whether we accept them or not.

Mr. Hutchens: They take themselves more seriously than anyone else does?

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes. They are trying to justify their existence when they make these amendments. Mostly the amendments are just a lot of words. If we look at the respective hours of sittings of the two Houses we see that there is no real comparison. This is because there is not sufficient voice by the Opposition in the Legislative Council. Debates in this House are carried to a great extent by Opposition members' drawing attention to the reasons behind the legislation, but this is not possible in the Council because it has only four Opposition members. That is entirely wrong.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Would those four Labor members vote for the abolition of the Council?

Mr. BYWATERS: I am sure they would.

Mr. Shannon: Did they in New South Wales?



Mr. BYWATERS: We are not talking about New South Wales.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Have your four colleagues in the Council ever stated that they would agree to vote for its abolition?

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes. If the Minister reads through debates from the Legislative Council (and I know that many members do not read them because they are of so little value) he will see the stand taken by Labor members there. Labor Party policy is to abolish the Upper House.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): Order! The Bill does not deal with the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Mr. BYWATERS: I assure the Minister that the four Labor members of the Legislative Council would be pleased to see it abolished.

Mr. Clark: The Government should allow the Bill to pass to see what would happen.

Mr. BYWATERS: As my colleague has said, this would be an excellent opportunity, if the Government wanted proof, to pass the Bill, and to see what happened, and the honourable Minister would receive his reply.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### DRAINAGE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Dunstan:

(For wording of motion, see page 595.)

(Continued from September 2. Page 750.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lawn: I suppose you are going to adjourn this one, too.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member will let me say what I have to say without prejudicing my remarks, I shall appreciate it. I have discussed this matter with the member for Norwood. As is generally known, a move is afoot for the formation of a metropolitan drainage authority which, I think it is reasonable to assume, would undertake the task that the honourable member wishes to be undertaken in order to alleviate the problem to which he has referred. If this is so, I consider that it would be prudent for the House to defer further comment on this motion until the formation of the authority can be determined. I believe that within the forthcoming week a decision will be made on this matter, and I therefore suggest that I have leave to continue my remarks. I give the member for Norwood an undertaking that, if the

drainage authority is not formed by next Wednesday or there is no assurance that it will be, he will have the opportunity to continue with the motion standing in his name. If he agrees to that, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### WEST TORRENS BY-LAW: ZONING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That by-law No. 19 of the Corporation of the City of West Torrens in respect of zoning, made on November 26, 1963, and laid on the table of this House on June 10, 1964, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 2. Page 755.)

Mr. BOCKELBERG (Eyre): I support briefly the finding of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Mr. Branson, on behalf of the Chamber of Manufactures, attended before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and gave evidence. The committee visited the site in company with the Clerk of the West Torrens council, and called evidence from Mr. Hart (Town Planner). It was the unanimous finding of the committee that this by-law should be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I thank members who have taken part in this debate for what they have said. I sympathize with the point of view expressed by the member for West Torrens, but point out that this motion involves a principle that goes far beyond the boundaries of West Torrens or any council area. In 1962 the Town Planning Committee presented to Parliament its development plan for the metropolitan area. That plan provided for zones for certain purposes. The plan was laid on the table of this House and remained there for a period. This gave members an adequate opportunity, if they wanted it, to refer back the plan for further consideration by the committee. That was not done. The implication in our lack of action in that regard is that Parliament accepted the proposals contained in the development plan, and that, I think, has been assumed widely in the community. In fact, the plan has not, of itself, any legal backing or standing.

The West Torrens council in this by-law intends to change a zone within that city, and those proposals cut across those contained in the development plan. It seems that the council did not take account of the proposals of the Town Planning Committee in drawing these zones. There may sometimes be justification for ignoring the proposals of the Town Planning Committee, but the evidence is that

in the present circumstances in that area there is no justification for doing so. Therefore, if this by-law is allowed to stand it is tantamount to this House saying that it is not prepared to accept the development plan prepared by the Town Planning Committee. There will be other by-laws from time to time, if this one is allowed to stand, that will cut across those proposals. In other words, the development plan will be a dead letter. I believe that is undesirable, as do the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. On the other hand, by agreeing to this motion we shall re-affirm our support for the Town Planner, for the Town Planning Committee, and for the development plan, and I believe that that is our correct course.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunstan, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jennings, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.  
Motion thus carried.

#### LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL COURTS AND WORKMEN'S LIENS) BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (DOG FENCE AND VERMIN) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1965.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1965, a sum of £18,000,000 be granted: Provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments and services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1964, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It follows the usual form of Supply Bills and provides for the issue of a further £10,000,000 to enable the public service to function during the period in which the Estimates of Expenditure and the Appropriation Bill will be debated by Parliament. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £10,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages which may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages. The Under Treasurer reported to me yesterday that it was necessary to pass another Supply Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

#### THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £112,568,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 15. Page 820.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): During the Address in Reply debate earlier this session I raised a matter concerning the Daughters of Charity, an organization in my district. I referred to a letter that I had sent the Treasurer some time ago seeking a charitable grant similar to that made to other organizations and I am disappointed to find no provision in the Budget in accordance with that request. I shall not debate the matter at length because the inquiries that should have been made have not been made and the Treasurer has assured me that he will have

them made. Therefore, I hope that the Treasurer will agree to the request.

I wish to deal with valuations of the Land Board. From time to time I have received complaints about the compulsory acquisition of land for the purpose of widening roads. However, I have never struck an instance before like the one to which I shall now refer. Last week I was approached by two of my constituents, a husband and wife. I received a telephone call from them, visited their property, and saw for myself what is happening to it and to other nearby properties on Cowandilla Road. They sent me a letter, which I have today passed on to the Minister of Lands. I have made observations in this area and had discussions with various landholders there. The couple I have referred to said that in October or November, 1962, they were notified by the Highways Department that Her Majesty intended to acquire 1½ perches of their land. This involved a loss of 236 sq. ft. of shop space, plus 7ft. from the adjoining house on Cowandilla Road. They will also lose 20ft. of the shop down the side street, as they are on a corner block.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Was there a shop on the block?

Mr. LAWN: There was a shop on the corner and a house adjoining. They will lose 7ft. from the adjoining house and 20ft. from the side of the shop because the corner is going to be on an angle. They were asked to submit a claim for compensation. They obtained a comprehensive report and valuation of the land involved from E. C. R. Shepherd & Sons. They then submitted their claim for compensation at £2,982. On April 29, 1964, they were visited by an officer of the Highways Department who informed them that on the previous day a new acquisition law had been passed whereby the department could now acquire their shop, dwelling, and stock. The officer informed them that this information had been given to him at a board meeting on April 28. I do not know of any acquisition law that was passed in April this year unless some new regulation was issued by the department. I take it for granted that the Minister will fully explain the matters raised in the letter.

On May 28, 1964, they were visited by an officer of the Land Board who informed them that their shop was not a profitable store, that stores similar to theirs could not hope to cope with competition from large supermarkets and big businesses in any case, and, therefore, they might as well have their property acquired and not go broke later on. My constituent told me on the Monday morning when I visited the store

(he had his books and so on) that he should know better than anyone else whether it was a profitable store and whether he was likely to go broke. He told me he had been in the business for years and was not worried. In any case (and I think the Minister might agree) if a man is prepared to continue his business at his own risk the Land Board should not have the right to tell him that he is going to go broke or that his business is not profitable.

This man is content with the profit he is making and wants to stay in the shop. He will put up with the inconvenience, to which I shall refer later, rather than leave the shop: he is content and satisfied with the profit he is making. He told me that his next-door neighbour (and I verified this with the neighbour) received £300 for a 7ft. strip off the front of his premises, plus an allowance of £10 to clean up the rubbish from his old fence. These premises would be about 60ft. wide and fronting Cowandilla Road. The premises to which I have been referring have a frontage of 47ft. 6in. My constituents' solicitors told them that they were being offered under £200 for the land involved and this was after they had consulted with the Land Board or the Highways Department, either of which is in consultation with the Government. The total figure offered was £2,344 and the remainder is for the shop and the loss of the business and so on. The land involved was valued by E. C. R. Shepherd & Sons at £500. Only about £80 has been offered for painting and signwriting the new shop front and so on, although these people estimate their painting costs will be £330. They said that the sign writing alone will cost a considerable sum.

This is a Four Square shop and someone from the headquarters of the Four Square shops, who should know what he is talking about from experience, said that the £80 offered by the Land Board would not pay for the cost of marking out the signwriting, let alone the cost of painting and of the labour involved. They have lost their verandah and the painting and signwriting on that will have to be put on the shop front. These people have claimed £2,982, whereas the offer, presumably from the Land Board, is £2,344. They will lose 236 square ft. of shop premises, also 7ft. of the house frontage, and they estimate the offer by the Land Board will be short by £638. This couple intended later to open a ladies hair-dressing shop and set their daughter in business as a hairdresser when she completed her education. This plan of course, will now have to be abandoned, as the remaining space of the premises will be required in its entirety for

storage to enable them to conduct their present business. For a 47ft. 6in. frontage on a corner block, the offer was less than £200. For the 60ft. block next door the owner received £300, and he told me that he had relatives in the street who had received £300 to £340. For a frontage of 67ft. 6in. on a corner block on Marion Road, the Land Board offered £110 six months ago, and that was accepted. I have always understood that the Land Board was competent and made proper valuations, because I had no reason to believe that it made mistakes. However, having in mind these details, I wonder what the Land Board is doing. I would have written to the Minister and to the department and conveyed the replies to these people had the matter been more simple. I have placed questions on the Notice Paper seeking information about the factors considered by the Land Board in arriving at a valuation. I hope the Minister will have this matter further investigated to see whether a satisfactory explanation is available. Perhaps the differences in the valuations can be explained, but I await the reply with interest.

During the Address in Reply debate the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) referred to the Socialist undertakings of the State. I said that he must have read a previous speech of mine because I had said the same thing. Next March members opposite will be given an opportunity by the *Advertiser* and *News* to make a statement of 400 or 500 words about the election campaign. Certain members that I could name will say they are opposed to Socialism. I draw the attention of the House to the State's activities, having in mind the remarks by Government speakers yesterday. The Auditor-General's Report, on page 213, states:

The Electricity Trust balance-sheet showed that the total funds employed in the electricity undertaking at June 30, 1964, amounted to £127,556,000, compared with £118,543,000 at the end of the previous year. Those totals included internal funds by way of provisions for depreciation and equalization of financial charges, investigations, developmental expenditure, etc., together with accumulated surpluses £3,726,000 at June 30, 1964, retained and used in the undertaking. Significant features of the 1963-64 operations were:

a. The surplus was £450,000 compared with £137,000 in the previous year.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. LAWN: The report continues:

b. Debenture interest charged against revenue rose by £379,000 to £4,631,000. The average rate of interest payable at June 30, 1964, was 4.89 per cent (up .02).

Revenue Statement.

The number of consumers supplied directly by the trust at June 30, 1964, was 328,465, an increase of 15,962 (5 per cent) for the year.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): There is too much audible conversation on my right.

Mr. LAWN: That is a State undertaking resulting from legislation passed about 1947. It was stated earlier today that the Premier might be pleased to get rid of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Ryan: That is long overdue.

Mr. LAWN: The first time the legislation for a Royal Commission was introduced it was defeated by the Legislative Council. The second time the Bill was passed by this House, the Legislative Council agreed to the setting up of a Royal Commission, the Government to have one nominee, the Chairman to be a judge, and the old Adelaide Electricity Supply Company to have a nominee. The Legislative Council, on the second attempt, agreed to the Bill in its amended form for a Royal Commission to inquire into the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited. As the commission consisted of a nominee of the company and a judge of the Supreme Court, it was considered that it did not matter what the Government nominee did or said, or how he voted, because the odds would be against any recommendation adverse to the company. Strange to say, the report was unanimous. The company's representative voted in favour of the Government's taking over the old company, because it would be in the interests of the State. Members opposite criticize the taking over of private enterprise, and I do not advocate the wholesale taking over of private enterprise. The Adelaide Electric Supply Company, by its very name, catered exclusively for Adelaide and the metropolitan area. It did not believe in extending its activities to country areas at huge costs for only a small return and for only the few consumers that would receive the power. It wanted to develop in the metropolitan area. Members opposite over the years have complimented the Government on the activities of that undertaking and on the way people have been receiving power for the first time in their lives. The Government provided £1,000,000 for the Electricity Trust to supply power to country areas, with the result that the whole State would benefit. It would have been a different result had this been left to private enterprise, which is only interested in undertakings that return a profit. For many years now no increased charges have been imposed by the

trust (which is, of course, a State undertaking) although increases in wages and in interest on loans have occurred. The trust has been able to absorb all those increases and yet still increase its profit, which was £450,000 for the year just ended and £137,000 for the previous year.

Mr. Clark: And it has given a service to the community, too!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, a good service. I think the reference to the trust in the Auditor-General's Report reflects great credit on such a State instrumentality.

Mr. Burdon: It should make some people see the light!

Mr. LAWN: It should, and I hope that the member for Stirling, to whom I referred earlier, will see the light and appreciate our Party's attitude on this matter. The Government Printing Office's activities are outlined on pages 193 and 194 of the Auditor-General's Report. There was a surplus for the year of £4,454. Then, on pages 244 to 251 under the heading "Revenue Statement" the Housing Trust's activities are set out. The surplus on activities for 1963-64 (£420,623) represented an increase of £164,000 compared with the previous year. The percentage of surplus to mean funds employed was 0.5 per cent. If we had left housing to private enterprise there is no telling what would have happened. Would private enterprise build the thousands of houses that the trust has built on the same profit basis of 0.5 per cent? Never!

Mr. Casey: The member for Rocky River is not here at the moment; he is the Government's spokesman on that score.

Mr. LAWN: This is another State activity that is not only able to build badly needed houses for people but is providing houses at much cheaper rentals than private landlords would charge. Many people are paying eight guineas and 10 guineas today for a half a house or a flat—

Mr. Ryan: With no protection whatsoever!

Mr. LAWN: That is correct. The Housing Trust is not concerned with R.I.P.—rent, interest, and profit! At pages 254 to 257, the State Bank's activities are outlined under the heading "General banking and credit foncier business". The financial position of the bank continued to improve and at June 30, 1964, the same high level of liquidity and steady return on funds invested was shown as for previous years. Annual profits have progressively increased and for the last six years have aggregated £1,000,000. Over that period, there have also been significant increases in

advances on overdraft and under credit foncier terms as well as increases in customers' deposits and advances by the State Treasurer. I should like to see this instrumentality delve further into hire-purchase and make more money available at a lower rate of interest than that at which private enterprise makes it available.

Mr. Clark: Is there any reference to a State insurance scheme?

Mr. LAWN: No, but I shall refer to that in a moment. I recall an incident during the year when a person desired to purchase a motor car; he had to borrow the money. I know that money can be borrowed from hire-purchase companies or even from the car dealer himself for this purpose. Many dealers make the money available at 6 per cent interest. In this case the dealer offered to arrange for a loan of £800 at 6 per cent interest to purchase the car and told the purchaser that he could repay the money at the rate of £22 a month. The purchaser decided to investigate other sources of finance and finally obtained an overdraft of £800 at 6½ per cent. However, that money is being paid back each month and is earning 5½ per cent interest, whereas hire-purchase companies and dealers such as the one in this case do not pay a penny interest on the money repaid by the purchaser. Over three or four years, 5½ per cent interest on each repayment of, say, £22 a month would be considerable.

Mr. Bywaters: Plus the fact that the other method involves a flat rate of interest!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The hire-purchase companies (and the dealer I have in mind) would have charged £48 a year until the debt was discharged, whereas the overdraft rate of 6½ per cent represents only a difference between any credit in the bank and the money owed, on a simple interest basis. Previously I borrowed money from a hire-purchase company in Grenfell Street at a 9 per cent flat rate of interest, which worked out at 19 per cent on simple interest. After a few months a friend of mine arranged for a bank to handle that transaction and the hire purchase company was paid off. On that occasion the rate of interest on my bank overdraft was 6 per cent. That was the overdraft rate which, of course, was only on the difference between whatever credit I had in the bank from day to day and the money that I borrowed. I would like to see the banks' activities greatly extended.

I think the Woods and Forests Department was one of the departments referred to by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) in the Address in Reply debate. The department's operations for the year are referred to on pages

185 to 189 of the Auditor-General's report, and on page 185 we find the following:

The surpluses transferred during the year from plantations increased by £29,000 to £770,000. Contributions to Consolidated Revenue for the year from the surpluses of the undertaking were £540,000, compared with £360,000 in 1962-63.

Mr. Bywaters: Government members would support this, yet it is Socialism.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Next March Government members will say they are opposed to Socialism.

Mr. Bywaters: I think they said Socialism was the same as Communism.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and that they are opposed to both. The honourable member, the trapeze artist from Torrens, said there was a difference between an increase in a rating assessment to a householder and an increase in the actual rate. However, I still fail to see where that difference is, for if a man has to pay £5 extra to the Government I see no difference in whether he has to pay it because his assessment has been increased or because the rate in the pound has been increased. Government members will be saying next March that they are opposed to Socialism, but they will have to answer to the people why they continue sponsoring socialistic enterprises. While I am not prepared to admit that the Electricity Trust is completely socialized, I maintain that the only thing necessary to make it so would be to make the present trust answerable to the Minister, who in turn would be answerable to Parliament. The same thing applies to the Housing Trust. I believe that the Woods and Forests Department is a completely socialized department, for it is completely under the control of the Minister of Forests.

Mr. Bywaters: The State Bank is another example of Socialism.

Mr. LAWN: The bank has a board, but I am not sure whether that board is answerable to a Minister, although the member for Murray may be right in what he says. Previously I have drawn attention to the surpluses the Woods and Forests Department contributes to the State Budget every year. The department is ploughing back between £250,000 and £500,000 every year into its undertaking. I think that the present £540,000 may be one of the highest contributions it has made to the Treasury, but I know it has made a contribution of about £400,000 in years gone by. I think more of these socialized activities would be a good thing for the State.

Mr. Clark: It would be a good thing to have a State Insurance Office.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I dealt with that matter at length last year, and I submitted a graph, which appears in *Hansard*, showing the activities of State insurance offices in other States. The Treasurer can get up here and say just what he wishes to; if he wants to support something he will have a good argument that way, and if he wishes to oppose something he can pull arguments out of the air that sound quite logical. I have heard the Treasurer say more than once that the State insurance offices in other States are losing money, but I know that that is not so. Members on both sides of the House will recall that some time ago a couple of private insurance companies that were operating in this State had to go out of business, and I know that people in this State (in fact, some were constituents of mine) were told that they could put in a claim and that when the whole matter was finalized they would get any dividend that was paid, which could be one shilling in the pound, and perhaps not even that much. Many people had their compulsory third party insurance with those companies. The law of this State compels motorists to take out third party policies. I agree with that law, and I would not suggest that a person be able to drive a car without that compulsory insurance. I also agree with the method of administering the insurance. As members know, it is necessary to produce the receipt for the premium before the Registrar of Motor Vehicles will issue registration papers. However, it is wrong that those people, having complied with the law regarding compulsory insurance, should be called upon to bear a loss when a private enterprise insurance company goes broke. Some of those people had to meet commitments of several hundreds of pounds, and they will be working for the rest of their lives to pay it.

It is compulsory for every employer to take out a workmen's compensation insurance for each of his employees, and I wholeheartedly agree with that. It was a long time before this principle of workmen's compensation insurance was accepted, but the law today provides for it. I believe that a State Insurance Office should be established and that it should be permitted to take any kind of insurance. However, I maintain that compulsory insurance such as workmen's compensation and third party insurance should be handled only by a State Insurance Office, for this would ensure that those people who complied with the law by taking out the compulsory insurance would be protected. That was the position in Queensland prior to the Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government taking office there, and I do not think it has changed.

Mr. Corcoran: No, that is still the position.

Mr. LAWN: That Coalition Government has been in office for some years now, and apparently it has not seen any reason to alter the law that was implemented by a Labor Government. Obviously, that Government finds it advisable and more advantageous to the State to continue what the Labor Government introduced. Incidentally, Queensland has not considered it necessary to have two Houses of Parliament. The same thing applies in New Zealand, where the Liberal Party Government has never seen fit to restore the Upper House. As a matter of fact, it was a Liberal Party that abolished the New Zealand Upper House.

I do not think there is any need for anyone to ask me whether I support or oppose the Budget. Before I have finished speaking everyone will know where I stand. I will not vote for increased taxes in the manner suggested by this Budget while an undertaking such as a State Insurance Office could earn more revenue for the State. We could make savings. Over the years I have worked in private industry, and I know that every now and then employers get a bee in their bonnets that they must make a drive for increased production. The late Mr. E. W. Holden, a former member of the Legislative Council, told the union with which I was associated that he did not have to go around and tell the men to speed up; all he had to do (this was not in the days of full employment) was give his foremen instructions to sack a few men in each department. In that way he got extra work. That is the way he got extra production in the old firm of Holdens. That is the type of thinking amongst our friends opposite. If they do not think that way, the people they represent do. It did not matter whether women were involved in the practice at Holden's, either. That is another reason why women should have a vote in the Legislative Council. Employers make efficiency drives in various ways.

I say emphatically that there is no need for this State to have two electoral rolls, two cards, two different envelopes, and all the different rigmarole. I do not know whether the State Government has to pay postage on enrolment cards. An elector makes an application on one card, and this places him on the rolls of the House of Assembly, the House of Representatives, and the Senate. However, a special card and a special envelope are needed to enrol for the Legislative Council and there is a special way to get the card.

Mr. Jennings: Ironically, it is a pink card!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it is. We have been accused of being Communists, yet members of the Party opposite sell their wheat to Red China or anywhere. As a matter of fact, they were selling wheat to Russia in the depression years for 1s. 10d. because that was 2d. more than England would pay.

Mr. Hutchens: In the final analysis, this is public expenditure for political purposes.

Mr. LAWN: It is. There is no need to have two cards, two separate envelopes, and two separate rolls. The Government could save money if this were not necessary.

Mr. Clark: The Legislative Council could be abolished, of course.

Mr. LAWN: The complete answer is the abolition of the Legislative Council. However, we are discussing the Budget, and if we adopt it we shall be imposing greater taxes on the people. If the Legislative Council were abolished, we could save a great deal of unnecessary expenditure of public money. It could be said that I have not referred to all the matters referred to in the Auditor-General's report. Some departments have incurred losses but, as I said in the Address in Reply debate, I would not expect private enterprise to run the Museum, the Art Gallery, or the Public Library. They would not do so unless the undertakings showed a profit. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that we should close our Railways Department and give private enterprise £4,000,000 a year to run it. That came from a member of Parliament! It was not said as a joke; it was in reply to an interjection, I believe from this side of the House, on whether the railways should run at a loss.

Mr. Loveday: The farmers would soon be squealing about it!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. That honourable member said we should close the railways and give private enterprise the grant we are now giving to the Railways Department. Even he would admit that private enterprise would not run the railways or anything else unless they made a profit. He had the audacity to say that we should hand over the railways (he did not say we should sell them) and then hand over a subsidy to run them. Before I even went to work I heard that the Government was granting concessions not only to farmers and country people but to Holdens to set them up in business. Private enterprise could not survive without the people. If it were not for the people who purchase their products, they could not function, and this applies to the cheque system. Cheques

are written out and handed around, but they would not be worth the paper they were written on unless people accepted them. I do not want to get into an argument on credit, however.

This is the second Budget this year imposing extra taxation on the people. Under the Commonwealth Budget people have had an extra 5 per cent income tax imposed on them. The purchasers of motor vehicles have had a further increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax, and now this Government proposes further increases in taxation. I turn now to the statement made by the Treasurer in introducing this Budget. It cannot be reconciled with the statements of the cheer-chasing member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and of the member for Rocky River. Even the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) told us what a wonderful State this was.

Mr. Loveday: Bursting at the seams with prosperity!

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but that was different from what the Treasurer said. I do not know that Government members read the Treasurer's statement; they seem to take it for granted that the master cannot do anything wrong. The member for Barossa thought it was a great thing that the Treasurer became Premier and Treasurer on November 5, 1938—Guy Fawkes Day. I think it was a black day for the State, as I think it is when any Liberal becomes a member of Parliament. Unfortunately, members opposite do not have the same democratic feelings that I have—that the people should be entitled to have a Labor Government if they want it. If the people obtain the Government they elect and want, they deserve what they get, but if the same rule is used they can change the Government at the next election. That is the principle of democracy, which unfortunately does not exist in South Australia.

*(Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.)*

Mr. LAWN: At page 3, the Financial Statement reads:

Whilst the South Australian economy is in excellent condition and the outlook very good, the 1964-65 Revenue Budget for a number of reasons presents some difficulties.

Although the Treasurer says, for political reasons, that our economy is sound he expresses some doubt, for page 5 of the statement reads:

I feel bound to express the view that the Commonwealth has taken far too severe an approach in its financial policy towards the States. Had it not been for the considerable surpluses this State possesses from prior years and from the uranium project following upon the prudent budgetary policies adopted by the

Government, the impact upon our finances would have been severe in the extreme. Those surpluses will naturally not be available next year and, unless a substantially more favourable approach is then made by the Commonwealth, the 1965-66 State Budget will be very difficult.

Where in this statement can be found the prosperity that Government members are preaching about? In the fourth paragraph of his statement the Treasurer says that this Budget presents some difficulty and shortly afterwards he gives a strong hint about what the Government will do next year, when he says:

I feel bound to express the view that the Commonwealth has taken far too severe an approach in its financial policy towards the States.

That is the Liberal Party policy of tightening up finances, making less money available to the States for spending and increasing taxation so that people will have less money to spend in the community. It seems to me that in his Financial Statement the Treasurer has thrown out a strong hint that if the electors return his Government next year they can expect similar measures to those introduced some time ago by the Menzies Government in what was subsequently called the "horror" Budget.

Mr. Jennings: There will be a horror Budget after the Senate election, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: We may have another supplementary Budget in the Commonwealth sphere. On page 4 of his Financial Statement the Treasurer says:

The Government has felt bound to examine what increases in taxes and charges may be appropriate to reduce further the prospective deficit for the current year.

Therefore, obviously the Treasurer does not believe that this State is as prosperous as his colleagues, who have spoken in this debate, would have us believe.

Mr. Jennings: It gets to the stage where it is more difficult, while the next step is impossible.

Mr. LAWN: I agree. The Treasurer then refers to some increases the Government proposes, such as the increase in licence fees on insurance companies from 1¼ per cent to 5 per cent. That has been dealt with adequately by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) and other members. The financial statement also refers to the increase in the transfers of motor vehicles. I remind honourable members that since the Menzies Government was returned in 1949 there have been eight movements either increasing or reducing sales tax on motor



vehicles. The result in South Australia was severe as many employees are engaged in the motor vehicle industry. What was the effect on industry when the Menzies Government increased sales tax? Chrysler's at one stage just about went out of business. The fact that the Government has again increased sales tax by 2½ per cent will have an adverse effect, and now there is to be a further increase of 1 per cent on the cost of a motor car by the introduction of a new transfer fee. In introducing the Budget the Treasurer said:

South Australia has now had five years of financial independence from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and the results of next year's review of the taxation reimbursement grants arrangements, which are independent of the Commission, will indicate whether it is in the interests of the State to continue as a "non-claimant" State.

Mr. Jennings: I don't know whether they have had independence from it at all, really.

Mr. LAWN: The Treasurer expressed a further doubt about the future of South Australia when he said:

For the past five years, and even including the sixth which is the present rather difficult year for budgeting, there is no doubt that the interests of the State have been well served by being "non-claimant".

I do not know how the Treasurer claims that the interests of the State have been well served by its being "non-claimant", because he says that the surpluses built up over the last five years will be absorbed this year and there will be a deficit of £575,000. So, if he thinks that is being well served, then we have a different financial outlook. The statement continues:

Over that period we have had four years of surplus aggregating £3,610,000 and one deficit of £311,000. Allowing for a deficit this year of £2,492,000, the net result would still be favourable to the extent of about £800,000. The Treasurer said that as a non-claimant State we had been well served because over the first four years the surplus amounted to £3,610,000, but that is all going to be eaten up this year, and he is budgeting for a deficit of about £2,500,000! I call that a **black Budget**, almost approaching the horror Budget of the Menzies Government of a few years ago. I will not support this Budget. After being in the House with a man for 15 years, one has some idea of the workings of that man's mind and, after reading his statement, I am convinced that the Treasurer is giving a polite warning now that, if his Government is returned next year, this State will be heavily hit in the taxation field.

Mr. Jennings: You say that if there were not to be an election next year the taxes would be heavier.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. We know what has happened in the Commonwealth sphere. Each time the Menzies Government wishes to increase taxation, the Prime Minister goes to the people for an election irrespective of whether the Government has been in power for 12 months, 18 months or two years, and after he is returned for a further three years, he introduces increased taxation. Obviously this State's Treasurer would be no less astute in that regard than the Prime Minister. Rather than introduce a horror Budget a few months before the State elections, he is giving warning of what he is going to do next year, if he is returned, but I do not think he will be. That is what the people have to expect.

We have heard the Treasurer criticize the Prime Minister, and criticize the financial deal he receives from the Commonwealth Government. I do not know whether he receives any worse or any better deal than does the Bolte Government in Victoria or do other State Governments. As the member for Gawler said yesterday, when the Senate election is held shortly, the Treasurer and the Prime Minister will travel around the State arm in arm, kissing in each other's pocket, and the Treasurer will tell the South Australian people what a wonderful Prime Minister he is and will ask them to return three Liberal and Country League Senators.

Mr. Jennings: Will they bury the hatchet?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, for a while, but then they will fight like cat and dog, but the fights will be sham.

Mr. Bywaters: Or issue High Court writs.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and use pistols. The Treasurer and the Attorney-General went over with pistols and axes to take out a High Court writ.

Mr. Bywaters: Water pistols!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I oppose the Budget.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I cannot remember the last time the Treasurer in his Budget was obliged to tap several new fields of taxation at the same time. In this Budget, we have five specific areas of taxation in which the tax is either increased or in which it is imposed for the first time.

Mr. Ryan: Good or bad?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member for Port Adelaide will pay me the compliment of listening to me he will hear what I have to say about it.

Mr. Hutchens: He can suffer almost anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the honourable member said the member for Port Adelaide could say almost anything, and that would be extremely accurate, too. This taxation has been made necessary by a gap of about £4,500,000 between the expenditure required during 1964-65, and the revenue that can be anticipated without these increases in taxation. In his Budget speech, the Treasurer put the responsibility of the necessity for increasing taxation fairly and squarely on the Commonwealth Government, when he said:

I feel bound to express the view that the Commonwealth has taken far too severe an approach in its financial policy towards the States. Had it not been for the considerable surpluses this State possesses from prior years and from the uranium project following upon the prudent budgetary policies adopted by the Government, the impact upon our finances would have been severe in the extreme.

He then went on to say (and the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) spent some time talking of this) that unless there was a more favourable approach by the Commonwealth the 1965-66 Budget would be very difficult indeed.

This all merely underlines the growing financial dependence of the States upon the Commonwealth. That is a matter to which I have referred previously in this debate. I believe that, accepting the current trend of opinion in Australia, this is inevitable. It is apparently in accord with the outlook of the Australian people and since this Budget was introduced, of course, we have had the sharp reaction all over Australia to the Victorian Budget introduced by the Treasurer of that State (Mr. Henry Bolte) last week. What he proposes is, so far as one can tell, perfectly constitutional—provided the Commonwealth Government will play, of course. There is nothing unconstitutional about it but there is no doubt that it has created resentment both within and without the State of Victoria. I notice that in his statements the Victorian Premier does not seem to be quite so definite in his plans now as he was when he first made the suggestion in his Budget speech a week ago.

Mr. Bywaters: It appears that most people are in favour of uniform taxation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member sums up what I have been saying: it appears that most people in Australia now favour uniform taxation. I personally believe it is a great pity that the Commonwealth and the State Governments have not over the last decade or so been more active in this matter, because 10 years ago the climate of opinion

in Australia would have favoured the handing back of income taxing powers to the States. That would have been desirable. Now, however, it seems that it is too late, that it is no longer a matter of practical politics. In that time, things have joggled along quite well. We have had an extremely capable Commonwealth Government and a number of very capable Liberal Governments.

Mr. Bywaters: Many people would not agree with that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Most electors throughout Australia have agreed time and again about that, so I think the less the honourable member says about it the better. However, I think that these Governments must bear some responsibility and, in my view, some blame for not acting earlier on this matter and trying to do something about it. Of course, the tragedy is that if the Labor Party ever does get back to power in the Commonwealth sphere—

Mr. Coumbe: It seems rather unlikely.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, there is very little prospect of that happening now. As I was saying, if the Labor Party ever does get back to power in Canberra, as may happen one day in 10 or 20 years' time (one never knows), the squeeze will be on and there is no doubt that a Commonwealth Labor Government would use its overwhelming financial power to squeeze the life out of the States.

Mr. Casey: Have you got a crystal ball over there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I happen to have a copy of the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party*, something which the member for Frome would do well to study. It does not need a crystal ball to know that it is the policy of the Party opposite to destroy the federal system of Australia, and it will be easy for that Party to do just that if it regains power in Canberra, because of the now overwhelming power of the Commonwealth Government in the field of finance in Australia. That is just a gentle warning that I issue on that score, because it is something that we may have to face one day if the Party opposite pulls up its socks (and it has been trying to do that for 15 years now without success).

Mr. Hutchens: We find it difficult to stoop low.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not quite know what the Deputy Leader means by that remark. I know of all sorts of things that the Opposition has been doing to try to pull up its socks, including a bit of stooping. I now turn to

the items in the Budget, which I think should be referred to on the first line. The Treasurer said in his Budget speech that a gap of about £4,500,000 existed between expenditure and expected revenue. That had to be met somehow and we all know of the ways in which it is to be done, including an increase in taxation of about £1,250,000. It would be idle to say that this has not caused any complaint or protest amongst those sections of the community that will be affected by these taxes. It is only natural that there should be complaint and protest, and there would be something wrong if people did not complain in these circumstances. There may be some anomalies (and I certainly have had some representations on specific matters) in the proposals for increased taxation that have been presented to this Parliament. There will, of course, be an opportunity to go into that and to debate the details when the Bill is before the House, but not in this Committee. However, I point out that the money had to be found from somewhere, and the Treasurer has done his best, no doubt, to find it in the best possible places with the least possible inconvenience and burden to everybody.

The Labor Party (it has been noticeable in this debate) has been well on the band wagon of complaint and protest. We have heard something from practically every member about this matter—complaints and some destructive criticism of the proposals, but it is noteworthy that not one member opposite has made any suggestion of where this money should come from, if it is not to come from the sources suggested by the Treasurer. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), who is sitting there so attentively now, was drawn on this question last night by the member for Gouger who asked him by interjection what he would do about getting the money. However, the member for Gawler refused to say, although he did say that he was not going to give away Labor Party secrets, but, of course, the answer is that he does not know where the money would come from if it did not come from the sources outlined in this Budget.

Mr. Coumbe: The member for Norwood also made some suggestions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he spent some time referring to financial matters, as well as to other matters at some length.

Mr. Coumbe: The member for Gawler suggested succession duties be raised.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he made that vague reference and that is all he said on the matter.

Mr. Fred Walsh: When are you going to say something, anyhow?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The chief spokesman for the Labor Party said not a word about where the money would come from: there was plenty of criticism offered, of course, but not a word of constructive criticism as to the sources of this money. Let me refer for a moment to this little document I have here entitled *The Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party*.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Have you brought that up to date yet?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not got the 1964 amendments.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Someone should keep you posted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should be grateful to the member for West Torrens if he would keep me posted. I have pasted in the 1963 amendments.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You are the number one snooper.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not see why. Surely this is a public document; I paid my 5s. for it around in Morialta Street. Do Labor members want to keep it under the bed or something? As the honourable member well knows, *The Constitutional Platform of the Liberal and Country League* is available at the L.C.L. head office for the asking. Any honourable member, even the member for West Torrens, could go and get a copy if he wanted to do so. We do not sell it, whereas the Labor Party charges 5s. for its publication.

Let us look under the heading of "Finance and Taxation" to see what the Labor Party, according to its platform, would do if it were in power. The first item is "Progressive taxation on unimproved land values". Why did the Leader of the Opposition not come out and mention that in his destructive speech yesterday and put a bit of construction into it as well. The third item relates to increased probate and succession duties.

Mr. Clark: What about No. 2?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member likes I shall read No. 2, although it is not particularly relevant at this stage. No. 2 refers to an amendment of the Federal Financial Agreement to secure an equitable adjustment of State and Federal finances.

Mr. Clark: That is not important at all!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It goes on to refer to the elimination of public borrowing and the utilization of national credit. Well, I do not know! The member for Gawler is emphasizing this now, although I was not going to mention it. I was going on to No. 3, which is "Increased probate and succession duties

on a progressive scale on estates over £6,000 in value". I do not know whether members opposite want me to read further, but I do not think the rest of it is relevant. I have quoted two avenues of taxation that we know the Labor Party would use if it came to power, yet its members do not mention it in the Budget debate, surely the place where it should be mentioned. I will bet my bottom dollar that we will not hear much about it during the State election campaign, either. That is the sort of plank in the platform that is kept very much under the bed at times when it is likely to come up for public scrutiny.

Mr. Nankivell: Particularly when the Labor Party is looking for country seats.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I notice that the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) is paying attention. I think these are very pertinent considerations for the people of South Australia when they evaluate the remarks of members opposite in the Budget debate.

Yesterday we were handed our copies of the Auditor-General's Report. The Leader of the Opposition and other members on both sides have referred to it. I do not intend to refer to the Auditor-General's comments on the detailed accounts because that can be done during the debate on the lines. However, I will refer, as I think the Leader did, to some of the Auditor-General's comments in his address (I suppose one would call it) to the President of the Legislative Council and to the Speaker of the House of Assembly. He suggested that some departments should exercise greater control of expenditure to ensure that payments were kept to the minimum required to adequately carry out their functions. He went on to say that the rate of spending in some departments was not well organized, and that an examination of the Loan Estimates for the year under review showed that 32 per cent of Loan Fund payments were made in the last two months of the financial year and that there was also a significant increase in payments from Consolidated Revenue in June. These are matters that cause some disquiet. Later—and this should be taken at its face value—he referred to the salaries of his own officers. He said:

The salaries paid to senior officers of the Audit Department make it difficult to retain these specially trained officers.

That is a serious matter for this Parliament, because the Auditor-General is a Parliamentary officer on whom we rely to a very heavy degree, and if he has not sufficient staff to carry out his duties Parliament, and through it the State of South Australia, will suffer.

On the next page of his report he calls our attention to several matters specifically. I shall not go through them all but shall mention only two, one of which is education. He points out that in five years the net cost of the Education Department to Consolidated Revenue has increased by 91 per cent, whereas the increase in the net number of pupils instructed in State schools in the five years ended December 31, 1963, was 24 per cent. That comment is open to the rejoinder that we are spending more on education and that we are justified in doing so. I believe that rejoinder can be properly made, but the fact that he draws our attention to this, and that there is the sharp contrast between the increase in expenditure and the increase in population, shows that this is a department that we should watch carefully to make certain that we are getting the best value for our money. The other matter to which I wish to refer is on page 5, where the Auditor-General says:

Because of the financial implications involved, I consider that, with the increased size of the Public Service, the Public Service Act should be amended to provide a board to consist of full-time members, who, free from departmental obligations and interest, could more expeditiously and adequately carry out their functions under the Public Service Act.

He had referred to delays and so on, and to the fact that the board consisted of three members, two of whom were part-time and had other onerous duties. I suggest that we give this matter particular attention because it governs to some extent—to a large extent, I guess—the efficiency of our Public Service. I hope that when the Government examines the Auditor-General's Report closely, which I am sure it does and which perhaps it has already done, it will consider adopting this suggestion.

I said I did not intend to refer to any of the details of the report, as this can be done when we are discussing the lines. However, I should like to refer to one other general matter whilst referring to the first line, as I cannot think of any other line on which I can properly do so. It concerns the whole of the Public Service and every Government department; I am referring to the pay and allowances (which is probably the best way to put it) for members of the Public Service who are members of the Citizen Military Forces. I suppose there is no need for me to emphasize in this place the desperate urgency of an increase in recruiting for the C.M.F. Our situation as part of Australia is not a happy one, and I believe it is absolutely necessary to increase the size of the C.M.F., but

that is a matter of policy for the Commonwealth Government. I think there is an almost overwhelming case for the re-introduction of National Service in some form or another, but I shall not debate that now. The point I make here is that we should be doing everything possible to encourage young men to join the C.M.F. I am afraid that that is something that is not being done to the full by the Government with regard to public servants. My attention was drawn to this matter earlier this year by two articles in the *Public Service Review*. The first, in the January-February issue on the front page, was headed: "Young public servant claims: Military camps cost me at least £5 a week." Then an attempt was made to substantiate that.

In the March issue appeared a further article dealing with this matter and complaining, in substance, that the South Australian Government did not go as far in encouraging public servants to join the C.M.F. as did other Governments, such as the Commonwealth Government. The member for Frome asked a question on this matter on June 11, 1964, and the Treasurer replied in terms almost identical with those he used in answer to my question in June, 1961. The burden of that reply was that many young men serving in the C.M.F. would not be able to serve in time of war because they would be man-powered out of the Army. The Treasurer said that he had grave doubts whether these people should be serving at all because it might be a waste of time. I regret that he gave the same answer in 1961 and 1964. If this is a problem, I believe that the Government could have taken some initiative to solve it in the three years that elapsed between the questions, but so far as I can see nothing has been done. Anyway, I do not believe that that is a very relevant consideration.

Mr. Casey: Don't you think that one of the most important reasons why public servants will not join the C.M.F. is that they lose money from their weekly pay?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Jennings: Don't you think there is another reason? Who would want to serve under Major Millhouse?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is another matter that we can leave at one side. As far as I know there is no Major Millhouse at the moment but there may be such a being in the future as there was in the past. However, I cannot see that that would be a reason for the discouragement of persons wishing to enter the services.

Mr. Coumbe: Major Millhouse would have more supporters than Corporal Jennings!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only concerned whether these people should be in the Army or not. I point out that applications to enlist in the C.M.F. include an undertaking to serve in time of war within or beyond the limits of the Commonwealth. That is mentioned in the certification by an applicant, which reads:

I certify that the whole of the information supplied by me on both sides of this application is true and correct and that I volunteer for service within and beyond the limits of the Commonwealth.

Further down, in accordance with an asterisk, the certificate reads:

Members of the Citizen Military Forces will not be required to serve beyond the limits of the Commonwealth except in time of war, when the Governor-General has, by proclamation, called out the Citizen Forces or part thereof for war service. No member of the Australian Military Forces will be permitted to serve abroad until he has reached the age of 18 years nor will he be permitted to serve in an operational area until he has reached the age of 19 years.

Mr. Casey: Doesn't that bring out forcibly the fact that the onus should be on the Commonwealth Government rather than on the State Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What onus does the honourable member mean?

Mr. Casey: For making up the pay. This is a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But I have not reached that point yet. I am referring to the Treasurer's argument that people should not be encouraged to serve because in time of war they would be manpowered out of the army.

Mr. Casey: That was the text of my question to the Treasurer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but the Treasurer brought in the other point.

Mr. Casey: He must have misunderstood me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point is that it is obvious that it is contemplated that those who have joined the C.M.F. will be required to serve. I do not think it is relevant to say that one-third, one-half, two-thirds or any significant proportion will be manpowered out of the army in time of war. It is contemplated by the Commonwealth Government that they will all go if the C.M.F. is called out for war service. To come to the matter which the member for Frome is so anxious about (that is, the question of remuneration for young men serving), the present policy of the South Australian Government is to make up the difference in pay between Army pay and Public Service pay if Army pay should be lower than

pay in the Public Service. That policy is laid down in Administrative Instruction No. 79 of 1955. The first paragraph deals with National Service training which is out of date. The instruction continues:

2. Leave to attend any defence force training other than compulsory National Service training will still require Ministerial approval in each case.

3. The terms of leave will be as before. They are stated again for convenient reference hereunder:

(1) The officer may utilize all or any of his recreation leave during his period of training in which case no action regarding difference in pay is necessary for the period of recreation leave.

Paragraph (2) states that the officer may do the same with long service leave if he has it. The instruction continues:

(3) (a) The period of training not covered by recreation or long service leave will be applied for and recorded as military leave, but the commencement and concluding dates of the full period of training must be shown in the application.

(b) Military leave counts as service for all military privileges.

(c) If the officer's pay as a member of the Defence Forces plus the value of rations, quarters and clothing (at present 10s. a day) and marriage and separation allowance (at present 12s. a day) if married, is less than the salary he would have received for civil duty for the period of such military leave, the difference is to be paid to him by the department.

I do not think I need read the rest of it. It is an illustration of that principle. That is the policy of the South Australian Government and I believe that a similar policy obtains in Tasmania. The Commonwealth Public Service Board circular sets out the Commonwealth provisions on this matter, and they are much more generous than our own are. I believe that the policy of the other four State Governments follows that of the Commonwealth Government. Following the decision of the Government to suspend National Service training, the Public Service Board had approved the grant by the Chief Officer of leave of absence with full pay to officers and employees who are members of the Volunteer Citizen Forces, for the purpose of attending naval, military or air force training. The circular states:

The undermentioned conditions govern the grant of such leave—

(a) for attendance for annual continuous obligatory training—

(1) Citizen Naval Forces, up to 13 days.

(2) Citizen Military Forces, up to 14 days.

(3) Citizen Air Force, up to 16 days.

In addition to this a further four days may be granted for annual obligatory training purposes on the certificate by the commanding officer.

That is the annual camp and an extra four days for bivouacs for the year but, in addition to that, that period is already in excess of that allowed in South Australia. Leave will also be granted—

for attendance at one school, class or course of instruction annually—

Citizen Naval Forces—up to 13 days (including Saturdays and Sundays).

Citizen Military Forces—up to 16 days (including Saturdays and Sundays).

Citizen Air Force—up to 16 days (including Saturdays and Sundays).

There must be a certificate that the course has been attended. So it is obvious that not only is the Commonwealth policy that there should be leave with full pay for C.M.F. training, but also that the period of training allowed in any period of 12 months can be about twice as long. I strongly believe that everything should be done to encourage enlistment in the C.M.F., in the Navy and the C.A.F., but I do not believe that the present policy of the South Australian Government gives as much encouragement to enlistment as there could or should be.

Mr. Casey: It is a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a matter for the employer, whether he be private or Government, to encourage or discourage employees. C.M.F. service is not a holiday. I regard it as a matter of duty, and it is a duty which, although in many cases enjoyable, entails sacrifices. Australia urgently needs to increase the size of voluntary services and every employer should encourage his employees to serve. I hope that the South Australian Government will review its present policy in this matter, and give a lead to private employers in this State.

That is the only matter that I desire to raise on the first line. It is of great importance to this State and to the nation, and I shall be able to debate the other matters during the debate on the various lines. Unlike my friend, the member for Adelaide, if he will let me call him that—

Mr. Jennings: I am sure he would be very flattered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope so. It will probably come as no surprise to members on both sides to be told that I intend to vigorously support the first line.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I, too, oppose the adoption of the first line of the Estimates. The member for Mitcham did not give members on this side much to answer, but in the early

part of his speech he criticized members on this side and our policy. I was interested to see that he had, as we have seen before, a copy of our platform and rules of the Party, and this is legitimate as we have no secrets to hide. We are happy for the member for Mitcham or any other member on the other side to read our platform and rules. It was interesting here some time ago when an endeavour was made to get something of a similar nature from the Liberal and Country League, but we received something other than the policy and platform of that party: we received only some of the ideologies of the L.C.L. The member for Mitcham referred to the Labor Party Conference and the conference recently held by the Liberal and Country League. There is a distinct difference here. Whereas when we hold our conference it is open to the press to come in, take notes of the proceedings and report them in the newspapers, it all being open and above board, for some reason or other the L.C.L. prefers not to have the press in attendance. I do not appreciate the reason for that but from time to time we notice reports of the conferences, mainly of resolutions from different sub-branches which have been passed and which from there go into the limbo of the lost and are heard of no more. They are only recommendations to the Government that it should do certain things, but at every conference that our Party holds resolutions submitted by branches in different parts of the State are carried by the conference. They are then submitted to the Parliamentary Labor Party for action.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is dictation.

Mr. BYWATERS: No, it is not dictation—it is democracy as it should work. When the rank and file of the Labor Party endorse the Labor Party members of this Parliament, they should have the right to determine the policy of the Party.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: On a card vote.

Mr. BYWATERS: I think it is far more democratic than the way in which we elect members to Parliament under the gerrymander. If that system operated here, members on this side of the Committee would quickly move over to the other side. The member for Mitcham claimed that no member on this side of the Committee stated where he would get the additional money from. Apparently, he was out of the Chamber when the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) was speaking, because he put up a few good suggestions as to how this extra money should be provided.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Were they legitimate?

Mr. BYWATERS: The suggestions that the member for Adelaide made were quite legitimate. One could not but support them. One was that we should have a State Insurance Department, which would bring in revenue; another was that the socialized industries are bringing revenue into the Treasury. But the most important thing that the honourable member opposite has overlooked is that this year we are receiving less money from the Commonwealth Government than we have on other occasions. Budget expenditure has increased by £4,500,000 from last year, but the receipts from the Commonwealth Government by way of tax reimbursements are £126,433 less than last year. It is apparent when we read the press that not only this State but other States in the Commonwealth are complaining about the unfair treatment by the Commonwealth Government this year. Even the Treasurer complained about this—certainly all the other State Premiers have complained. I happened to be in another State at the time when this year's Premiers' Conference took place in Canberra and I noted that every Premier was reported in the eastern papers as complaining bitterly about the treatment received: there were three Liberal Premiers and one Labor Premier making the very same observation.

It is apparent that the State Governments are not getting a fair deal from the Commonwealth Liberal Government. This, of course, is the place where most of our revenue should come from but we find that that is not the case. The Budget totals £110,000,000, but less than £40,000,000 is provided by the Commonwealth Government, about £70,000,000 coming from State undertakings. We find that it has been necessary to impose an extra burden upon the community to the extent of £4,699,268 in the form of extra taxation which should never have been levelled, had the Commonwealth Government treated us fairly. We have heard the Treasurer say more than once that, under the Chifley Government, this State received a better deal than it has had under the Menzies Government. This is becoming more obvious and it is quite apparent that the Commonwealth Government is using money far in excess of its needs. We should receive a much greater reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government than we are receiving at present, and I suggest that all Treasurers should make this their main object.

Honourable members have referred to the Auditor-General's Report and I should like to point out that it is most unfair that the Leader of the Opposition, who must prepare his reply to the Treasurer's speech concisely and systematically, receives the report perhaps only half an hour before he actually makes his speech. Certainly other members have a chance to look at the report, but not the Leader. Naturally, when Parliament is in recess the report cannot be ordered to be printed and we must wait until Parliament resumes after the show adjournment for the Treasurer to table and move that the report be printed. Surely this could be done on the last day before the Royal Show adjournment, so that it could be printed during the recess.

Mr. Shannon: You will remember that when the report is ordered to be printed it is passed around; it is already in print!

Mr. BYWATERS: We realize that, but that does not always apply.

Mr. Shannon: It is usual.

Mr. BYWATERS: I know it is usual with the Auditor-General's Report but not with all reports. The Auditor-General's Report could be tabled on the day that Parliament resumed after the show adjournment, but the Leader of the Opposition should surely have a copy of it before then. He would then be able to study it before he spoke on the Budget. We have had much publicity in the press today about the criticisms levelled by the Auditor-General, but I point out that it is his duty to bring certain matters to the attention of the public. I have been a member now for only eight years, but each year I hear similar criticisms levelled at certain departments and offices, such as the Housing Trust or the Electricity Trust. However, that is the last we hear of them.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Especially in matters concerning the Education Department.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, that is a case in point, but I think it applies to most of the Government departments. The Auditor-General goes on making these comments and the newspapers go on publicizing them. For instance, the *News* today carried the headline "Stop this Laxity" and referred to different things, and this morning's *Advertiser* printed other comments from the report. Surely this is an excellent example of what is required, as suggested by members on this side a year or two ago. We urged that a public accounts committee be set up for the purpose of investigating anything that looked like being wasteful expenditure. We know

that wasteful expenditure often occurs; we can see it in Government departments, and we do not close our eyes to it. In addition, we are often approached by people who criticize such wastage.

This wastage does not apply only to Government departments, for we often see it in private enterprise. If the heads of private enterprise do not do something about it, they have to either lose profits or increase prices and, of course, they usually take the latter course. If there is a need for some tightening up in Government expenditure, there should be a body that could look into this very thing and bring down recommendations in order to make sure that the tightening up took place. Often we find that the blame is levelled at the man on the lower rung of the ladder who is accused of not getting on with the job, but usually on investigation we find that he has not been supplied with certain things that are necessary to carry out the work. An instance of that was brought to my notice only a week or so ago. The man at the top is the one who should be answerable in these circumstances, because he is responsible for the administration. I think that the backwash very often comes to the person who is least to blame, the man who is working for wages as a day labourer, and I think that is most unfair.

The Auditor-General, on page 3 of the report, referred to excess water charges to Government employees living in Government houses. I am glad he mentioned this, because it has drawn my attention to something which I have been thinking about for some time. I come in contact with many Government employees living in Government houses, and I cannot help noticing that some of these employees have a distinct pride in keeping the houses in the very best of condition, with nice gardens, lawns, trees, roses and so on. In this way those employees are protecting Government property. However, some Government departments are imposing excess water charges on employees because of the pride those employees take in looking after these houses, and I think that is most unjust. Whereas one department will encourage its employees to beautify its property other departments apparently discourage such action. What encouragement is given to people if this excess water charge is imposed on them? A person does not need to get too many excess water charges of £10 or so to discourage him from looking after his employer's property.

Mr. Shannon: It would be no greater hardship to the man in Government employment



than it would be to the man in private employment; the same thing would apply.

Mr. BYWATERS: If I owned a house occupied by a good tenant and he used some excess water I should be glad to pay for it, because I think it is an advantage to have a tenant who looks after a house.

Mr. Frank Walsh: The valuation of the Government houses must be very low for the tenants to incur such high charges.

Mr. BYWATERS: In country areas, if a man grows a few fruit trees, some vegetables and a good lawn, such a charge is easily incurred.

Mr. Loveday: That applies particularly in low rainfall areas.

Mr. BYWATERS: That is so. It applies in the honourable member's district as well as in mine. The Auditor-General's suggestion of uniformity is a good one, but I think it should be applied to see that Government employees occupying departmental houses are not penalized if they look after the properties.

The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and I have taken much interest in the Lower Murray District Hospital at Tailem Bend. Much voluntary labor and many fund-raising efforts helped to establish this hospital, which is a fine building. The nearest hospitals to Tailem Bend are at Murray Bridge, Mannum and Keith. They are subsidized, but the hospital at Tailem Bend is not. It receives the low sum of £350 a year as a grant. This is the eighth occasion on which I have heard the Budget presented and I know that this amount has not been varied since I have been a member, and possibly it was not varied for a long time before I entered Parliament. With the decreased value of money, this £350 is far below the money value that was intended in the first instance. Charges at the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been increased, and they will penalize people on low incomes and others in the metropolitan area. Charges have risen at some subsidized hospitals, which has been inevitable, but the increases have been nowhere near as great as at the Lower Murray District Hospital. The charges in some cases are £1 a day higher than in nearby hospitals, which is an anomaly. Whereas subsidized hospitals admit pensioner and indigent patients free of charge, this is not possible at Tailem Bend.

An approach was made to the Minister of Health for a subsidy, but it was not granted. An approach was also made for an increase in the grant but that request was rejected. At the deputation we pointed out to the Minister that it was not unusual when applying for a

subsidy to make a comparison with other areas, but the deputation was told that, as the hospital was so close to the subsidized hospital at Murray Bridge, a subsidy could not be granted. We cited other instances, the most noticeable of which was in the Upper Murray regions. Loxton, Renmark and Berri are subsidized hospitals near Barmera, which has a Government hospital. Pensioners who need treatment at Tailem Bend have to pay the full hospital charge. They get a small rebate because of some concession granted by the hospital board, but it is very little, whereas the same patients can enter the Murray Bridge Hospital and receive free treatment. That hospital is filled to capacity and increasing in size all the time, and often beds are empty at the Tailem Bend Hospital because of it. What is even more silly is that the Government brings patients from Point McLeay to Murray Bridge Hospital and bypasses the Tailem Bend Hospital because it is not subsidized. Surely this is an anomaly that should be corrected, and I appeal to the Minister of Health to further consider the matter so that this hospital is not placed in an anomalous position when compared with other hospitals.

I was disappointed recently by correspondence dealing with adult education centres. I am the Chairman of the Murray Bridge Adult Education Centre and a letter was received saying that the centre was not to extend classes because of tightness in Education Department finances. Rapid advancement has taken place in adult education in recent years. The Education Department has had a real desire to encourage it and the Minister of Education must be concerned when it is necessary to send such a letter telling principals and registrars of adult education centres that they are not allowed to conduct further classes unless it is a matter of real urgency. This will put a brake on advancement in adult education, which has provided a real facility and fulfilled a need in the community. Recently I attended the opening of the Workers' Educational Association at Goolwa in pleasant surroundings and was told of the future of adult education by experts from other States as well as from South Australia, yet we are told to pull our horns in because a cold wind is blowing through the department. That expression was not used in the letter but is one that I have heard used by many people when referring to the tightening up process taking place in the department.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) referred a moment ago to the expansion of

the department. This is true; there is a need for more expansion and it is a pity to hear that the Budget has been restricted and that many organizations have been told that less money is available this year. Although the Budget has been increased in total by about £4,500,000, a tightening up is taking place, which is not good. Sir Warren McDonald (Chairman of the Banking Corporation) was reported this morning, under the heading "Bright Picture Of Economy By Bank Chief", as saying that the Australian economy has achieved near-full productive capacity with little evidence of a boom psychology. He is reported as mentioning other matters pointing to the bright picture in Australia. From time to time the Treasurer refers to the bright future of the State, and the Opposition gives him full marks for that. But here we find that a cold wind is blowing through Government departments because of lack of finance at a time when we are enjoying times of plenty. People must wonder why this should be the case, and it is evident, as I said earlier, that the Commonwealth Government is to blame for its total disregard of the States. It has forced them to increase taxation: Victoria has adopted one method, Queensland another, and New South Wales another. In South Australia the Treasurer has found it necessary to introduce legislation to increase taxation that will hit various sections of the community, some of which can ill afford to pay it.

I have been interested for years in the British Science Guild books, now published by the Handbooks Committee. I know that other members received benefit from them and have made comments in this place, particularly the member for Norwood who has raised the subject on several occasions, as I have done with the Treasurer. I have an interesting pamphlet printed by the Government Printer and setting out how this committee came into operation. It is headed, "Foundation of the Handbooks of the Fauna and Flora of South Australia", and states:

More than 40 years have now passed since the publication of the first part of the first handbook of the British Science Guild series—J. M. Black's *Flora*. It is, therefore, appropriate to record the origin of these handbooks before it is forgotten in the lapse of time. After the first world war, the South Australian Branch of the British Science Guild was very active in devising ways for increasing scientific knowledge and its applications. At that time an up-to-date account of the flora of our State was a pressing need. With this in view, Professor J. B. Cleland suggested that the Science Guild might undertake to arrange for

the preparation of a series of handbooks dealing with the fauna and flora of South Australia. If these were prepared in an honorary capacity by leading authorities, the Government might well be asked to publish them as it were on a £ for £ basis.

There seems to be a large volume of noise in the Chamber. It is only fair that there should be less noise. I listened to other speakers.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner): There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. BYWATERS: Thank you. The pamphlet continues:

The branch accepted the suggestion and it was arranged that a deputation consisting of Professors Wood Jones, T. G. B. Osborne and J. B. Cleland should wait on the Premier, Mr., afterwards Sir Henry Barwell, with the proposal. Fortunately, Professor Cleland had prepared a memorandum on the subject in the following terms and this document was handed to the Premier on February 25, 1921.

I am not going to read all that Professor Cleland mentioned in this memorandum, but he referred to the need for handbooks on fauna and flora. This would be of interest to the Minister of Lands, because he has been largely instrumental in efforts to preserve much of our fauna and flora, and in obtaining land to make this possible. In clause 6 of his resume, Professor Cleland states:

The work involved will be highly skilled and laborious. In the interests of science the authors will be prepared, we believe, to devote their time and knowledge to this work without fee, if a means of publication can be obtained.

The pamphlet continues:

The Premier read through the memorandum and said, "A very generous offer, gentlemen. I shall lay it before Cabinet." Professor Cleland received from the secretary to the Premier, a letter dated March 10, 1921, in the following terms accepting the offer:

"With reference to the proposed scheme under the auspices of the South Australian branch of the British Science Guild for the preparation of a series of handbooks on the Fauna and Flora of South Australia, which was submitted by yourself and Professor Wood Jones to the Premier on the 25th ultimo, I am directed by the Premier to inform you that in consideration of the contributors in the compilation of the handbooks undertaking the work in an honorary capacity the Government is prepared to undertake the printing of the publication at the Government Printing Office at the expense of the State."

In recent years the Chief Secretary of South Australia decided that the Government Printer should publish the handbooks on a commercial basis, rather than that the Handbooks Committee should apply each year for a Government grant for publication.

This has been discontinued in the last few years, and indeed the committee has this

handbook printed and sold at a small profit of about 10 per cent, with no cost to the Government for printing. I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that these men, highly skilled in the sciences, including some professors at the university and men active in other spheres with Government departments, have compiled over the years a valuable collection of handbooks that are available at low cost to students and others interested in these forms of science. It is commendable that this work has taken place over the years, these men of great experience providing this service free of charge.

Let me briefly tell of some of the books available, and their prices. They include *The Seaweeds of South Australia*, sold at 8s. 6d. a copy; *The Mammals of S.A.*, sold at 5s. a copy; *The Marine and Fresh Water Fishes of S.A.*, sold for 16s.; and we have had Parts I, II, III and IV of Black's *Flora of S.A.*, sold at about 10s. a copy. There are a number of such books some now out of print, but many of them have been used by university students and agricultural science teachers at secondary schools, besides those people working in the field, like naturalists, and other organizations particularly interested in this sphere of education. This is a valuable contribution to the welfare of the State.

From time to time I have raised this matter in Parliament and have had replies to questions. In one instance the Minister of Education (Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson) obtained for me much information and commended the work being done by these gentlemen. At that time, in 1958, the work was still being subsidized in these Estimates by a grant to this committee, but no longer do we find that line in the Estimates. It has gone, and there is no objection to this. The fact is that it is still a cheap publication standing on its own two feet. I want to draw the Government's attention to an injustice. These learned and skilled men have provided this valuable information and, if any incidental cost has been incurred, it all has to come out of their pockets. That is not good enough. They bear the cost of any postage, telephone calls or out-of-pocket expenses. Surely this is no due recognition of the work they have done. If we want to encourage this sort of thing to continue, we must do away with this anomaly.

Another thing that is entirely wrong is that this committee has no standing whatsoever. It has no statutory power; it has no authority in approaching Government departments. Committee members go in purely as

individuals. Let me list the men now serving on this handbooks committee. I understand that the present members are: Sir John Cleland (Chairman), Mr. Cotton (Editor), Professor Robertson, Dr. Cockcroft, Mr. N. Tindale, and Mr. Hawes (Government Printer). They form the present committee but they have no actual standing, if my information is correct, with the Government. Surely in a case like this a board could be constituted giving them some recognition. It would not be difficult. If this were done it would give them some standing with Government departments and with the Ministers themselves. I know the Ministers respect all these gentlemen. I do not think that anyone would say "Nay" to that. These men are all men of distinct standing in the community. If they could be given status and recognition as a statutory board it would be of benefit in the future, and there would be continuity with these valuable books. The Minister of Education, when replying to a question of mine, referred to the wide international demand (the words were his) for these books and the high standard recognized by people in other countries of the world as well as by the people of South Australia. The university often requests that certain books be printed. An approach is made to the respected man best acquainted with the subject, and he collects the material in his own time and at his own expense. Because of this, I could say much more on this subject, but the books are being printed.

Just how long some of these men will be able to continue is not known, as they are aging, but when they do retire provision has not been made for anyone to be appointed in their place. This will be a loss to the State. When it is realized that Professor Cleland introduced this deputation in 1920, it can be appreciated that the professor is no longer a young man. Other members of the committee are also at the stage when they will have to hand over their duties to somebody else, providing that somebody else is willing to take over. In the cause of science and in the cause of the preservation of our national heritage I hope that the Government will consider appointing this board. At least they should be given expense money so that they may continue their operations.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I congratulate the Treasurer on the fact that, despite the difficulties he has encountered because of increases in the basic wage and smaller reimbursements from the Commonwealth, he has

sufficient reserves and has exercised wise husbandry of available resources so that he can compile this Budget with so few additional taxes. In introducing his Budget the Treasurer told members how much primary industries were contributing to the State's economy. He said we had had good years, but I point out that care should be taken in future with the production of meat in this State, as it is becoming one of our most important production items. The exports of meat rank near the exports of wool. Leading veterinarians have pointed out that there is a grave risk that foot and mouth disease and other exotic stock diseases will infect our stock. If this occurs the numbers of stock will be drastically reduced and it will be extremely expensive to eradicate these diseases. Further, we will lose overseas markets to various countries.

Although Commonwealth authorities maintain that our restrictions and inspections of imported stock are satisfactory, it should be noted that New Zealand has imposed rigid restrictions as regards people arriving from overseas. Many of these people are forced to go through various fumigation processes, and every precaution is taken to ensure that they do not introduce any stock disease into that country. We have been a little careless in this regard. We are importing cheese from countries where foot and mouth disease is endemic but certain authorities maintain that cheese could be an effective carrier of such a disease to other countries. Loopholes exist in our quarantine regulations and migrants are bringing food into this country, thus creating a risk. These regulations must be tightened up considerably if we are to prevent outbreaks of disease here. Only a fortnight ago there was an instance of a restriction being imposed by the Commonwealth Government. It related to the importation of Sabonna copper health bracelets. I tried to ascertain the reason for this restriction but was unsuccessful, although I was told that wearing such a bracelet could do no harm, but that people should not be encouraged to wear charms of this kind. Such a bracelet is not now allowed to enter the country but on inquiry I discovered that people bring countless bracelets into the country from overseas in luggage as well as through the post. This illustrates the careless way in which we are allowing certain other articles to enter this country and which might cause an outbreak of certain diseases here.

In the Address in Reply debate I mentioned that areas such as Victor Harbour enjoy a short tourist season—only three or four months of the year. During that time the local business people are busy, but for the rest of the year business is slack and I am sure that the establishment of a residential college at Victor Harbour would be a considerable help in this regard. The local people are helping themselves considerably; they are a progressive community, and one of the finest golf courses in Australia is to be found at Victor Harbour, attracting many people in the off-season. The local progress association is doing its best to advertise the town and to encourage people from other States to stay there. In addition, it is hoped that the slight addition in tourist funds provided in the Budget will be of some assistance. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) mentioned the W.E.A. residential college, which is on a small scale for adult education, but at least it will attract people to the district, and it should benefit the local people generally.

As to the Auditor-General's Report, I think I mentioned last year, in connection with the criticisms of local government accounts, that a high standard of qualifications for district clerks should be required. The district clerk's office is an important position now, involving the handling of much money, and he must be expected to pass a more difficult examination if the standard of accountancy in local government is to be maintained at a satisfactory level. At a meeting of accountants this week I think it was mentioned that, under our Companies Act, anybody can act as an accountant in a company, even if he has no qualifications. It is considered that, to maintain a satisfactory standard, accountants should obtain qualifications similar to those expected of an auditor. I think that I must support to some extent the Opposition's advocacy for an accounts committee to examine Government accounts. I do not think that the Auditor-General, who makes certain comments that are published in the press at various times, can be expected to be always accurate in his criticisms. Indeed, at times a certain lack of industrial knowledge has been evident, especially in regard to egg marketing. I think a committee to check his findings would be beneficial in every way. During the Address in Reply debate I praised the Electricity Trust and since then I have been accused of supporting a socialistic concern and being an individualistic Socialist.

Mr. Ryan: You will admit the trust is a socialistic project?

Mr. McANANEY: I was a bit doubtful about the meaning of Socialism, but I now find that it is the principle that individual liberty should be completely subordinated to the interests of the community, so I cannot be a Socialist.

Mr. Clark: Where did you get that definition?

Mr. McANANEY: The late Ben Chifley tried to socialize the banking system, and as such a move would be depriving the individual citizen of his liberty that would be Socialism. But how can the Electricity Trust be called a socialistic concern when there is no compulsion on people to use its electricity and the trust itself uses private enterprise more and more to extend its various powerlines and services?

Mr. Dunstan: It is quite obvious you haven't the faintest idea of what you are talking about.

Mr. McANANEY: I agree that the trust, as a State-owned concern, has done a splendid job in many ways.

Mr. Ryan: Only since it has been a socialistic enterprise.

Mr. McANANEY: Members opposite have said that the trust has been successful and that had it been a private enterprise it would not have been so successful.

Mr. Ryan: Your Government took it over from private enterprise.

Mr. McANANEY: Whether it is Government enterprise or a private enterprise it should operate on a competitive basis. No-one is opposed to State ownership of an organization if it is in reasonable competition with private enterprise. The trust works with a capital of some £92,000,000, with an average interest rate of somewhere under 5 per cent. If it were a private enterprise and it had to do what private enterprise has to do, that is, pay 8s. in the pound company tax on any money it makes, it would have to make 8½ per cent on its money to pay the company tax which the State gets, without any extra charges, and under those conditions it would lose £3,000,000 a year. Much of its borrowing is at concessional rates through the 2s. in the pound rebate, so this means that it would have to make 10 per cent on its money to be on a comparable basis with private enterprise and in those circumstances it would lose £5,000,000. I do not decry in any way what the trust has accomplished; it has provided cheap electricity, and this has been of terrific benefit

to South Australia. I merely point out that under certain favourable conditions it can make a profit, whereas if it had to carry the burden that private enterprise has to carry it would be in a different position altogether.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We would be in the doldrums if we still had the old Adelaide Electric Supply Co. instead of the trust.

Mr. McANANEY: Our Treasurer, with great foresight, has subsidized the trust considerably in respect of country extensions. Many people in the country have had to pay substantial amounts to get a supply of electricity; to get it on the property I was interested in I had to pay a standing charge of £1,800. I think it was a good thing to do it that way, as it kept the total cost down and meant cheaper electricity.

Mr. Ryan: Do you advocate competition with the Electricity Trust?

Mr. McANANEY: There is competition now. I can use a diesel tractor to pump irrigation water, so there is still competition. It is not a socialistic undertaking without any alternative for the consumer. Over £3,000,000 must be provided for the Railways Department, but that is something we do not hear very much about. This would hardly rate in the socialistic plan, as it is in the interests of the community. To take wool from the property in which I was interested I paid a carrier 4s. a bale to carry it 30 miles to Mount Barker. It was then taken on to a socialistic railway system, which wanted 12s. a bale to run it 20 miles downhill. This involved double handling, which is the sort of thing we want to get away from as much as possible.

We still have a choice of banks. I was forced to deal with the Commonwealth Development Bank two or three years ago. It took over two months to go through all the rigmarole to borrow the money, and by that time I had got my irrigation scheme in operation by going to another bank on one day and getting the money the next.

During the Address in Reply debate I said we needed much more money for roads, and I think everyone would concede this. We should get back to the principle of road users paying for roads, and there would then be some competition between road transport and the railways. If road users are not charged with the cost of roads, there is no way of comparing road transport with railway transport to see which is the better method. Surely a petrol tax alone would be better than all the complicated ways in which money is raised. It would be the fairest way to raise the money, and it

would enable the relative merits of road transport and railway transport to be compared. If some of the small lines do not pay, it is to everybody's interest to close them.

About 200,000,000 gallons of petrol is used in this State annually, and, although I am not advocating this, a tax on petrol of 2s. in the pound would bring in £20,000,000 a year. We are now spending about £17,000,000 or £18,000,000 a year on roads, and we need more. Apart from the £20,000,000, we would still have the £6,000,000 from registrations, so a total of £26,000,000 would be available for road purposes. It might be said that a tax of 2s. a gallon was prohibitive, but it would not make the price of petrol as high as in other parts of the world. It would work out at 1d. a mile for the average car. The average cost of running a car is 6d. to 8d. a mile. I put this forward as a proposal. A penny a mile extra would not be an unjust amount to ask motorists to pay for roads. Heavy transport petrol costs would be 8d. to 9d. a mile out of a total cost of 3s. or 4s.

Mr. Ryan: That would be done on a Commonwealth basis, wouldn't it?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, but it would be a better method than the haphazard methods used now. More money must be made available for roads. Freeways will cost a tremendous amount for each mile and the money must be obtained from somewhere. Motorists' organizations say that motorists pay taxes in other ways, but the cost of roads will have to be paid by the people who use them. Council rates on properties are old-fashioned. They used to be satisfactory when the land produced the wealth of the country and landholders were the only people who used the local roads. Now roads, whether 100 or 200 miles from Adelaide, are used by everybody. There are no local roads now and I can see no reason why people should have to pay for the roads merely because they own property, when many other people who do not own land, but earn high incomes, do not have to pay. I believe that these rates are an unjust way of collecting revenue for roads. Assessments differ between councils as do the actual rates declared, and this is an inequitable way of levying money to meet the cost of roads. Last year we agreed that pensioners in difficult circumstances could get a reduction of their rates. However, most pensioners do not have a car, so why should they be rated? If they did not have to pay it would be beneficial to many people who need assistance.

The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) quoted a report of what was said by Sir Warren McDonald. However, he glossed over the part that said that we are in for a good time but that care is needed. The report read:

"With activity buoyant and the outlook promising, it is perhaps difficult to accept the real need for continuing caution in our approach to expansion," he said.

"But with internal demand already high and rising, labour, especially skilled labour, in increasingly short supply, and some quickening evident in the uptrend of costs, care may well be necessary at the present time.

"It is not easy to keep a balance on the knife edge of stability made keen by high activity."

It can be seen from remarks by the Treasurer in the Financial Statement that it is already difficult to get jobs done. An example of this is the present trouble among Municipal Tramways Trust employees. A sufficient labour force is not available to occupy the positions vacant, and the employees have to work long hours of overtime. They are unhappy about it and are prepared, perhaps, to strike. What is the solution when no other labour is available? Already there is a large demand for labour in the community. In the Address in Reply debate I said that a balanced economy was needed at all times, and that is something the State has endeavoured to achieve. At times there is a reduced demand for goods and services and that is when prices are cut. Control of business people is then needed so that they cannot agree to keep prices up, with consequent unemployment, loss of production, and a community lacking in confidence. The Commonwealth Government has had to assist State Governments to balance their Budgets. We have now reached the stage when the subsidy is being abolished. At present there is too much demand for labour, and this, combined with the increased demand for goods, means that prices will rise. With an excessive demand for labour, wage costs will rise, although they cannot when fixed by a statutory body. However, there is not the incentive for management to be efficient because they can easily get rid of goods, but the essentials needed by the community are difficult to obtain. This leads to inflation, and something must be done about it.

It has been the aim of the Commonwealth Government to achieve economic stability and the Liberal Government has done a splendid job. Unemployment figures are lower, and production figures are higher than in most countries of the world. The only countries showing better figures are those that have had fewer controls than we have had in Australia.

Many methods have been tried to solve the problems. As the Chairman of the Banking Corporation said, a delicate balance has to be maintained. The wrong methods may be being used to remedy the position. Increases in income taxation restrict purchasing power. An increased tax on personal income has an immediate effect on the spending power of the wage earner, but people on provisional taxation do not have their purchasing power reduced for a year or 18 months, and by that time the situation could be reversed. The whole system operates too slowly. Interest rates are varied and increased to reduce the demand for money and to stop inflation, when this should not be done as it causes rising costs. We have seen how it has affected the cost of housing. A reservoir principle should be used, and money should be placed in reserve to be used when needed. I shall not deal with the way in which it should be done; I merely state that it should be done by that method rather than by others, which are too slow. I support the adoption of the first line. It is the result of wise husbanding of our resources in the past that the Government has not had to inflict more impositions than it has.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I rise to exercise my right to make some general observations on the Estimates. I express grave disappointment at some remarks of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). They were made in fear of the possibility of a Labor Government. He went to great lengths to lead the Committee and the people of South Australia to believe that the Labor Party with its policy was incapable of running the State's economy. For his enlightenment, let me draw his attention to the record of past Labor Governments in the Commonwealth arena. It is convenient for him to forget that when we were waging a war the Liberal—Country Party coalition walked out of office, handing over to John Curtin the power to run the affairs of this country, depending on the support of two Independent members.

Mr. Hall: How long ago was that?

Mr. HUTCHENS: If the honourable member has no knowledge of history it is not my fault, and if he is too lazy to read it I shall not assist him. It was in the early 1940's; but in 1943 the people of Australia put a Labor Government into office with a majority so overwhelming that there was only one Liberal and Country Party member in the House of Representatives from South Australia.

Mr. Dunstan: There was only one west of Bendigo.

Mr. HUTCHENS. Yes. These are facts. When the Chifley Government went out of office in 1949, the Curtin and Chifley Governments had prosecuted a war and held office through all the rehabilitation years. By following the Labor Party's financial policy they had not only made a gift to Great Britain of £25,000,000 while in office and paid off part of the public debt of Australia but had reduced our interest bill by £7,000,000 a year. Yet the member for Mitcham has the audacity to say that we cannot run the economy of this country when in office.

Of course, he knows it is not true but he has the temerity to read the policy of the Australian Labor Party in an endeavour to ridicule it, aided and abetted by his colleagues who laughed when he referred to the fact that we were going to adopt the use of national credit. What's wrong with the use of national credit? I remember listening to the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. H. Quirke) talking on national credit, and nobody in this place ever tried to show that he was wrong in his contentions.

Mr. Clark: Do you know why?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Because there is no answer to it. We see from the Auditor-General's report that the South Australian Railways Department has a deficit of £3,000,000. It is no fault of the administration of the railways, nor its function. If we look further at the report we discover that it is almost precisely the sum that was paid in sinking funds and interest payments. The burden of interest rates is keeping our railways poor, but what happens with the transcontinental railway? Here was a railway financed by the use of national credit and it is the only railway free of any indebtedness today.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It is a much easier line to maintain than our State network.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, but that is quite apart from my argument. The Minister of Agriculture is merely trying to draw a red herring. Nobody in this Chamber appreciates these difficulties more than I do. We know what the Commonwealth Bank has done; indeed, it was established to assist in financing the economy of this country. As I have heard the Minister of Lands say, the banks can issue credit and withdraw it whenever they like. They are not concerned with the country's economy. The functions of the banking commission are set out in clause 516 of the Banking Commission's report, as follows:

The objectives of an economic and monetary system for Australia should be to achieve the best use of our productive resources, both present and future. This means the fullest possible employment of people and resources under conditions that will provide the highest standard of living. Since the monetary and banking system is an integral part of the economic system, its objective will be to assist will all the means at its disposal in achieving these ends.

Clause 503 states:

The Commonwealth Bank is a public institution engaged in the discharge of a public trust. Its special function is to regulate the volume of credit in the national interests, and its distinctive attributes is the control of the note issue.

Mr. Bywaters: National credit was used to finance the war.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. Hall: Wasn't taxation used?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The older, conservative mind becomes a slave of tradition from which it can never depart. That seems to be the whole trouble here! I say to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and those who think similarly that the Labor Party is never ashamed of its policy, and it is available for everybody to read. On behalf of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party we would readily put our financial policy into effect. I make no apologies for it. A suggestion was made that we would not discuss progressive taxation on unimproved land value, but that is our policy and we believe in it. We believe also that it is wrong to penalize a person who is investing in the State and thereby making improvements.

Mr. Hall: Do you think land tax is heavy now?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I do not say that it is, but we are not ashamed of our policy. Members opposite would not agree with that policy and there might not be any tax at all, but it is convenient, as the member for Stirling will know, to make all sorts of interjections that are far from factual when it suits a particular political outlook. What we mean by progressive land tax is that those who can afford to pay because of assets, etc., should pay more in the way of taxation.

Mr. Hall: In other words you would increase their taxes on what they are now.

Mr. HUTCHENS: We would draw more taxes from those who had the ability to pay more. That is what we mean by it. Nobody appreciates more than I do the difficulties associated with financing our public works programme and other services in this State. It is a difficult State in many ways, with an area of over 300,000 square miles, and 83 per cent of that receives less than 10 inches of rain annually.

Great distances are involved with all types of services, and these are costly. There are no rivers originating in this State, and it depends on water from other States for irrigation. Water is carried by mains longer than any used in other States with the possible exception of Western Australia. Another difficulty is an unsympathetic Commonwealth Government when the needs of this State are considered.

I will not discuss that matter further, but turn now to a matter raised by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. I am grateful to that member for supporting the attitude of our Party in respect of a public accounts committee, and I hope that his support will be assured when next a move is made in that direction. I am sure such a move will be in the best interests of the State. I turn to the Auditor-General's Report. At page 1 it is recorded:

The rate of spending in some departments is not well organized. Examination of the Loan expenditure for the year under review shows that 32 per cent of Loan Fund payments were made in the last two months of the financial year, and there was also a significant increase in payments from Consolidated Revenue.

I agree that money must be obtained and spent because of the necessity to develop this State. Changing situations in the world demand such things as the freeways and overways that were mentioned by the member for Stirling. Care should be used in methods of finance, and expenditure should be checked and rechecked, if necessary, to ensure that every penny is spent wisely. We cannot continue under conditions such as those disclosed on page 2 of the Auditor-General's Report under the heading "Debt charges". It reads:

I have each year commented on the growing Public Debt which comprises bonds, bills, stock and debentures, and other interest-bearing indebtedness of the State. At June 30, 1964, this figure was £495,000,00, equivalent to £480 per head of population, an increase of £20 per head during the year under review. Interest-bearing indebtedness has increased over the past ten years (from £223,228,000 in 1954) by 122 per cent, but the amount per head has risen only by 71 per cent owing to a gain in population.

Had it not been for that gain in population we would not have spent so much money. The Auditor-General has drawn attention to what might be termed the loose manner of spending by some departments, so I think it is time we had a Public Accounts Committee such as the Commonwealth Parliament and most other States of Australia have. It is in the



public interest that we have such a committee, and I hope we have one soon, for without it we encourage departments to be lax in their expenditure.

I noted from the Treasurer's speech that there was a surplus in our Loan Fund of £1,700,000, which represents money not expended, and a cumulative surplus from the Revenue Account to the end of June, 1964, of £1,922,000. At first sight this would appear to be a little unusual, but I think this is one occasion on which we can compliment the Treasurer for his foresight and his anticipation of what might happen. The Commonwealth Government seems to have the queer idea that we can be too prosperous. We remember, of course, that not long ago we had a credit squeeze. In the Australian Broadcasting Commission's news tonight it was said that the share market in Australia was at an all-time low because of the lack of confidence created through the belief that if the Commonwealth Government was successful at the Senate elections it would institute another credit squeeze. The Treasurer, in anticipation of this, of course, has put this money aside.

This is a very good reason why we as the Opposition should be energetic in our efforts to see that the Labor team for the Senate elections gains the greatest possible majority. If this does not happen the Treasurer can take the opportunity to fulfil some of his promises. We have learned over the years that he makes many promises at election time. The Labor Party has been criticized for its policy. It is so easy to look at the Opposition's policy and find some fault, because it is there in black and white for anyone to see. I am reminded of an article that appeared in the political commentary section of last Saturday's *Advertiser*, in which the writer of the article on behalf of the L.C.L. said quite frankly that that Party did not determine its policy but left it to its elected representatives. We do not know what the policy of the Liberal Party is because it can be change: it is just one of expediency.

Mr. Hall: In other words, it is flexible.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Extremely so. It is a matter of expediency. Even though it is said that the policy is determined by the elected representatives, that policy is not always put into effect but is used for hoodwinking the people. I can go back to 1941, when the *Advertiser* of March 4 of that year quoted the Treasurer's policy speech as follows:

It is also our intention to push on with the establishment of homes for the unfortunate people who at present are obliged to occupy substandard houses. The results of investigations convince me that unless we desire our capital cities to be associated with those plague spots which have been a feature of nearly every large town in the world, it is necessary to ensure the erection of homes under healthier and better conditions. I have already made available a preliminary amount of £50,000 to the trust, which is taking steps to have these blots removed from the city.

In the Address in Reply debate I drew attention to substandard conditions in my district—narrow streets and unsatisfactory housing—where rents are high and the people are being exploited. Nothing has been done since the Treasurer made that statement of policy, yet we hear from members opposite that this Government is progressive. In the same policy speech the Treasurer said:

My Government is a strong believer in the decentralization of secondary industry and desires to foster the development of flourishing country towns to arrest the drift of population to the city.

I have taken out a few towns at random as examples of what has happened. I know some country towns have developed, but what has happened to many of our major country towns? The town of Burra in 1946 had a population of 1,500, and in 1962 it had decreased to 1,300. In that period the population of Jamestown has remained static; Kadina has increased by 100; Quorn has decreased by 400; Wallaroo has increased slightly; and Balaklava has decreased by about 100. Over that period the population of the Carrieton area has decreased by 100; East Murray has remained static; Freeling has decreased; Georgetown has decreased; Gladstone has decreased; and Gumeracha has increased by 10. The populations in the district council areas of Hallett and Hawker have decreased; the Kapunda area has decreased by 300; Murraytown has decreased by 100; and Orroroo has decreased by 200. The metropolitan population in 1946 was 59.32 per cent of the total State population, and in 1962 it was 59.70 per cent. That is almost precisely the same, despite the pledge that the Government would stop the population drift.

Mr. Harding: What about the South-East.

Mr. Casey: Let members opposite mention those places in their reply.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Now that the little whirlwinds have stopped blowing, I shall repeat what I said a short time ago. In 1946 the percentage of population in the metropolitan area was 59.32 per cent and in 1962 it was 59.70 per cent.

Mr. Heaslip: The drift has been stopped.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The percentage has remained steady.

Mr. Heaslip: You said it had not.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What about Port Pirie, Millicent and other places?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I feel a little flattered because of the desire of honourable members to try to contradict a fact I have stated. In the 1944 elections the Treasurer talked about sewers for country towns and towns that had received them, including Kapunda, but that town had not even seen a pick and shovel. In 1941 I heard the gem in regard to progressive government when the Treasurer said, amongst other things, how ill-considered were the proposals that were so alluringly placed before some of the electors by the legislators who advocated legislation for the 40-hour week. He was opposed to any progressive move in that regard.

Mr. Coumbe: Why do you dwell in the past so much?

Mr. HUTCHENS: We have heard from the honourable member all that has happened during the past few years. Last night one member opposite stood up, looked into the Treasurer's vacant seat and said that he was indispensable and was a man who had never gone wrong in anything. He went on to say that all the years we have been talking about had been wonderful years and that everything the Government had said would be done had been honoured.

Mr. Heaslip: South Australia has gone ahead under the Treasurer's Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Is there any State in the Commonwealth or any country in the world that has not progressed in some degree since the First World War? Of course there is not. I agree with the man who said, "If we had done any worse we would have been damned for all time."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think in one respect the honourable member is correct in that we have "dammed" more than any other State in regard to water supplies.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I think the Minister will acknowledge, as I said at the outset, that that was done from sheer necessity. I acknowledge that the Government has to impose taxes and has to raise its revenue income when costs are increased. I am concerned about these imposts and the way they have been made.

Mr. Ryan: So is the public.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Of course. The member for Norwood and others made it clear last

night that the imposts have fallen on the less fortunate people to the advantage of the more fortunate. It seems that the Liberals are determined to kill the goose that lays the golden egg, an example of which is the impost levied on documents relating to the registration and transfer of registration of motor vehicles. The Commonwealth Government in its Budget increased sales tax on motor cars from 22½ per cent to 25 per cent, and this is the eighth occasion that this sales tax has been varied in the last 13 years. Everyone knows that following an increase in sales tax a slacking occurs in a trade, with a retrenchment of staff. With a decrease in taxation the reverse happens. The motor car industry is all-important to this State, and without it there would not be much secondary industry here. The motor car industry, with its associated industries, is the biggest employer of labour in South Australia, and is of paramount importance to the nation. The various skills of the work force, and the modern equipment and machinery are important. Any retarding of this industry is dangerous, because these skills and plant are easily converted. They could be of immeasurable importance in the defence of Australia. The Second World War proved how important these industries were and how easily they could be converted. The increased taxation could damage this industry and the economy of the country, and further delays the day when industry will be able to carry out a strong and active export programme. As members on this side of the House have said, the increase in cost on mortgage documents from 2s. 6d. to 5s. a £100, will add to the burden of the most needy section of the community. The people are wanting houses. Young couples trying to settle down to a married life with some security and to rear a family will be in difficulty. Their plans will have to be postponed to a later date because they cannot afford to buy a house. It is said that these extra costs will be passed on: that cannot be denied.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) took us to task on our proposals in regard to succession duties on a progressive scale on estates of over £6,000 in value. That is our policy; we believe it is right and proper. There will be no hardship in respect of succession duties on large and wealthy estates, because the people who will benefit from those estates are in most cases well off when faced with succession duties. The member for Barossa last night said that by this system we were going to kill initiative. Of course, he is

not aware of the full policy of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That policy has been called the Lloyd George damnation.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Abuse is no argument. Those who cannot argue effectively merely offer abuse. We are concerned about the primary producer.

Mr. Heaslip: Tell us what you are going to do there.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I will tell the honourable member what we are going to do. We have made and will make provision so that the primary producer in respect of succession duties will be permitted to inherit a living area without paying succession duties.

Mr. Coumbe: What is a living area?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The honourable member knows what a living area is; it is referred to in many Acts of Parliament. We shall do that so that the man who is the backbone of the country will remain its backbone and not be driven off the land, as he is by this Government. This is our policy and this is something that we desire to do to keep the man on the land who is willing to use it to its fullest extent. We know that, in the main, it is the small farmer who will do this for the benefit of the economy of this country. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 17, at 2 p.m.