

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 23, 1964.

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STAMP DUTIES AND MOTOR VEHICLES) BILL (No. 2).

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

QUESTIONS.**GAS PIPELINE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the report by the Director of Mines concerning the 500-mile high-pressure gas line, which is estimated to cost £20,000,000, and compared with the use of nuclear power for industrial purposes, if such gas line is proceeded with does the Government intend that this gas line remain the property of the Crown? Further, has the Premier, as Leader of the Government, made any representation to the bordering State of Queensland that, in the event of gas being found near the Gidgealpa field, the supplies of both areas will be connected to provide greater supplies to feed any pipeline when constructed from Gidgealpa to Adelaide? Will he indicate whether he has received an interim report from the Canadian natural gas expert concerning the future of the Gidgealpa field?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot fully answer the Leader's question at this stage. Such a project would be one of the largest ever undertaken in this State and would be extremely costly, probably involving about £20,000,000. It could only be justi-

fied on economic grounds if a large quantity of gas over many years was assured. Although the findings at Gidgealpa are significant, they do not at present constitute a tested field of the character that would warrant the construction of a pipeline. Whether or not those findings will warrant a pipeline in the future remains to be seen, but I believe that they will: I believe not only that gas will be found in the Gidgealpa field but that oil will be found in the surrounding structures, of which some are very important. The supply of gas is not yet determined, so consequently the Leader's question is somewhat premature.

However, I will admit to the Leader and to the House that the Government has done some planning in this matter, because if the gas is to be brought down it is essential that the pipeline should operate simultaneously with the operation of the first power unit at the Torrens Island power station. Those power units would be suitable for the use of gas, and it would be essential that the gas be available for their use when they operated. I believe that the first unit will operate in 1966 and the second one in 1967. As honourable members will see, we are working against a tight schedule. A 500-mile pipeline of fair dimensions and capable of carrying gas at high pressure is a big undertaking, and I believe we would have difficulty in completing it in the period of two years that appears to be available to us, especially as it will be some time yet before the field is adequately tested.

I am sure that every honourable member will agree that this pipeline would be of tremendous economic importance to South Australia, in fact, one of the most important projects ever in the industrial development of this State. Therefore, it is imperative that the project be the most efficient and yet the cheapest that we can provide. True, the Delhi-Santos group has discussed this matter and has expressed a willingness to construct the pipeline when the gas supply is proved, but I have pointed out that the question of finance is important. For instance, the consideration of taxation becomes important. That group is now working on a project that should be ready for examination by the end of the year. In the meantime, the Government is considering alternative proposals to see which is the best in the interests of the oil fields as well as of the consumer. The shareholders in the oil field are probably more directly concerned in the efficiency of the pipeline than are the consumers because consumers have alternative fuels such as fuel oil. However, persons with shares in

the oil company must rely on what is left after the transmission costs have been deducted. It is too soon to give a positive answer to the Leader's question, but I assure him that alternative proposals are being examined to see which is the most effective, which is the most efficient, and which can be undertaken with the least cost for the transferring of the gas from the field to the metropolitan area.

FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. HEASLIP: On page 2 of yesterday's *News* appeared an article disclosing evidence given to the Select Committee on the Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Bill. Standing Order No. 393 states:

The evidence taken by any Select Committee of the House, and documents presented to such Committee which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such Committee, or by any other person.

Have you, Mr. Speaker, a statement on this matter, because it appears to be a breach of Standing Orders? If it is a breach, what action will be taken?

The SPEAKER: The first indication I had of this matter was when I saw the article in the late edition of yesterday's *News*. Immediately I called in the Chairman of the Select Committee, the Minister of Education, and asked him to make an explanation to me on the matter. I also called in the Secretary of the Select Committee. Both the Chairman and the Secretary told me that they had informed two representatives of the *News*, including the political roundsman, who had asked whether they could publish evidence given before the Select Committee, that they could not do so. I then called in a representative of the *Advertiser* and told him that he could not publish the evidence, as to do so would be a breach of Standing Order No. 393. I then spoke to the Chief of Staff of the *Advertiser* and explained this to him, and he gave an undertaking that in these circumstances the evidence would not be published. I have written to the two persons concerned who gave the evidence and asked them for an explanation in this matter and I am awaiting their reply. This morning I received a letter from the Managing Editor of the *News*, Mr. Boland, stating:

The article published in the *News* last night referring to new Festival Hall sites was not evidence given before the Select Committee. It was based on a précis of the Town and Country Planning Association's views given to us by Mr. D. P. March in this office—outside

Parliament House—before Messrs. March and Milne appeared as witnesses before the Select Committee.

I replied that I could not accept this explanation, as in the article referred to it was stated in the heading that this was evidence placed before the committee this day. It is hard to understand the statement. Previously, I had written to the Managing Editor of the *News*:

I refer to the article headed "More Sites for Festival Hall" published on page 2 of the last edition of the *News* on Tuesday, September 22, 1964. The subheading of this article reads:

Because of site disadvantages at Montefiore Hill three other Adelaide sites should be examined for a new £1 million-plus festival hall, the Parliamentary Select Committee on the Festival Hall was told today. The recommendation was made in evidence submitted jointly by Mr. D. P. March and Mr. K. L. Milne, on behalf of the South Australian Town and Country Planning Association.

Then follows an account of certain of the evidence given before the Select Committee on the Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Bill. Standing Order No. 393 of the House of Assembly reads:

The evidence taken by any Select Committee of the House, and documents presented to such Committee which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such Committee, or by any other person.

Would you kindly explain the publication of the article referred to above.

I am awaiting a reply from the Managing Editor of the *News*, and have written to both Mr. March and Mr. Milne asking them to give me an explanation of the matter, as I consider it a grave breach of Standing Order No. 393. I cannot accept, at this moment while awaiting a reply from a member of an association who has given evidence before the Select Committee, that this person would not know, because I understand that he was previously Mayor of the Corporation of Walkerville, and it should be obvious to him that he was breaching Standing Orders by publishing details of evidence that had been given before a Select Committee of this House. I am awaiting replies to this correspondence.

TOURISM.

Mr. COURCE: I understand that last week the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau, visited Perth, Western Australia, and attended a conference on tourism. Can he say whether he inspected this State's tourist office in that city and, if he did, whether South Australia is adequately represented in that State to publicize the tourist advantages of South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not have the opportunity to see what was being done in Western Australia on behalf of South Australia. People travelling from Western Australia to the Eastern States generally stop in South Australia, and we have concentrated more on the large volume of business offering in Victoria and New South Wales. In Melbourne and Sydney we have bought our own premises and established permanent offices, but I regret that I am unable to report much activity in Western Australia.

WARREN RESERVOIR.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the feasibility of raising the weir of the Warren reservoir?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I have obtained the information. The capacity of the Warren reservoir is 1,400,000 gallons. Raising the weir by 10ft. would increase the capacity to 2,350,000,000 gallons, and raising it by 15ft. would increase the capacity to 2,900,000,000 gallons. However, studies in effective conservation and utilization show a gain of only about 200,000,000 gallons a year which is lost at the Warren reservoir at present, and which goes downstream into the South Para reservoir which is already fully developed. Therefore, the expected gain from carrying out the works suggested by the honourable member would not be sufficient to justify the expenditure involved; nor would it be of any great benefit to the area which is at present served by the Warren reservoir. Plans are being examined to augment the supply to Warren reservoir, probably by increasing the size of the main pipeline and pumping station at Mannum on the Mannum-Adelaide main.

BAROSSA CANNERIES LIMITED.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Several years ago a company known as Barossa Canneries Limited at Nuriootpa ceased business and I believe went into liquidation. I understand that the State Bank held a charge or mortgage over the real estate of that company and of one or two of its directors. Will the Premier ascertain whether any steps have been taken to realize the real estate at Nuriootpa of both the companies and persons concerned and the nature of such steps if any have been or are to be taken? I understand that considerable land and other assets at Nuriootpa have not been put to any particular use in recent years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is a State Bank matter and the finances of the State would not be directly involved, but I know that some time ago when another company was looking for premises in that vicinity the State Bank was most anxious to sell the property concerned. I believe that the State Bank would welcome an inquiry from any prospective purchaser and would make the property available at a reasonable price.

MELBOURNE EXPRESS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have received a letter regarding the late arrival of the Melbourne Express, which states:

My own guess is that on at least 50 or more days—

that is, in 1964—

the train has been anything from 10 minutes to one hour late. If this is so there must be some fundamental reason not readily apparent which causes this late arrival, and it would be interesting to know just what it is.

In view of the suggestion that the train is frequently late and that some underlying reason must exist for this, will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways ask his colleague to request the Railways Commissioner to investigate and report on the matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and ask for a report.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PARTY MEMBERSHIP.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. McKEE: For the second time in recent months I have been described by the *Advertiser* as a member of the Liberal and Country Party. I am generous enough to forgive a mistake of this magnitude on one occasion, but as I have been in this House long enough for members of the press to realize that I am not a member of the L.C.P., and not likely to be, I draw their attention to the mistake on this occasion.

CAMPBELLTOWN BY-LAW: ZONING AND BUILDING LINE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That By-law No. 31 of the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown, in respect of Zoning and Building Line, made on April 27, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on July 28, 1964, be disallowed.

The principle behind this motion is exactly the same as the principle which lay behind the

motion I moved some weeks ago, and which was agreed to by the House last week, in relation to the City of West Torrens. In this by-law the City of Campbelltown intended to set aside a zone for light industry, the area of which in the metropolitan development plan presented to this House several years ago was shown as a living area and not as one for light industry. Previously the City of Campbelltown had had a light industrial zone further west, but some years ago the zoning was altered and this reverted to a living area, or residential zone, as it is called. This particular area is, however, shown in the development plan as a light industrial area.

The committee therefore had two areas to look at: the one which had previously been zoned by the Campbelltown council for industry and which so appeared in the development plan, and the other area zoned in the development plan as a living area but which, under this by-law, it was proposed should be a light industrial area. The inspection of the two areas was undertaken by the members of the committee, who were accompanied on that occasion by the Town Clerk of the City of Campbelltown, and evidence was taken in the matter from Mr. S. B. Hart (Town Planner). His evidence, which is lying on the table for any member to see and read, was to the effect that there was no good reason why the zone set aside in the development plan should not be retained as a light industrial area, and, indeed, on the other hand, the area which the Campbelltown council proposed to zone for light industry under this by-law was less suitable for the purpose than the original one.

On page 4 of his evidence Mr. Hart gave a number of reasons for this: first, the proposed zone is close to an area which is proposed in the development plan as a recreation area; secondly, it is in itself very attractive (and this the members of the committee saw), and nearby to it are built substantial and attractive homes; thirdly, it lies at the gateway to the Adelaide Plains from this part of the hills, and in fact as one comes out of the hills in this area it is the first part of the plains one sees, and it would be a pity if one's introduction to the Adelaide Plains was through a light industrial area, which is of necessity less attractive than a living area; and fourthly (and this is perhaps a more practical reason than the third one, although the third one was very important in the view of the committee) this area is a long way out and is not well served by public transport, nor is it likely to be well served by public transport

in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, the site set aside in the development plan, in the opinion of the Town Planner, is better and more suitable in every regard for industry, and therefore the evidence of the Town Planner was that there was no reason in this case why there should be a departure from the proposals set out in the metropolitan development plan. As I explained on the last occasion when I moved one of these motions, the committee feels that, unless there is good reason for a change, Parliament should uphold the proposals contained in the development plan.

Motion carried.

GLENELG BY-LAW: PUBLIC RESTAURANTS AND FISH SHOPS.

Order of the Day No. 3: Mr. MILLHOUSE to move:

That by-law No. 56 of the Corporation of the Town of Glenelg, in respect of Public Restaurants and Fish Shops, made on June 9, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on July 28, 1964, be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 850.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I took some time discussing this Bill last week and I sought leave to continue my remarks because I thought it would be necessary to obtain some important figures. I was quoting what I believed to be the Crown Solicitor's opinion, but as I had discussed the matter with him only over the telephone it was obviously quite unfair to the Crown Solicitor. I should say that the more I go into the matter the more I believe that the Leader was extremely ill advised in introducing this legislation, which I believe stands condemned on many points. If I take some little time this afternoon in dealing with this matter it is because of the far-reaching nature of the Leader's proposal and the repercussions it could have upon State revenue not only in the area concerned but throughout the whole State. I emphasize, too, that this proposal could have repercussions upon other industries in other places.

First I should like to conclude what I was saying regarding the legal position, because now I have the Crown Solicitor's opinion in

his own language and over his own signature, which is far preferable to giving it, as I gave it last week, as an interpretation of a telephonic communication. That opinion states:

The High Court has made it plain over a series of decisions that discrimination by a State in the use of its roads which imposes a restraint or restriction by the State of the carriage of goods or persons is a detraction from the constitutional assurance granted by section 92 of freedom of trade, commerce, and intercourse between the States. As was decided in the case of *Armstrong v. the State of Victoria*, this does not necessarily mean that no part of the expense of maintaining roads may be thrown directly upon the traffic using them in the course of trade, including interstate trade. Traffic is a constant flow, and the regularly recurring charges of maintaining the surface for it to run upon may be recoverable from the flowing traffic without any derogation from the freedom of movement. It is, however, essential that the charge must be a genuine attempt to cover or recover the costs of upkeep, and the amount must be reasonable in relation to its nature and purpose. When a ton-mileage rate is in question, it must be reasonable as a proportionate contribution made by the description of vehicle by which the contribution is fixed: that is to say, a proportionate contribution to the recovery of those costs of upkeep, the bearing of which by the traffic cannot be said to impair the freedom of interstate transport.

The following comment is most important:

The State cannot single out interstate transport from transport generally for a particular charge. The places where a journey begins or ends have no bearing on the justness of a compensatory charge made for using the roads. The Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963 was framed in accordance with those principles and based upon almost similar Victorian legislation which was examined in *Armstrong's* case and approved by the majority of the Court. The cardinal features of the charge in both Acts are plain. There is no distinction in the incidence of the charge between commercial goods vehicles which pass over the border and those which do not. The rate of the charge is general and clearly fixed. It applies to vehicles in this State of more than 8 tons load capacity, that is, to heavy lorries and the like, whose use of the road might be supposed to make a considerable contribution to the increase of the costs of maintenance. The proceeds of the charge must go to the credit of a special Roads Maintenance Account and money to the credit of that account must be applied to the maintenance of public roads, including grants to municipal or district councils for that purpose. The Act applies to all roads throughout the State, and the contribution is towards compensation for wear and tear caused by such vehicles to public roads in South Australia.

In my opinion a proposal which would exempt from the provisions of this Act the area of the State south of the east-west railway line would at once involve a discriminatory burden

upon road users in the area to which the taxing provisions apply. Those in the area unaffected by the tax would pay nothing. Those in the remaining portion of the State would pay for maintenance of the public roads of South Australia. Such discrimination which would necessarily affect interstate road users would, to my mind, constitute a legal reason for declaring the Act to be invalid as offending against the provisions of Section 92. The proposal involves a second difficulty. The moneys received by way of charges are required to be paid to the Roads Maintenance Account and moneys to the credit of that account must be applied only to the maintenance of public roads. As I see it, the Act contemplates that the public roads so to be maintained are the public roads of the State from the use of which road charges are obtained.

If no road charges are to be obtained from the large area of the State to be exempted under this proposal, the legality of expenditure from the special fund for the maintenance of roads in that area is, to say the least of it, doubtful. In any case such an expenditure would seem inequitable having regard to the purposes of the Act. No doubt the interstate carrier mainly uses the principal interstate highways in the course of his business. But he has to collect the goods he carries somewhere and deliver them somewhere and for these purposes he may require to use any part of the State network. Section 92 protects the freedom of the interstate trader to use every road in the State, and in consequence, in the calculation of charges it is reasonable to take into account this network as a whole. Conversely it is unreasonable and therefore, in my opinion, in breach of section 92 to exempt the roads in a large portion of the State which interstate operators have every right to use. The proposal would inevitably lead to a challenge of the validity of the Act and, in my opinion, the challenge would be sustained and the discrimination involved render the Act invalid, at least so far as interstate carriers were concerned.

That is the considered opinion of the Crown Solicitor in this matter. It is very much in accordance with what I said last week. I believe that the proposals of the Leader of the Opposition would render this legislation liable to challenge; I believe that it would be challenged and I have every reason to believe that the challenge would be successful. That is my first point.

I shall now deal with the Bill from another angle because, after all, what the High Court decides or does not decide is something upon which only the High Court can definitely pronounce judgment. However, I know that in previous cases where we have attempted to impose charges the High Court has shown that it applies a very rigid standard to the application of the control of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution and I have not the slightest doubt that the proposals of the Leader would undoubtedly lead to a challenge

in the High Court. Some interstate road transport hauliers have been loath to pay the tax and I am sure that they would welcome a measure like this that might enable them to avoid paying. To hear the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), whose district mainly benefits from this legislation, anyone would believe that Eyre Peninsula is burdened by some great difficulty and hardship with regard to road transport. This is the basis on which the Bill was drafted and I have examined the position to find where this hardship lies. The member for Whyalla said that the hardship particularly applied to wheatgrowers. I have done some research on the matter. I have found first, that the Australian wheatgrower generally has legislation that protects him in regard to a home consumption price based upon the cost of production of wheat plus reasonable living expenses and a fair sum for his investment in the industry, and this has applied over a period of years. You, Mr. Speaker, have had probably more influence than anyone else in Australia on this matter and you know that the home consumption price has been fairly and squarely assessed to take in the cost of the wheatgrowers.

Mr. Riches: Of course, last week you charged the Opposition with looking after the non-producer.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer to the honourable member's district presently. However, now I wish to deal with the wheatgrower and the question of his hardship. The member for Whyalla went to the penitent form and confessed that this aspect had been overlooked previously. I have taken the trouble to compile the cost of 100 miles' carriage of a ton of wheat in the respective States. This is an accepted item in the cost of production that determines the home consumption price of wheat. I have taken out figures to see where this hardship exists. The cost of the carriage by rail on Eyre Peninsula of 100 miles ton of wheat by truckloads under class "AP" is 35s. 9d. In Western Australia, under class "M" in the schedule, the cost is 40s.; in Victoria, where the class is classified as "wheat", the cost is 42s. 6d.; in New South Wales where the classification in the schedule is "grain", it is 54s.; in Queensland, the classification is "A" when it is for local consumption and the cost is 71s. 6d. and where the classification is "M" when it is consigned to a seaport, the cost is 51s. 9d. Honourable members will realize that for the cartage of a ton of wheat for 100 miles the wheatgrower

in South Australia receives a concession over the freight rate charged in any other State of about 15s.: 14s. 3d. compared with Western Australia and an increasing amount compared with the other States. The freight rates of the other States are used in calculating the cost of production of wheat. Where is this hardship that the member for Whyalla conveniently found for Eyre Peninsula, which includes his own district?

These figures are quoted on the authority of the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers Association, and I presume that body knows something about this matter. The association pointed out to me that on Eyre Peninsula the road and rail freight is almost the same for distances up to 80 miles; for 80 miles by rail the cost is 10.6d. a bushel, whereas by road it is 10.66d. a bushel. For 100 miles by rail the cost is 11.49d., whereas by road (and I presume these figures applied before the road maintenance tax was introduced because at present the Prices Commissioner is working on a new determination) the cost is 13.25d. It is interesting to note that all of the costs are below the lowest cost enjoyed by wheatgrowers in any other State of the Commonwealth. The hardship for Eyre Peninsula is apparently a cost that is lower than any other State, including Labor-governed States. I do not know whether the honourable member considered New South Wales.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The longest hauls for wheat of any State are in New South Wales.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The charge is 35s. 9d., but this becomes a hardship because Whyalla is involved! In New South Wales the cost is 54s. but possibly it is not a hardship there. I do not know why. With a Labor Government there I would have thought that it would be a hardship. If honourable members consider these figures they will realize that the cost of wheat haulage in South Australia is low compared with other States. The South Australian Government, at the expense of subsidizing the railways directly from the Treasury, has kept the cost in this State appreciably lower than it is in any other State. That applies to Eyre Peninsula the same as it applies to other States.

Mr. Riches: And the rest of this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, because we do not believe in discriminating between one area and another. I am glad that the honourable member is agreeing with me. It could be argued that it is all very well charging this money to this area but it does not get a fair share of public moneys

spent on its roads: I have attempted to obtain reliable figures on the sum collected on Eyre Peninsula for road maintenance—

Mr. Riches: Of course, that argument was not used!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:—and of the sum spent, so that members can see whether there is any ground for discrimination. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles states that the amount paid in registration and licence fees on Eyre Peninsula is £263,060, from 21,831 registrations; in this area there are 2,400 rural holdings, and from the records of the Registrar it seems that there are 4,300 concessional primary producer registrations in force, about two concessional registrations for each rural holding. I do not want it said that a full explanation of the facts was not given to the House, and that it voted under any misapprehension. In 1959-60, on construction of roads and bridges, the State spent £780,187; on maintenance of roads and bridges, £24,618; on machinery loans to councils, interest free, £20,241; on roadwork loans to councils, £14,000; and on grants to councils, £281,130. Apart from all the work on highways, on maintenance and other expenditures, the Minister made a grant of £281,130, compared with registration fees received of £263,000. The figures for 1960-61 are: £478,364, £60,677, £87,042, £4,916, and the grants to councils were slightly more—£286,456. In 1961-62 the total was £1,245,596; in 1962-63, £1,141,373; in 1963-64, £1,618,508, which gave a total for the five years of not less than £6,043,288. The highest number of registrations in any one year would probably have totalled about £270,000, which would, of course, also have included driving licence fees. Can any honourable member opposite say that this area has been neglected?

Mr. Riches: Nobody said that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members said it; they said this area was under a special disability. What is the basis for that remark? It is all very well for the honourable member to interject, but he will have some difficulty explaining this matter in his own district presently. This £6,000,000 is in relation to a registration of 20,000 vehicles of which, as I pointed out, over 4,000 vehicles are registered at concessional rates.

Mr. Bockelberg: I think at the meeting at Cleve it was said that they had no roads on Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A large area does not even pay district council

rates—and may I point out that it is rich pastoral country through which we are laying bitumen roads. The honourable member who sponsored the Bill knows that fact. The question of outback roads was also mentioned and, although I have not taken the trouble to find out precisely how many vehicles would be concerned, the number would be small indeed. Is it contended that the outback roads have not been justly provided for?

Mr. Riches: Nobody is talking about outback roads.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They are, of course, included in the Bill; the definition is so wide that it would just about include anything imaginable. In the five-year period the total expenditure on outback roads was £914,046, which is in addition to the £6,000,000-odd that I have already mentioned in regard to the area south of the line. Do honourable members contend that this area has been neglected from the point of view of road expenditure? If it is not being so contended, what justification exists for exempting the area from road maintenance tax?

Mr. Riches: They are not contending that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member knows that the Bill would exempt the whole area south of the east-west line. I am prepared to go to the honourable member's district or to that of another honourable member opposite to debate this matter with electors. Indeed, I intend to visit some districts to debate this very question. I have received many requests from people in this State for the road maintenance tax to be lifted from their particular areas. I had a request from Mount Gambier; the Mount Gambier timber workers said they did not think they should pay the ton-mile tax. How will the member for Mount Gambier justify exempting Whyalla while charging the tax at Mount Gambier? The honourable member who comes from the adjacent district is also involved in a similar argument as to whether timber carters should pay the road maintenance tax. I have explained that they are heavy users of the roads and that we are spending much money on those roads. It seems there is to be a difference between their particular situation and that of the people at Whyalla who, apparently are to receive special privileges. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) will be able to go to Mannum presently to explain to the industry there (to which steel is carted and from which agricultural machinery is transported: "We are in favour of decentralization of industry so long as it is at Whyalla

and on Eyre Peninsula. When it comes to Mannum, as member for your district, I have to loyally support the district of Murray, and it should be charged a road maintenance tax. The district of Whyalla, which is getting a new bitumen road from Whyalla to Iron Knob for which the State is paying, should be exempted."

Is that what he believes? I could mention two other districts: the township of Quorn has a special problem with regard to barytes and has to pay a road maintenance tax. People there have said that they want to avoid the road tax if they can. The member for that district will be able to visit Quorn and say, "We know your district and your industry is struggling; we know you have much competition from imported barytes and much difficulty in maintaining the industry; we know this will include extra cost of transportation which you cannot avoid; but I had to support Whyalla in an endeavour to see that the steel industry would not be embarrassed, because it is so hard up at the moment that it requires special consideration."

If honourable members give me the fare I shall be happy to go with any of them to debate these things in their areas, not only now but at a more appropriate date a little later on. In fact, I shall be able to go to Mannum to say, "Yes, we understand Mannum's situation, but you have to pay road maintenance tax on everything which you bring into Mannum and which goes out from Mannum, and your agricultural machinery necessarily involves your using the road. But when it comes to the steel industry at Whyalla, of course that is a different matter, and that is something to which we have to give special privileges."

I think if honourable members will look at what is involved in this they will come back to the fundamental question of the application of taxation. I believe that all taxation should be applied evenly and fairly, and that it should be applied in connection with the services that are rendered. I make it clear that there is no ground whatsoever for any departure from this. The move that has been made is a political one, and it will have repercussions; it will not be confined just to one convenient area. Whatever people say about me politically (and they say all sorts of things) they cannot say that I run away from an argument, and this is the type of argument that I would very much like to get into. I will be looking forward to the day when I may be able to go into some districts

and explain how the policy of my friends opposite works in taxation matters.

When we talk about a road maintenance tax we are talking about something which is a charge for the service rendered. This tax is not something that will be going out of the pocket of one person and applied to the benefit of somebody else totally unconnected with the purpose of the collection. This is tied down by the High Court of Australia to maintaining and improving roads. It does not go even for a general beneficial purpose such as taxation, but is tied down in a specific way. It is a charge for a service which is policed, actually, by the court itself, and if it were used for any other purpose it would be immediately declared by the High Court to be invalid. Let us assume just for one moment that the House was sufficiently ill advised to accept the Leader's amendment. What are the consequences that may arise? First, to get our Commonwealth road grant we have to provide a certain matching sum. Frankly, we are depending upon the road maintenance tax to enable us to get our share of the Commonwealth road grant this year. If we do not have the tax we do not get our road grant unless we raise the money in some other way. Although I may put a small sum on the Loan Estimates to build up to a sufficient volume to attract the Commonwealth grant, we do rely upon this matching money to attract the Commonwealth grant, and we will rely upon it more and more in the years to come. Honourable members know that under the agreement with the Commonwealth the amount that is provided for roads this year by the Commonwealth increases next year and increases successively in each of the years for which the agreement works, I think a period of five years. However, while the amount provided by the Commonwealth increases it is also true that the amount to be provided to match the Commonwealth grant also has to be increased.

We have been debating the Budget for some time and we have heard speakers say that this sort of tax is not a good tax, but I have never heard anybody come into this House and say any sort of tax is a good tax. If we allow this exemption and it is challenged (and I do not believe for one moment that it would not be challenged), from the moment it is challenged the funds obviously would have to be paid (if they were collected at all) into a trust account, and they could not be dispensed for road maintenance work. If this were not done we would find ourselves in the position of another

State which accepted money, under protest, and applied it for general purposes, only to find that it had to be refunded.

I should like honourable members when they address themselves to this matter (particularly those members whose districts would not be exempt from this tax) to tell me what additional tax they would advocate for their district to make up for the loss of this revenue, because that would be a good thing to know. For instance, what additional tax do we impose on Mount Gambier to make up for the exemption that we apply to Eyre Peninsula? That is the logical consequence of carrying into effect the ill-advised proposals which we have before us at present. I hope the House will not be led away for political motives into something which might be considered to be a little bit politically attractive to one area but which, I assure honourable members, will not be accepted by the people of South Australia as a fair and proper deal. I can only say that it is an issue that will be fully explained, particularly to the proposed non-exempt districts; I will give particular attention to them when the appropriate time comes.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): In rising to support the Bill I want to address myself immediately to some of the arguments the Premier has seen fit to put before the House this afternoon. The Premier has said that he is satisfied that the Act, if amended in the way suggested by the Opposition, would immediately be subject to successful challenge in the High Court.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Crown Solicitor said that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I will have a word to say about that in a moment. The Premier said he was satisfied that it could be successfully challenged in the High Court on the grounds that it would then infringe section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. The Premier says this on the basis of a document supplied to him by the Crown Solicitor, in which the Crown Solicitor sets forth certain arguments to that effect. Well, Sir, with very great respect to the Crown Solicitor, there are certain things in the judgments of Armstrong and the other cases in the interstate legislation to which the Crown Solicitor has carefully not adverted in his opinion given to the Premier.

Mr. Shannon: Didn't he specifically mention Armstrong's case?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, but he did not advert to some of the matters contained in the judgment in that case.

Mr. Shannon: I think he must have read the judgment, though.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, I think he did. In fact, Mr. Wells (and I do not know whether it was Mr. Wells who prepared the opinion of the Crown Solicitor which the Premier has read) appeared before the High Court as *amicus curiae* in that case. As the Crown Solicitor's opinion on the validity of State legislation relating to road charges has previously been found to be somewhat awry, I think we might examine the basis of his opinion on this occasion. It is not unknown in South Australia, particularly under this Government, for an opinion to be asked from a public servant. After all, when one is a member of the legal profession and is dealing with a constitutional matter about which arguments can be put forward it is not always terribly difficult to find some arguments on one side and some on the other and one inclines to the side of one's client in trying to put some kind of argument forward. I think that is what has happened in this case.

There were two basic matters in the opinion which the Premier read to the House upon which the Crown Solicitor based his opinion. The first was that in exempting certain parts of this State it was imposing a charge upon vehicles using not all but certain of the roads in the State. Therefore, since a charge was being imposed only on certain roads, this was discriminating as between road users and because there was a discrimination against interstate users of roads, the discrimination between some users intrastate and interstate as between other intrastate and interstate users was in itself imposing a restriction upon the freedom of interstate trade, commerce and intercourse and this discrimination was such a legal hindrance that the High Court would find that it was unconstitutional. What the Crown Solicitor did not point out was that in the Armstrong judgment the Chief Justice of the High Court specifically said that it was possible to impose a charge in respect of certain roads. I shall read to the House some of what the Chief Justice had to say:

One may suppose that, if the governments concerned combined to construct a new roadway between Melbourne and Sydney of the most modern kind capable of bearing heavy traffic, section 92 would have nothing to say to a decision on the part of the governments that it should not be constructed or opened as a free public way but only as a toll road so that the annual charges for interest and costs of maintenance should be borne by the traffic that chose to use it. Such a road would of course clearly fall within what was said in

Hughes & Vale Proprietary Limited v. State of New South Wales (No. 2) (1), viz. "A modern highway is in fact a constructional work of a very substantial character indeed. It cannot be distinguished from the facilities that have been mentioned either in cost, the technical and engineering skill it demands or the general purpose it serves. It is an engineering work of a major description designed to carry heavy motor vehicles between distant places."

It was not only Sir Owen Dixon who adverted to this matter, but in the later case Mr. Justice Windeyer talked at great length about the imposition of charges for particular roads and traced the history of various kinds of toll which he said would be perfectly proper and would not offend against section 92. Therefore, it can be seen that it is possible to charge for the use of a particular road and for the use of particular roads and there is no difficulty about it. Indeed, so far did the New South Wales legislation go that it was found that the definition of public street and the expenditure for the special road fund was very wide indeed. Sir Owen Dixon, in the New South Wales case, *Commonwealth Freighters Proprietary Limited v. Sneddon*, said:

One not unimportant but I imagine completely gratuitous addition to the difficulties arises from the definition of the expression "public street". Beginning with words closely approximating to the Victorian definition of public highway, the New South Wales definition first drops the words "for passage with vehicles" and then adds the words "and includes any place at the time open to or used by the public on the payment of money or otherwise". Apparently the literal meaning of the words would cover a swimming pool, a zoo or a music bowl.

He found that they did contain these things and that there may be expenditure from the special road fund for them. However, he said that he did not think that the leak would be very great from the financial reservoir and in that case there was nothing wrong with the definition. To say that the judgment of the High Court in the Armstrong case or the Commonwealth Freighters case has shown that, in fact, we cannot exempt from the impost a certain area of the State is just not true. There are, I will admit, some very cogent arguments to be put as far as the expenditure of the money is concerned and the High Court's decision is not entirely clear on this subject. Argument was addressed to the High Court in the Armstrong case to the effect that it was not fair to charge interstate freighters with the maintenance of second-class, suburban or back country roads when the use of those roads would be slight, if not

non-existent, by interstate freighters and that, therefore, this was putting upon interstate freighters an unreasonable charge. The High Court found that contributions towards road maintenance must be reasonable and bear a reasonable relation to the service given to be not exceptionable under section 92.

However, the High Court dismissed those arguments and said clearly that since the back country or suburban roads might conceivably be used at some time by interstate freighters in delivering or taking goods that they would transport in the course of an interstate transaction, then it was impossible to separate one road from another in this and the expenditure on roads from the special fund of moneys that was contributed on the basis that it was for a service to be given could not simply be confined to just roads likely to be used by interstate freighters. Therefore, the expenditure of moneys from the special fund upon Eyre Peninsula when, in fact, interstate freighters may well deliver to or take from Eyre Peninsula goods in the course of an interstate transaction does, in no way, necessarily invalidate the position, because interstate and intrastate freighters will alike be exempt on Eyre Peninsula and alike will have the benefit of the exemption there as they are alike subject to the tax elsewhere in the State.

While it may be said that there is an argument to be put that the High Court has said that, while these moneys must be expended on the roads on which the freighters that are paying the tax will be involved, it is a contribution towards road maintenance and, therefore, it must be seen that those moneys are spent for the purpose for which they are contributed, nevertheless the purpose of imposing the tax in the remainder of the State is not avoided by the expenditure of the moneys in areas to which persons passing over the roads on which they pay tax may go in the course of their journey and not pay tax on those further roads. At most, there is one slight argument in this. It is a proposition that could be put but is not particularly well founded on the decision of the majority of the High Court in the Armstrong case, which was unanimously upheld by the Full High Court Bench in the New South Wales case and was later applied in the examination of evidence in *Breen v. Sneddon*, 106 C.L.R., 1961. The Premier, in discussing this matter, has adverted to all sorts of figures that bear little relationship to the road maintenance contribution. He has talked about it before, and said today that he is

giving figures for construction of roads. Construction of roads does not come into the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. Money from the road maintenance contribution cannot be used for the construction of roads, as the High Court has made that perfectly clear. It is a maintenance charge only for fair wear and tear, and is not a charge towards the construction of roads that are at present in an unsatisfactory state or do not exist.

The construction of major highways on Eyre Peninsula is not something that could conceivably be paid or contributed to out of these moneys. It was clear in the High Court cases that the grant of money from road maintenance contribution to local councils for the purpose of maintenance of roads in their areas, was proper. In the New South Wales case a significant proportion of the road maintenance contribution was given to the County of Cumberland Council which was the metropolitan planning authority of Sydney. These sums could be properly put forward to councils on Eyre Peninsula. Why is it that the Premier seeks to assure the House that we are going to run into grave constitutional difficulties? The Premier has a habit of coming to this House and imagining that members have not bothered to find out what was the basis upon which action was taken in other States or action was taken by the High Court. The Premier is wrong about this. The matter was carefully examined before the Opposition's amendments were drafted. There is nothing in any way in the High Court judgments that would make this legislation invalid if the amendments were made as moved by the Opposition. The Premier has a habit of putting up all sorts of furbies in the hope that his audiences are ignorant on the subject about which he is talking. That is what has happened here. From the moment this matter was raised in the House honourable members opposite have been uneasy.

Mr. Shannon: That is the biggest scream of the lot.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was obvious on the first occasion it was mentioned that members opposite were jumping up and down and making odd statements, and the Minister of Agriculture was scribbling notes to back-benchers to get them to jump up and say something about it.

Mr. Clark: They were not so eager when the meetings were held.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Premier comes along this afternoon and jovially and ebulliently says that he wants to go out and debate this matter at the grass roots of the electorate.

Mr. Shannon: At Cleve, particularly.

Mr. DUNSTAN: A strange reluctance has been shown by members opposite to talk about this matter on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Shannon: You had better stick to facts while you are about it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: How many meetings there have been addressed by Ministers? One, but how many others? Honourable members know that meetings have been held on Eyre Peninsula because of the matters about which the honourable member for Whyalla spoke. This impost strikes hard at grain farmers on Eyre Peninsula and they are subject to a disability not existing in the remainder of the State. The Premier is trying to suggest that the main benefit of this amendment will be derived in the district represented by the member for Whyalla, and that it will be derived by the steel industry. How much impost will the steel industry pay under this legislation?

Mr. Shannon: Have you any idea how much steel is road-hauled?

Mr. DUNSTAN: How much impost is going to be paid by the steel industry under this legislation?

Mr. Shannon: You cannot give me a simple answer to that question.

Mr. DUNSTAN: So far as steel is road-hauled any distance, under our amendment it will be paying an impost.

Mr. Shannon: It will not be paid as far as Port Augusta.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, but what about the rest of the journey, and that applies to everybody on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Loveday: That point has been carefully omitted.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Anyone on Eyre Peninsula who is road-hauling to the metropolitan area or to any of the main settled areas of this State will still pay an impost.

Mr. Loveday: A radius of 200 miles from Adelaide would include most of the State.

Mr. Jennings: Most of the electors live in Whyalla.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly, and the Premier knows there is little impost due to be paid by the electors of Whyalla under this legislation that would be in any way avoided if the Opposition's amendments were enacted. The people who will benefit from this amendment are the grain farmers on Eyre Peninsula, hardly any of whom live in the District of Whyalla, but many in the districts of the member for Eyre and the Minister of Works, the member for Flinders. The Premier knows that, but did not talk about it. Apparently, he would have

people in Quorn or Mannum believe that somehow or other the workers in the steel industry at Whyalla were getting some special benefit that would not apply to other people, and that there is no mention made of the impost on grain farmers on Eyre Peninsula. Let the Premier defeat the measure if he is so minded, but we have no hesitation in debating this matter publicly. I do not mind if the Premier comes to my district and debates it with me. I have a few road hauliers in my district. I do not mind debating it before an audience of road hauliers or of anyone else, and I am certain that the members for Murray, Mount Gambier and Millicent will be happy for the Premier to win votes for them by going into their districts. He has done it successfully on previous occasions and I am sure they will welcome his doing it again. If all the Premier can put up is the kind of gobbledegook that he saw fit to say on local matters, omitting things in High Court judgments on these matters, we have little to fear and much to look forward to at those debates.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the Bill and make it clear that I am not able to debate it from a legal viewpoint as did the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. Nor can the Premier claim to debate this legally, because he relies on advice from the Crown Solicitor. Last week I listened attentively to the Premier when he spoke on the measure, following the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Although he made a dramatic attempt to advance some kind of argument, I am afraid it did not hold much water. This afternoon the Premier mentioned the farmers on Eyre Peninsula who will benefit from the Bill. Honourable members opposite will realize, as we do on this side, that the West Coast is in a peculiar geographical location. People on the West Coast have not the facilities that are available elsewhere.

The Premier indicated that you, Mr. Speaker, probably knew more about wheat and barley than most people in the State. I point out that these people will be adversely affected by an increase of anything from £50 to £100 a year in cartage fees. Section 3 of the principal Act defines a public road as "any street, road, lane, bridge, thoroughfare or place open to or used by the public for passage with vehicles". We would amend that by striking out the words "or used by", which is essential from my point of view, and I know the Premier has been approached on that matter too. I refer particularly to roads in the Far North which are outside local government areas and which are not roads in the true sense of the

word. Nobody could convince me otherwise. At present cattle is being loaded in parts of this State where all that exists is a track that has been flat-graded. The people concerned are being charged under the present legislation—

Mr. Bockelberg: Who are you talking about?

Mr. CASEY: People in the Far North.

Mr. Heaslip: Didn't you advocate a 4-ton limit?

Mr. CASEY: How can one charge these people for road maintenance when there is no semblance of a road in the area?

Mr. McKee: And never likely to be!

Mr. CASEY: The Commonwealth roads aid legislation states:

... in making payments to municipal and other local authorities for the construction, reconstruction, maintenance and repair of rural roads or for the purpose of road-making plant for use in connection with rural roads. I point out that two-fifths of the road grant received by this State must be used according to Commonwealth legislation. If any of that money is being used it is only a drop in the ocean.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It totals nearly £1,000,000 in five years; I do not know whether that is a drop in the ocean.

Mr. CASEY: But it is not being spent in a particular area. I cannot be convinced that the last 150 miles of the Birdsville track could be classified as a road. No maintenance is carried out on it; no gravel is carted to it and it is merely flat-graded. At present four roads run from Clifton Hill station to Birdsville, and when we consider that the mail truck can be bogged in that area for 19 hours that will give honourable members opposite some idea of the state of the roads.

Mr. Heaslip: Over the border or in South Australia?

Mr. CASEY: In South Australia, of course. For the information of the honourable member, the mail truck goes only as far as Birdsville. There should be some relaxation and our amendment here should be carried. We should define just what constitutes a made road which has been constructed and which is being maintained as a road. Under the present legislation such people as I have mentioned are being victimized. I see no reason why cattle should not be classed in some instances as perishable commodities. I think the member for Onkaparinga would agree with that. Earlier this year cattle being transported down the Strzelecki track were buffeted so much on the roads that they could not be sold for human consumption here. What is

the point in transporting them south if that is the case? Strangely enough, cattle from the north cannot be kept in the southern districts until the bruises vanish because they just will not eat the food here. Perhaps if they were kept for 12 months they would resign themselves to the inevitable. However, under the existing legislation many people are being charged a road tax from which they receive no benefit. The Premier has said on several occasions that we have spent thousands of pounds on outback roads. That may be so but no improvement has been effected. A more definite policy must be taken on this measure, and unless it is taken shortly we shall lose much of our cattle to Queensland—or much more than we are losing at present. The Premier conveniently tries to influence the House with rates of cartage which might sound all right but are found to be only half correct when they are analysed. The rate of cartage of ore between Broken Hill and Cockburn (which is under the Silverton Tramways Trust), a distance of 35 miles, is 8s. 9d. a ton. This rate can vary very slightly with the price of lead, in terms of the agreement between the mines and the Silverton Tramways Trust. The Premier comes along and says that the rate charged is 3d. a ton-mile, but unfortunately he forgets to say that that is only one way; the real fact is that the rate is only 1½d. a ton-mile counting both ways, which we must do because the empty trucks must be taken back again to be refilled. Similarly, on the Cockburn to Port Pirie run, about 230 miles, the new rate under the agreement with the South Australian Railways is about 66s. a ton (I do not have the exact figures) with a rebate over 600,000 tons a year. This rate is also subject to a variation in the basic wage. Here again, the Premier quoted a figure of about 3d. a ton-mile, but he forgot to take it both ways, and actually it works out at about 1.6d. to 1.7d. a ton-mile. The empty trucks have to be taken back in order to be refilled.

Mr. Shannon: That applies to road transport, too.

Mr. CASEY: That is so. The only difference there is that the ore trucks do not back-load with anything. Nine times out of 10 those trucks go back empty.

Mr. Shannon: Why?

Mr. CASEY: They are specifically used for ore traffic.

Mr. Shannon: That is not so; there is a demand for the carriage of goods from Port Pirie to Broken Hill.

Mr. CASEY: I know that. I live right on that railway line and I see those rail trucks going past, and nine times out of 10 they are empty going back to Broken Hill.

Mr. Shannon: I agree; but you never see road hauliers there at all. There are very few road hauliers between Port Pirie and Broken Hill; would that be right?

Mr. CASEY: Quite the contrary. Last Thursday I passed eight hauliers travelling between Terowie and Burra at about 10.30 at night, which is the time they travel.

Mr. Shannon: But they were not travelling between Port Pirie and Broken Hill.

Mr. CASEY: I cannot say whether or not they were. Traffic between Broken Hill and Adelaide is interstate traffic, and outside the metropolitan area Broken Hill is probably our biggest city, because it deals exclusively with South Australia. Motor transport in that area is increasing considerably, and no doubt it will increase even more in future.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): While it is fresh in my mind, I will deal with the matter raised by the member for Frome. The honourable member referred to the Premier's statement about road freight rates on ore. If members take their minds back to the honourable member's interjection, they will recall that he was dealing with the point that the mining companies at Broken Hill might change over to road transport. I should like to point out to the honourable member that in all the evidence we had on the occasion when we investigated the question of the standardization of the line between Port Pirie and Cockburn it was clear that if the companies changed their method of moving ore from rail to road they would be faced with the same problem that the railways are now faced with, namely, empty back running. The honourable member's arguments in this matter were not quite as valid as the Premier's arguments, in my view.

Principles are involved in this matter, but before dealing with the question of principles I should like to mention the wheat traffic on Eyre Peninsula, about which we have heard so much. We have heard quite a bit about the meeting at Cleve at which the member for Whyalla was present; it is not in the honourable member's district, but apparently he felt duty-bound to go down there and support the candidate who is opposing Mr. Pearson, the Minister of Works, and no doubt he did his turn of rousing the meeting to a right pitch of indignation. The Premier gave us some illuminating figures regarding the costs of the grower of wheat on Eyre Peninsula in getting

that wheat to an outport. Those growers have two major outports, one being Port Lincoln, at the bottom end, and the other being Thevenard, on the north-western corner of the peninsula. I point out that a large percentage of the wheat grown in South Australia is destined for overseas markets: we use in our own State only a very small percentage of the total crop. With wheat destined for overseas, the freight rates that apply to outports throughout the whole of the State are the same, so there is no disability in freight rates for the farmer who grows wheat on Eyre Peninsula as compared with farmers in the Lower or Mid North (who ship it from Port Pirie or Wallaroo) or the farmers in the Murray Lands and the south, who ship through Port Adelaide. Those people are on all fours for shipping wheat that is destined for an overseas market.

The Premier chose 100 miles as his measuring stick to compare the costs in South Australia with the costs in other States. However, there is a factor in this which the Premier may or may not know and which I happen to know. I will mention only the three major comparable States, which are South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. The average wheat haul by rail to an outport in South Australia is 75 miles; the average haul in Victoria is 150 miles; and the average haul in New South Wales is 250 miles. Bearing in mind that the grower has the differential to pay for the cartage of his grain to the output for shipment (that is a debit to the grower for his cartage costs), the South Australian grower has a much greater advantage than appeared from the figures given by the Premier a few moments ago—some 36s. against 52s. for our nearest competitor. When we bear in mind that our nearest competitor in Victoria has twice the average distance to cart his wheat and the New South Wales farmer has more than three times the distance to cart his wheat, we are in an even better position than the Premier's statement would have made it appear. I think this is pertinent to the question of the disability that the farming community on Eyre Peninsula may be suffering.

This afternoon I heard the Opposition's legal luminary expound, imbecilically almost, on our own adviser, the Crown Law Department. I was not very pleased to hear opinions expressed, regarding our Crown Law Office, that suggested that the officers of that department were not competent and that it was not the first time that they had made egregious errors. He did not use those words, but that was what he

implied. We now have it alleged by the member for Norwood that if this amendment is adopted by the House it cannot be successfully attacked. Let us assume that that is correct. Now we come back to fundamentals of justice: whether one section of the community is having the right and proper thing done by it compared with another. In other words, is there a question of discrimination? The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) was careful not to touch on this question. I wish he had done so because I am sure his legal training would have made him see both sides of the question—that some people are going to be left out of benefits to be derived by others.

I wish to comment upon how much the privileges would be worth. The member for Norwood suggested that, after all, Whyalla loading would be paying as soon as it got through Port Augusta. There is no argument about that because, under the Bill, Port Augusta will be the dividing line of where the Commonwealth Government takes over on the roads towards Western Australia. The relevant mileages may be a guide to honourable members as to the effects on the steel industry, not only the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, but others that are working at Whyalla. It is a growing industry and the demand for steel will increase. If my information is correct, more steel will be needed in Port Pirie before long. If steel is to come to Adelaide, the distance from Adelaide to Whyalla is 245 miles. Of that distance, 45 miles is the distance between Whyalla and Port Augusta. By simple arithmetic this means a 20 per cent rebate on road tax for carting to Adelaide. If members opposite suggest that a 20 per cent rebate is negligible, I do not agree. I think it would be of material benefit to a big business to cut costs by 20 per cent on one item. This will be a very handsome gift. If steel is not carted all the way the percentage rises, as some of it can be dumped on the way. I do not know if Port Augusta will enjoy expansion in major industries in the near future but Port Pirie certainly will. It is 60 miles from Port Pirie to Port Augusta instead of the 40 miles from Port Augusta, to Whyalla, and this means that the rebate would be higher. I do not think steel will be taken to Melbourne from Whyalla because this would not be economical for the steel industry, but, if it were, there would be a lesser percentage of saving in the overall haul.

I was pleased that the member for Norwood pointed out the position of the electors in the

districts affected by the Bill. The Minister of Works and the member for Eyre are the members for the districts concerned. When I first saw the Bill I was immediately struck with the possibility of political implications. The member for Norwood clarified that point for me. There is no doubt that the Bill has political implications. Apparently the Labor Party felt that there was no need to worry about the South-East because it held two seats there (the districts of the members for Mount Gambier and Millicent) and, therefore, the timber industry would have to pay the road tax because the Labor Party was not worried about these two seats. The Labor Party felt that it did not need to give a sop to people in the South-East. It felt that if it were going to throw something away, the best area for this would be the Eyre Peninsula because it felt that there might be a possibility of gaining a seat there. The Labor Party decided to call a meeting in the Eyre Peninsula and have Mr. Hudson and Mr. Loveday come along to tell the people there of the terrible time they were having and how they had been forgotten. These people were told that no money had been spent on their roads or on public works and that the Eyre Peninsula was the lost legion. That was all good politics.

Mr. Riches: Who said that?

Mr. SHANNON: I am reading between the lines and I do not think I am far from the truth. The member for Norwood specifically pointed out the districts of the two Government members. I was glad because I was hoping one Opposition member would be honest. Apparently most Opposition members thought that we were innocents in the wood and they did not draw attention to the possible political profit to be gained by giving little gifts from Father Christmas, as it were, to the right sources. There is no doubt that that is what the Labor Party is doing. The timber industry in the South-East is growing bigger each day and I believe the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) will agree with that.

Mr. Corcoran: Some carriers working in conjunction with the Woods and Forests Department have an agreement whereby the department pays the road tax.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is explaining how the road tax may be paid by another authority. Does that affect the profit of the department that pays the tax?

Mr. Corcoran: No, it does not, but it is one Government department paying another.

Mr. SHANNON: Do you think that the returns to the Woods and Forests Department will remain static despite the fact that it will pay for the carrying of timber.

Mr. Riches: Why are they paying it?

Mr. SHANNON: There is nothing different in principle here. Do not members opposite think that if it is fair to exclude the Eyre Peninsula and Port Augusta it is equally fair to exclude Mount Gambier, Millicent, Mount Burr, Snuggery, Nangwarry and other towns. The Premier and I represented the Murray River district for five years. Opposition members have talked about decentralization and the desirability of encouraging industry to move away from the city. Surely the Bill should have provided for this area if the Labor Party wished to give encouragement to decentralization. Mannum virtually exists on one industry; it has no railway and all its raw materials have to be transported by road. Surely if any town needs this provision Mannum would qualify. Of course, Mannum is already rather safely represented by a member of the Opposition. That may have had some bearing on the matter. Another town on the Murray River in need of help that is not served adequately by the railways and can only be reached by a circuitous route is Renmark. To reach Renmark by rail it is necessary to go via Tailem Bend. The perishable goods from this area must be transported by road. The goods have to arrive in Adelaide in a suitable condition for consumers. At present the citrus industry in the river area is having a bad time. The growers receive only one-third of the price for which the fruit is sold on the Adelaide market, as it costs the other two-thirds to market the fruit.

Mr. Riches: Do you think it would be better if we did not have the Bill?

Mr. SHANNON: I suggest that we might have thought of other parts of the State that are in great need.

Mr. Loveday: Why not repeal the Act?

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Whyalla is obviously trying to draw me out. If I see disabilities in other parts of the State why should I move to amend the Bill to widen its scope? I remind the member for Whyalla that we would finish up with Adelaide left in a tight corner and the only place paying a ton-mile tax. If we are going to give a benefit to one part of the State we should consider whether that benefit was justified and whether we should not take a State-wide view.

The district of Renmark is safely represented at present by a member of the Opposition who is likely to hold the seat. Why offer him cherries, he is doing very well.

Mr. Clark: He will be pleased to hear that.

Mr. SHANNON: Whether he is or not, I am a realist, as is the honourable member and his Party. Members of it have been clever, for they have selected with great care the spots upon which to throw their largesse. They have not attempted to consider other parts of the State where they are well entrenched, to see whether something should be done about securing the return of their candidate in opposition to a Liberal Party man. I do not know whether they expect to win the seat of Flinders by this stratagem. The District of Flinders will be well informed of the reasons for this move, because this debate has shown clearly why the measure has been introduced. When people know the full facts there will be a rebound on the Party opposite that propounded this peculiar idea of privilege for some and not for others, and the people will be annoyed. When members of the Opposition find that despite their guile and wiles they are still sitting on the Opposition benches, they are driven to do silly things, in order, if possible, to improve a poor position. This is one occasion when, upon reflection, the Labor Party will have decided that it chose poor grounds on which to fight, grounds on which they have no justification and where they cannot go to the electors and explain satisfactorily to them why they would give a privilege to one section and deny it to others who might need it more. It is a simple proposition. The member for Norwood is correct when he says that this is a road maintenance tax. We have funds from other sources for the construction and building of roads. The people using the roads shall maintain them. Is that unfair? Anything that would justify doing something about that maintenance tax that did not apply it fairly to all road users, would be unreasonable. It has to be applied fairly over the whole State otherwise it fails, and it is not justified unless it so applies.

The member for Frome alleges that the majority of roads in his district are earthen roads that have been formed by a road grader. Probably that is correct. The member for Stuart knows that tremendous distances are involved in the outback. It is a credit to the Engineering and Water Supply Department that trafficable roads can be formed over these long distances. I agree with the member for

Frome when he said that the condition of livestock travelling from outback places is poor when it reaches the market. This wastage is a sin, but every stock agent knows about it. It is almost impossible to provide sealed roads over the distances required on Eyre Peninsula and elsewhere in the State. It would take too much from our road funds to do that. The only way it could be done (and here I criticize the Liberal Government in Canberra) would be by road subsidy as has been done in Queensland. This action is equally justified for South Australia. If we had that source from which to draw funds to improve our northern beef roads, not only South Australia but the Commonwealth would benefit. Beef at present has a world demand, is readily saleable and the more good beef we can bring in the larger is our export. I agree with the member for Frome that there is some justification for an approach to the Commonwealth for similar treatment to that which has been given to Queensland. That State has a similar problem to us in bringing cattle in from the outback country. I consider that this type of legislation should not be passed. I have commented on things that are obvious to anyone with experience in this House, as to the background and reasons for the introduction of such legislation, because I considered it my duty to do so.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I rise to support the Bill and at the outset express my amazement at the interpretation that the Premier and the member for Onkaparinga have placed upon the Bill. It does not do any of the things which the member for Onkaparinga claims that it does. I hope that members will understand from what I have to say that the purpose of the Bill is nothing like the picture that was painted by the two speakers I have mentioned; nor was it conceived in the manner that the member for Onkaparinga would lead the House to believe that it was. Whether he, if he ever introduced a Bill into the House or prepared one, would look at it from the point of view of every electorate in the State and determine what political advantage could be derived from each electorate by its introduction, I would not know; that might be his approach to legislative matters, but it is not my approach, or the approach of any member on this side. Obviously, as he said, if the Labor Party had desired to introduce a measure that would benefit individual districts we would have looked after some of the districts that we represent ourselves, but this Bill, by and large, represents

a measure of justice in which we have no special interest apart from the desire to see fair play.

My interest in this matter was aroused when I received an invitation to visit Cowell to declare a sporting area open, and whilst there the Chairman of the Franklin Harbour District Council, together with a number of other men vitally interested in this matter, drew my attention to the heavy imposition of the Road Maintenance Act on the people on Eyre Peninsula. I told him I had not been able to assess properly the effect it would have on that particular area. There was not a long debate or a long time given for debate when the Bill was originally introduced in the House, and I thought it quite reasonable that some possible effects of this legislation on the outback areas might have been overlooked. He pointed out some facts to me: he told me he had set down in writing and placed before the Minister of Agriculture submissions asking that the matter be placed before the Government. Later on he sent me a copy of his submissions which I read carefully, and I considered that he had made out a good case. When it was suggested that this difficulty could be overcome by a simple amendment to the Act, exempting Eyre Peninsula and inserting an alternative definition of roads, it met with my full support. There is no suggestion in this Bill of any differentiation between an interstate road haulier and an intrastate road haulier. Both kinds use roads that are defined in the Bill.

The road between Port Augusta and the Western Australian border is used by interstate road hauliers and the suggestion is that, for the time being at least, that area should be exempt, and it is an attempt to meter out justice to an area which I consider has been harshly dealt with. I voted for the Road Maintenance Bill when it was before the House less than 12 months ago and I have to accept as much responsibility for that vote as any other member of the House must for his. I think my vote on that occasion was wrong in relation to its effect upon an area, which I did not visualize at the time. From all we have heard today I still maintain that I was not the only one who did not foresee the full impact on some of the far-flung areas in this State over which this Act is applied and which will suffer from heavily increasing charges. The Act defines the area in such a way that was thought desirable, namely, to have land marks or at least a clear definition of the area to be exempt. The railway crossing the continent and the gulf are surely land marks which

could be easily defined. There is no attempt to undermine the effectiveness of the Road Maintenance Act.

The Premier suggested we should put up some alternative, which we will not do because I at least agree with the necessity for the present Act. Indeed, I would defend the Government and the Parliament anywhere in the operation of the Act, but I am suggesting now that an area exists in which circumstances are not comparable with any other part of the State, and I doubt whether they would be comparable with any other part of Australia. They are circumstances competent for this House to consider. This Bill asks not to give anybody concessions but to refrain from imposing additional taxation on an area where we believe that tax would be an impost. In addition to exempting Eyre Peninsula, I ask Parliament seriously to look at the definition of "road" in the Act. When I voted for the initial Bill I frankly admit that I overlooked the wide interpretation that could be placed on this definition—a public road over which hauliers have to pay road maintenance. According to the Act a public road means any street, road, lane, bridge, thoroughfare—and this is the important part—or place open to or used by the public for passage with vehicles. North, east and west of Port Augusta there are well-used tracks through pastoral areas which are not roads coming within this definition. The case the member for Frome advanced is bad enough, namely, that people should be asked to pay road maintenance tax on the Birdsville track, but what about the tracks that are not roads at all? I understand that the method of operation is that the haulier has to keep account of all his running and is obliged to pay the tax to the Local Government Department on his running over every road that comes within the definition of the Act. If he fails to do that he is committing a breach of the Act. The Premier admits this is wrong. Last week he himself said it was not intended to levy this charge. If that is so, then I suggest there is no harm in taking that definition from the Act. No-one can deny that. The sum of money involved would not seriously affect the finances of the State; nor would it be necessary to impose increased taxation anywhere else. This is a new tax that has not yet been collected by the State and we are not asking that any other area be taxed, but that this area, which is not completely exempted, should be removed from the Act.

A haulier cannot travel from the metropolitan area to Eyre Peninsula unless he first pays 200 miles of road tax. All the areas mentioned by the member for Onkaparinga are covered in the 200-mile radius and people in those areas would not pay any more than the people we are dealing with under this Bill, who would still pay as much as any other haulier in the State.

The Premier made one or two jibes at the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday). He made great play that we were doing something for Whyalla and were not prepared to do it for other parts of the State. This, of course, is all nonsense, because everything from Whyalla would have to bear the tax for the first 200 miles. If the Premier seriously believes that the boundary should start at Whyalla, let the Bill be carried at the second reading and shift the boundary south. He tried to make out that the motive behind this Bill was one seeking, first of all, some substantial benefit for the people of the district of Whyalla exclusively. He referred to the non-productive residents of the district of Whyalla, but in the next breath he said that we were not concerned about those areas at all, that we were trying to curry favour with the wheatgrowers on Eyre Peninsula. The Premier cannot have it both ways. I emphasize that no-one is being completely exempted by this measure: everyone has to pay the road maintenance tax on the first 200 miles from Adelaide.

The Premier went to great lengths to tell of the money that was spent on roads on Eyre Peninsula, and he tried to make some charges that we were claiming that the Government was spending insufficient money or a disproportionate amount of money on Eyre Peninsula. None of these statements were ever made by any member on this side of the House. The Premier was indulging, in his characteristic style, in putting up Aunt Sallies and knocking them over himself. There is no differentiation of that kind anywhere in this Bill. Nobody went over to the West Coast and told the people there that they were down-trodden and that the Government was not spending enough on roads there. According to the advertisements in the newspapers I have read, meetings of the people were called by the wheat-growers' organizations on Eyre Peninsula, and some of the meetings were called by the branches or sub-branches of the Liberal and Country League. The Chairman of the Franklin Harbour council, who approached me, is, as far as I know, a member of the L.C.L. I read in the West Coast newspapers that they

have carried resolutions at their meetings on the West Coast, and that representations have been made from those meetings to the Government. The Premier said that at the L.C.L. conference there was no interest in this matter regarding the West Coast. Well, I do not know whether that is true or not, and it does not worry me one iota. I know the people who spoke to me, and I read the newspapers, and from those newspapers I learned that resolutions were carried at meetings of the L.C.L. If that organization denies that, that is entirely its own affair. Resolutions were also carried at meetings which were addressed and organized (if not called by) the Wheat-growers Federation. According to the newspaper reports, I understand that those meetings were addressed by the member for Whyalla and by other members representing the Party opposite. I think that some understanding was arrived at before those meetings were held. In fact, the only report I had from the member for Whyalla was that there was an understanding, before those meetings were called, that there would be no debate on the basis of Party politics.

Let this be known: there is a political organization on the West Coast that is interested in this matter. Every sub-branch of the Labor Party on Eyre Peninsula has asked for this measure. They are asking for it because these freights have an effect on everything that comes into the home. When I was in Port Lincoln some little time ago as a member of a committee, evidence was placed before us (this was about the same time as I was approached by the Chairman of the Franklin Harbour council) that bricks at Port Lincoln cost £42 a thousand compared with £24 a thousand in Adelaide. Let that figure sink in. Do members say that that does not inflict a hardship? What will the road maintenance tax do to the charges on everything that goes into the home? Of course, it is the people on the long end of the run who pay every time. I know the answer is to produce bricks in Port Lincoln, and probably that will be done, but what happened to the cost of bricks would happen to the cost of everything that is transported over there. People only have to live in those areas to understand and appreciate the position.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) made a play on Mount Gambier. He said that, in some places in the South-East, Government departments have come to the aid of the hauliers and are paying some portion of the cost. Why? How can they justify that on

any other ground than the distance that has to be covered? That is all we are asking Parliament to do.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That applies to the timber hauliers.

Mr. RICHES: Yes; probably it is not wide enough. If some member can amend this Bill to provide for a greater element of justice, such a move will receive my support. It is something new to me for this House to say, "We are not going to give justice to Eyre Peninsula because the same cannot be given in the same detail all over the State." I repeat that this measure only gives relief after payment in respect of 200 miles. I ask the House not to overlook the definition provided in the Bill. The Government has no responsibility whatever for the tracks through the pastoral areas, nor will any Government money ever be spent on them. The Premier himself said that the Government does not intend to collect from those areas, so why is there any opposition to removing such tracks from the definition? We do not propose removing any road at all. The Premier made much of the expenditure of money on roads. Wherever roads are put they are not used exclusively by the people alongside the road, and it is not true to say that the roads on Eyre Peninsula are built for the people living there. Eyre Highway is being built to provide transport between the States. No motorist in the metropolitan area wants to be confined to the metropolitan area: he wants to use roads outside that area at some time or another. This is just a red herring that the Premier has introduced, and it has no relation to the Bill whatever.

The Premier also made a play on the statement that money collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act must be spent on maintenance of roads used by hauliers. The Government can spend on the Eyre Highway all the money that it collects by way of this tax for the next 20 years and that road still will not be completed. We know the fate of this Bill because it is not being considered on its merits or on the basis of justice being meted out to the people who, by reason of their isolation, will have to pay higher taxation than other people in the State. It is being considered purely on the basis of what it would do to the electoral districts. I have never heard the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) at greater disadvantage than today and surely the House will not exercise justice on the basis of his opposition; I should hope that we have raised ourselves a little above that. I am afraid

that my voice will not allow me to continue at any great length. I hope that I have indicated that I strongly support the Bill. I resent the implication that we would be setting up a special, favoured or privileged section of the community. Let members who believe that go to the Eyre Peninsula and tell the people living there that they are a special, privileged section of the community; they will have the answer to that.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I do not wish to make a lengthy reply. Neither of the two speakers opposite mentioned the distance of hauling wheat from silos to terminals. Nothing was said about the wheat from the area except that most of it was exported. The member for Onkaparinga said that Party politics were involved, but we considered several areas and their distances from Adelaide in framing the Bill and concluded that relief should be granted to the Eyre Peninsula. I believe that the House has heard many good reasons for the exclusion of this area. The isolation of Eyre Peninsula has been fully considered by members supporting the Bill.

A Bill has already been introduced to repeal the Road and Railway Transport Act, but that Act should be retained and administered by a Minister of the Crown. It could be used to improve the affairs of the railways services of South Australia. The legislation we are now considering is not as important as that Act when we consider the importance of attracting freight to our railways. There must be a co-ordination of road and railway transport. We have been told about the opening of the interstate parcel express service between Adelaide and Melbourne and Sydney, but this is typical of a service that should be co-ordinated if this nation is to advance. Because of the isolation of this area and because the railways do not give a full service to the whole area, we believe that in the interests of these people this Bill should be passed. The area is defined clearly. A greater co-ordinated transportation service is needed in this State, and that does not exist under the administration of the Government. Before introducing this legislation, Labor members considered the distances and realized that a tax in respect of 200 miles would be paid on a journey to Eyre Peninsula. I hope members will support the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday,

McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No—Mr. Bockelberg.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.
Second reading thus negatived.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(TYRES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 851.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I will not delay the passage of this Bill. It provides that a person shall not offer for sale or for hire a motor vehicle that has been fitted with a regrooved tyre of 4-ply rating. I hope that in no circumstances will that practice be introduced, because I have been informed by people working in the industry that it is positively unsafe to regroove such a tyre. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Prohibition of regrooved 4-ply tyres."

Mr. LAUCKE: I move:

After "which" to strike out "has been" and insert "is".

This means that a vehicle that has a regrooved tyre on it at time of sale will be governed by this clause.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am concerned about the possible interpretation of the word "regrooved". It could be interpreted to include "retreaded" or "recapped". The processes of retreading and recapping consist of moulding new rubber on to a used casing and the moulding of new treads. Is the word "regrooved" acceptable in the trade to cover the exact meaning that the honourable member for Gouger wishes?

Mr. HALL: I have contacted a member of the trade in South Australia on two aspects of this clause—a tyre of 4-ply rating and the word "regrooved". I have been assured that everyone in the trade is fully conversant with both terms and that they have the same meaning for each man in the trade, be he a regroover, a retreader, a recapper, or a reseller.

In one instance, I got this information from the manager of one of the biggest tyre-selling firms in South Australia and, in the other instance, from the technical manager of one of the biggest tyre-selling firms in South Australia. Without hesitation, they assured me that both terms meant exactly what they stated and that no confusion could arise in the implementation of this clause.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT REGULATIONS:
MECHANICAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT.

Order of the Day No. 6: Mr. Millhouse to move:

That the Mechanical Handling Equipment Regulations, 1964, made under the Harbors Act, on April 2, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on June 10, 1964, be disallowed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(FRANCHISE).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 856.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I understand that this Bill, the clauses of which I have not studied closely, alters the roll of the Legislative Council and makes it the same as the roll for the House of Assembly. That is its main purpose as stated by the Leader of the Opposition but, of course, it is not the main purpose behind its introduction which, in my opinion, is the first step (and I see honourable members opposite smiling) towards carrying into effect a policy that the Opposition has favoured for many years, namely, the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Jennings: The Government is getting more sensible every day!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Our friends opposite, having failed in a direct attack, are now trying a flanking movement. It is stated that the Bill is introduced merely to modify the electoral roll for the Legislative Council. However, its real purpose is to abolish the two-Chamber system of Government. I want to deal with that first because I believe that that is the ultimate motive behind the Bill. Some of my friends opposite have given me some encouragement because, when I observe them nodding their heads and giving me a smile, I know that I am on the right line.

Mr. Hutchens: You mistake a smile for laughter!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had some experience in this House now. I think that the member for Stuart (Mr Riches), you, Mr. Speaker, and I are the three members with the longest unbroken service in this House, so I can speak with some knowledge of the work of the Legislative Council over a long period. I think I am qualified to give some account of the effects that the Legislative Council has had on the enacting of legislation and the carrying into effect of the laws of this State. I say without hesitation that, although at times it is more difficult to get legislation through because we have two Houses of Parliament, thus rendering it necessary for legislation to be accepted on two occasions and to take longer in its passage through Parliament, the Legislative Council is one of the great elements in our legislative system that provides not only effective legislation but also the protection of minorities from time to time. The Legislative Council has not delayed progress; it has maintained stability and I would unhesitatingly oppose strongly any Bill that was introduced as a first step towards the abolition of the Legislative Council. My reason for saying it is that last year my Government introduced a Bill, one of the features of which was almost to double the number of people eligible to vote on the Legislative Council roll. This legislation would have enabled the spouse of every person at present on the roll to be enrolled and be an elector for the Council.

Mr. Casey: Why stop half way?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Frome is a little concerned, as he can see where that would take him. What happened to that legislation? It was rejected by members opposite and was not allowed even to pass the second reading stage. Members opposite rejected it without giving this House the opportunity to consider its clauses. It seems to me that members opposite are just beginning to wake up to where their moves here led them. It is entirely out of keeping for them one year to reject absolutely a Bill to double Legislative Council enrolments without allowing it to proceed past the second reading, and then to introduce this measure. They have now become penitent and have said, "We went too far last year. We had better retrace our steps and recreate the image that we are a democratic Party. We were not a democratic Party last year, but to

recreate the image that we are we will bring in a Bill. It will not be in a form that will allow it to be carried, but it will make up for our past actions." This Bill is not electoral reform, as honourable members opposite know. They are aiming not at electoral reform but at a constitutional change and the abolition of the dual House system in order to get to the position that exists in another State. Honourable members know that that is inherently the policy of the Labor Party. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, and I know you will not call me to order if I make a passing reference to it—

The SPEAKER: I was just going to refer to that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If they had their way they would do the same in the Commonwealth sphere.

Mr. Jennings: I agree.

Mr. Clark: There is adult franchise in the Commonwealth sphere.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I look at the honourable member and wonder why.

Mr. Clark: You did not look hard enough.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If members opposite had their way they would centralize all power into one small group. When all is said and done, the small group ostensibly making the laws would be directed from behind, so ultimately all power would be centralized, if the Labor Party had its views carried into effect, into a body not elected by the general voters. That is what would happen if this Bill were given effect to. In the circumstances, with very much regret—and I know members opposite expected better of me—I have to announce that I must oppose the Bill!

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Nothing is more ridiculous than to hear the Premier shedding crocodile tears about democracy and the lack of democracy. That is the funniest thing I have heard this week. We all know his views about democracy and, after all, all we are concerned about in this measure is providing full adult franchise for the Upper House.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And refusing it for women.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have never heard any reason why there should not be adult franchise for the Upper House. It is no good the Premier's saying that if this happend a small group would be dictating from behind. I cannot see any difference between that position and having a small group dictating from in

front, and the Premier would be as conversant with that situation as are all members behind him. All we are seeking is to get a more democratic Upper House. Goodness knows, this has been sought for so long that it is about time it was granted. We are fond of giving people lectures about how much more democratic they should be in their Governments, yet this State sets the worst example of any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations in its electoral set-up. It was amazing to hear the Premier speak in this way. I am surprised at his exposing himself to such criticism, because everyone knows that his peculiar brand of democracy is regarded with absolute derision everywhere where there are people who understand what the word means. All we are endeavouring to do is move with the current trend of thought and see the Upper House become more democratic to express better the views of the people. Surely if the Premier is so concerned, as he often says he is, in endeavouring to meet the desires of the people of this State, this Bill should have his full support.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): There is no doubt that the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) has been to New South Wales, where this peculiar form of democracy is in operation. The Labor Party, which has been in power there for many years, made an abortive attempt to do what his Party is intending to do here by a method that is rather astute. The elimination of the Upper House is the goal of the Party opposite, and its members make no bones about it. I do not know why they do not move straight out for it. The Opposition is obviously fighting for breath. If the Labor Party is Australia-wide, as its members claim, it is obvious that the Party in New South Wales would be doing something about the peculiar method, which the member for Whyalla failed to enlarge upon, of electing the Upper House. That is about the most peculiar type of democracy one could imagine. If a vacancy occurs the two Houses meet to elect a new member. They do not elect members for six years but for 12, perhaps to make sure! It is obvious that we so-called democrats avoid anything that resembles democracy as the Labor Party would have it. There are other channels in their own peculiar set-up regarding the control of policy, which are, after all, fundamental to government. Whoever decides the policy for a Party in power is, in effect, the Government, because it is policy that counts. However, the Party opposite does not worry about the democratic system when it comes to appointing members from the various States to

attend the A.L.P. Commonwealth conference, for, irrespective of the numerical strength of the States, six men are appointed from each State to represent their respective branches and to decide the policy that all Labor members are supposed to follow—the letter of the law. It is of no significance that Tasmania, the size of a pocket handkerchief, with only a handful of population, sends six representatives to the conference. The principle might be all right, but I should not like to have to abide by it.

Mr. Riches: The same applies to the Senate.

Mr. SHANNON: For many years the Party opposite has advocated the abolition of the Senate and I suppose it still does, for I should expect it at least to be consistent. When is it going to put its own house in order? When is it going to provide a democratic system and a policy that will work for the general welfare of Australia? When will it start to tidy up its own domestic affairs? When it does, it might be better able to debate causes such as this, but until then I am not interested.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): Every speaker so far in this debate has been brief and I do not intend to depart from that. I was rather disappointed in the Premier's remarks for, although he spoke in a jocular fashion, I was not deluded for a moment. My colleagues will tell me I am a super-optimist when I say that for a moment I thought that at last the Premier had seen the light and was prepared to support the Bill. However, he did not take long to tell us where he stood—and that is in the same position where he has always stood on such matters. He is probably not game to be anywhere else! I think every sensible person must take exception to the Premier's remarks, particularly when he attempted to accuse us of opposing certain legislation last year because it gave the spouse of a Legislative Council elector the right to vote for that House. We did not oppose it for that reason but because it was one of the best (or shall I say worst) examples of attempting to introduce completely totalitarian and Fascist legislation. Tacked on to the sugar coating around a most objectionable-tasting pill was the fact that the sprat was going to be thrown in to catch the mackerel and that the Opposition would be deluded into thinking that because a few extra women were to be given the vote it was good legislation. We heard the Premier accuse us of wanting to set up a system under which a small minority ruled. Surely this exists now! We naturally appreciate the position in this Chamber where the two Parties are evenly divided by the wish of the people, and you,

Mr. Speaker (and I do not say this derogatorily), are sitting on the fence. Although I point out that that was not the real wish of the people, the incredible thing is that we find ourselves equally divided in this House, yet in another place we have the pitiful spectacle of four Opposition members and 16 Government members.

Mr. Millhouse: You are not suggesting your four members are pitiful?

Mr. CLARK: No, I would be the last to suggest that. I said it was a pitiful spectacle, and indeed it is. How ridiculous this must seem to everybody who stops to think about it. I am sure Government members realize this for, after all, they do not get into this place unless they show some signs of being able to think. Everybody must appreciate, too, the ridiculous difference between this House, with such even numbers, and the position in the Upper House. That is not the wish of the people, but despite the loaded dice it was the best the people could do. Compare that with the other place where there are four Opposition members. I can remember the time when it was said in this place by an honourable member who is still here that one of the chief occupations of many of the members of the Legislative Council in those days (I do not necessarily agree with the statement) was to sit there and listen to their arteries hardening. That could not be said now, for we have had a number of younger members elected to the Legislative Council over recent years.

Have members ever stopped to look at those younger members? Some of them are failed House of Assembly candidates. Apparently a seat in the Legislative Council is a reward for an honest endeavour in contesting a district which there is no hope of winning. In fact, the next aspirant for a seat in the Legislative Council could well be the gentleman whom nobody has ever heard of in Semaphore and who is aspiring to contest that district on October 3.

Mr. Millhouse: He will win it, too.

Mr. Dunstan: The honourable member's powers of self-delusion are magnificent.

Mr. CLARK: I trust the House will forgive me for pausing to give honourable members a chance to enjoy their merriment.

Mr. Jennings: The Hon. Mr. Story could not even beat Bill Macgillivray.

Mr. CLARK: I was not prepared to say that, nor was I going to enumerate the members who have reached the Legislative Council after defeat at a House of Assembly election. I have no intention of "rubbishing" the Legislative Council. Those gentlemen

are elected to that place under the present franchise, and if the job is available to them and they think they can do it, who can blame them for accepting the opportunity? All I am saying is that the House should consider the number of members who were not good enough for the House of Assembly but who have now been elevated to the Upper House. The Premier no doubt has memories about this; probably it would be true to say that he had not fond memories but sad memories. However, I will give the Premier his due over this: finally he managed to make those members knuckle down, too.

We were reminded during this debate of the position in two other States. We always seem to be told about New South Wales. Well, I have no ambition to emulate the doings or ideas of the Labor Party in New South Wales. All I can say is that if we did get the opportunity in this State to get rid of the Legislative Council, from my own knowledge of the members who sit in this place representing the people, through the Australian Labor Party, and those in the Upper House who do the same thing, I have no doubt at all what would happen. I do not want to be reminded of New South Wales. This is South Australia, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shannon: Did you want to be reminded of your own home territory? I gave you the chance to mention that.

Mr. CLARK: I know the honourable member attempted to do so, but personally I could not see that he managed to make one point in the course of his brief remarks. The only thing that was wrong with his remarks was that his brief speech would have been much better if it had been cut down to one-third its size. I am not going to get on to the furphy of the six men, because that is a subject that the honourable member knows nothing about and if I explained it to him I doubt whether he would be capable of understanding it. Therefore, I shall not waste my time doing so.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It is not analogous to the subject under discussion.

Mr. CLARK: That is so. The Premier referred to the State that does not have a Legislative Council. A few years ago I had the honour, along with a colleague from the Legislative Council, to represent this State at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, and one morning at breakfast I got into a friendly discussion with a Commonwealth Minister of the same Government that is in power today. That gentleman was from Queensland. We got to discussing the relative

merits of States that have a bi-cameral system and those that have one House, and he told me that he would never countenance replacing the second Chamber in Queensland. In other words, the system seems to have worked so well in Queensland that both Parties are happy with having one House of Parliament.

Mr. Casey: And I think Western Australia is following that pattern, too.

Mr. CLARK: That could well be. The Premier from the outset took the attitude that this Bill would abolish the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It is only the first step.

Mr. CLARK: I wish it did abolish the Legislative Council.

Mr. Shannon: Why didn't your Bill say so?

Mr. CLARK: I make no secret of the Bill's intention, and I do not think I will be taken to task by any of my colleagues for saying so. This Bill merely makes the rolls the same for both Houses. The Premier went to town quite a bit about the awful things that could happen. I think that if both Houses had the same rolls, whether or not voting for the Legislative Council was compulsory, the people who went along to vote, if they knew they were on both rolls, would vote for both Houses. What could be saner than that? What a ridiculous situation we have at present, where in many districts many people are not on the roll, never will be on the roll, and do not care whether they are on the roll or not, because of their opinion of the so-called august Chamber. If our Bill became law, I for one would be saved walking my legs off attempting to persuade people or to remind them that it was their duty to be on the roll for both Houses. Surely, if a person is entitled to a vote he should exercise that vote.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: People do not do it now even when they are on the roll.

Mr. CLARK: If all people were on the roll it would be different.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I have seen many refuse to vote.

Mr. CLARK: I remember that not so long ago, I think it was prior to the last State elections, I attended a meeting and I asked the people who were in the gathering whether they could tell me the names of their Legislative Council members, and nobody seemed to know. One chap came to me afterwards (a man for whom I have the highest respect, for he is a trade union leader and one who follows politics very carefully) and said, "Just on the quiet, who are they?" I do not know if the position is the same today. Although

I do not think anyone on this side of the House would believe that the State would not benefit by having only one House of Parliament, that is not contained in this Bill. The Premier, of course, based the whole of his argument on the fact that this was a move to abolish the Legislative Council.

In conclusion, I have always believed that, when there are two Houses of Parliament, if the second House always agrees with the first House it is a waste of time and if the second House often disagrees with the so-called Lower House it is an infernal nuisance. For that reason (and I say this because the Premier raised the matter) I should be happy to see the Legislative Council abolished. This legislation is not intended to do that, but in the hope that it could lead to the abolition of the so-called Upper House, I most heartily support it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Last week the Leader of the Opposition expressed a doubt whether I would speak on this Bill. I rise to put his mind at rest and to assure him that I shall speak against it. I have here a copy of the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party*.

Mr. Jennings: That is an obsession with you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going on to say that the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) has not yet given me my copy of the 1964 amendments to this book. I shall refer to that plank in the State platform under the heading of "Constitutional and Electoral." I believe this is something about which I should remind members opposite. It is rather contradictory in the various splinters of the plank. Resolution No. 1 is "Abolition of the Legislative Council." No. 2 reads:

A House of Assembly of 56 members representing single electorates elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting.

This is something we have not heard much about lately. I hope the two are not contradictory. However, let us look at No. 5. I am surprised that Opposition members have not placed a little more reliance on this, because part of splinter No. 5 helps them in this debate, but they have been silent about the second part. The first part reads:

Pending the abolition of the Legislative Council, provision for adult franchise for this House . . .

That is what this Bill does. I hope that if an Opposition member follows me he will explain the second part, which I shall now read:

. . . and limiting its power to delaying for 12 months legislation insisted on by the House of Assembly.

Mr. Corcoran: It is the same for the House of Lords.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Precisely. Last week the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) referred to the House of Lords but I noticed that he studiously avoided speaking about this part of the platform in this debate and all other Opposition speakers ignored it. If Opposition members are sincere in this and want to carry out the various planks of their platform why do they not do it in accordance with the planks instead of going not even half way towards the abolition of the Legislative Council? Why did they not include the provision to hold up things for only 12 months? Why have they not told the House what is in their platform?

Mr. Dunstan: We told you about that 12 months ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why not in this debate?

The seventh resolution reads:

Resolution of all matters of wide social interest which are not issues as between the Parties at elections and of deadlocks between the Upper House and Lower House to be by referenda.

If the other planks in the platform were carried into effect I do not know what deadlocks there would be between the two Houses; there could not be a deadlock because there would be only one House.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member does not get back to the Bill he will be deadlocked.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know why, Mr. Speaker, but you like to threaten me.

The SPEAKER: You are referring to provisions that are not in the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will return to the Bill, having reminded members opposite of their own platform. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): First, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for drawing the attention of the member for Mitcham to the Bill. I hope you will be slightly more tolerant of me because I am going to say that this Bill has nothing whatever to do with the abolition of the Legislative Council, but (I want to make myself perfectly clear on this) I believe in the abolition of the Council and I will support any move towards this at any opportunity I have at any time, and the same goes for the abolition of the Senate. That does not mean that whilst the Upper House is in existence it should not be made a little bit more workable, sensible

and generally democratic than it is. That is the reason for the Bill.

As in all of these matters many red herrings are introduced. The Premier, who is the past master at introducing red herrings and drawing them across any trail, talked about New South Wales. In New South Wales, the Upper House has got into a vexed state because the term of office there is so extensive. Therefore, the election to the Lower House cannot readily be mated to the appointment of members of the Upper House. The Premier and his supporters also failed to mention (but it was mentioned later) that, in Queensland, the Upper House was abolished. Since then Governments have been in power that have subscribed to the view that there should be a bi-cameral system, yet they have realized the effectiveness of a single Chamber of Parliament and have not made the slightest attempt to re-introduce the bi-cameral system there. Also, in New Zealand a conservative Government got rid of a wasteful, useless and completely mischievous Upper House. The member for Gawler quite properly said that in a bi-cameral system, if the Upper House is of the same political complexion as the Lower House, it is only a rubber stamp; but if the Upper House is of a different political complexion from the Lower House then it is an obstruction. I believe I have said enough to indicate briefly my support of the Bill.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support the Bill. If the Premier had used the words "liar" and "dishonesty" he would have been called to order and made to withdraw. He implied the same words when referring to the Leader's remarks when he stated his intention about this Bill. I shall not repeat the words of the member for Enfield, but this is a Bill for the application of adult franchise to the Legislative Council. We on this side have always subscribed to that policy. No matter what members may think we cannot do anything about abolishing the Council. It cannot be done by referendum but must be done by the Legislative Council itself. I may be wrong, but that is the knowledge we had in the 1920's when a Labor Government was in office and tried to pass legislation that was frustrated by the Legislative Council. It has not always been as co-operative as the Premier said this afternoon. It is all right when the Liberal Government is in office and Liberals dominate the Council, because Liberal members of the Legislative Council are more likely to co-operate with a Liberal Government than with a Labor Government.

We know what happened when a Labor Government was in power in this House and the Liberal Party controlled the Council. No-one can deny that it is democratic for everyone over 21 years of age to be able to vote for his representative in Parliament, whether in the Legislative Council or the House of Assembly. It cannot be suggested that a restricted franchise should apply to this House. Why deny it for the other Chamber? I am sorry that the member for Onkaparinga has left the Chamber because I should like to reply to him on things he said about New South Wales. It is true that in the early 1930's the New South Wales Government attempted to abolish the Legislative Council in that State, but the move was frustrated. I understand that members of the Legislative Council in New South Wales receive an allowance of £750. Their position is not the same as that of an ordinary member of Parliament and they cannot be compared with members of the Upper House in this State. New Zealand has no Upper House. I should like to have replied to the member for Mitcham, who has an obsession about the Labor Party and never speaks without introducing something about it.

Mr. Clark: It is not the only obsession he has.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, but it is a particularly bad one and he should correct that fault.

Mr. Millhouse: You should be proud of your Party platform and not be afraid of it.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The member for Mitcham never praises it but always attempts to ridicule it. I could ridicule his Party platform and some of the decisions of his Party. Perhaps I may have the opportunity to do so before I leave Parliament.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No.—Mr. Bockelberg.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

DRAINAGE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Dunstan:

(For wording of motion, see page 595.)

(Continued from September 16. Page 856.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I understand that it is the wish of the House and of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) that this matter be disposed of today. The Government is informed that it will be possible for the constituent metropolitan councils to agree to set up a metropolitan drainage authority in this State. That being so, I believe that it is the wish of the member for Norwood that this matter should rest pending the setting up of that authority which will take care of the problems referred to in his motion. If that is the wish of the honourable member I shall say no more. I presume that he will move that his motion be read and discharged.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): As I understand the Minister of Works, the position is that most councils have agreed to establish a metropolitan drainage authority; that the metropolitan drainage authority will be established; that it will undertake the responsibility for works on the creeks referred to in this motion; and that therefore the position now obtaining under the Local Government Act of putting an impost and responsibility on private citizens will no longer obtain. In those circumstances, and as I understand the position, I move that the motion be read and discharged.

Motion read and discharged.

(*Sitting suspended from 6.3 to 7.30 p.m.*)

THE BUDGET.

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

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 22. Page 976.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £15,452.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): In rising to speak to the Budget, I take this opportunity of referring briefly to two gentlemen who will be retiring from this Chamber at the end of this session. First, I refer to my colleague, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred

Walsh), who after many years in Parliament is retiring. His knowledge of industrial matters has been of tremendous value to the Party he represents and he will be hard to replace. I have enjoyed his company and advice and wish him and his wife a happy retirement, longevity and good health. Secondly, I refer to our friend on the other side of the Chamber, the member for Victoria (Mr. Les Harding). I have had the pleasure of knowing him for two years and have always enjoyed his company, his friendliness and his support on matters common to us in the South-East. I wish him and Mrs. Harding all the best in their retirement and, above all, good health.

In this Budget are several taxation increases that affect the average man and woman in the community. They follow the Government's increases in hospital charges that in some instances amount to £5 5s. a week. Therefore, despite the pleadings of the Minister of Lands in this Chamber last night, I cannot support the Budget. It has been announced on television this evening that the Government will be introducing an Indenture Bill for another pulp mill in the South-East, and the indications are that the mill may be in my electoral district. However, before I go into raptures over this suggested pulp mill, I want to be a little more assured that this time the mill will become a reality. I have no doubt, from my knowledge of the South-Eastern forests, that the material which is now lying waste there and which would make first-class articles could be used for pulping purposes for the benefit of not only the South-East of South Australia but the whole State.

I look forward to the day when this Government or some other Government institutes a scheme of farm forestry to encourage private landholders to engage in forestry to the benefit of the State and the landholders. These farm forestry schemes operate in many countries, and I believe they are successful. They are also a means of building up the timber resources of this country, particularly of this State. As our population increases and as supplies of timber from the other side of the world diminish, we will need increased forestry activities not only in this State but throughout Australia. I believe that it was no idle statement by several eminent Australian foresters when they said that we must double our forestry lands by the year 2000.

I now turn to the subject of our railway services. On August 11, the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, in reply to a question by a member on this side, said:

The Secretary to the Railways Commissioner is responsible for public relations, and he has staff to assist him in this function. It is not intended to create an additional position of Public Relations Officer. The department has joined with other Australian railway systems in a nation-wide publicity campaign, and in addition the department is awaiting a proposition from an advertising agency, specifically aimed at inducing the public to patronize the railway country passenger services.

Only yesterday I asked the Minister a question concerning the provision of an improved railway service to the South-East. Although the Railways Department is engaging in a publicity campaign to induce passengers to travel on its country services, I believe that one of the first requirements is a searching inquiry by the department into existing facilities. If an advertising campaign is successful in inducing passengers to use our trains, the Railways Department must have the facilities to retain those passengers once they start using the trains. It is no good inducing them to use the trains if modern facilities are not installed. I refer particularly in this instance to the railway service between Adelaide and Mount Gambier. For many years people of the South-East have not complained about the service provided on this line. They can leave Mount Gambier one night, transact business in Adelaide the next day, return to Mount Gambier that night, and go to work on the following morning. There is nothing wrong with the service, but I should like to see better facilities provided, not only to attract passengers but to keep them. Not many people know of the washing and toilet facilities provided, even at the Adelaide railway station, for the use of passengers after the night journey. There is little to indicate that any of these facilities exist, and there are no places where people can change. Travellers expect to find these things. If railways are to become a force in the transport needs of the State—as I believe they can and will—the facilities must be brought up to the standard provided by competitors.

I have often advocated uniform electricity tariffs throughout the State, and I shall continue to do so until we get them. As it is the policy of my Party, it will be brought about in the near future. When flying to Mount Gambier last Friday I observed large areas of water covering the South-East. Water

has not lain in those areas in such large quantities for the last seven or eight years. As I am keenly interested in the development of the South-East, not only from an industrial point of view but from an agricultural point of view, I was delighted to see the water. Over a period of about 10 weeks that part of the State had more than 20 inches of rain. It is becoming adequately drained, and the drainage has brought about great improvements in the carrying capacity of the land. Dairying has been increased, and sheep and cattle numbers have been raised tremendously. In the last three or four years the cattle population, particularly in the Western Division that has been drained, has almost doubled.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Some people say it is too well drained.

Mr. BURDON: I am one who is not yet convinced that the South-East is over-drained. I want much more conclusive evidence before I change my views about the drainage of the South-East. The drainage schemes have brought into production large tracts of land, which only a few years ago were useless. The productive capacity has increased by 100 per cent. Whereas previously the land was useful for only three or four months of the year it is now productive for the 12 months. One problem that might arise from the drainage of the South-East is that, although the land has produced more, and much surface water has been drained, there will be a continuing demand for irrigation. As production increases so will the need to irrigate land. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has already raised this matter and I support his suggestion that we consider the matter of the water now being drained into the sea.

South Australia is not kindly treated by nature in the matter of adequate rainfall, yet in the South-East millions of gallons of water every hour are being drained into the sea. We are draining the underground reservoirs in the summer months for irrigation purposes. This will continue and even accelerate. Therefore, we must consider ways and means of getting much of the water now drained into the sea back into underground reservoirs. Some of our artesian bores in the South-East vary in depth from 600ft to 900ft., but a danger exists in continually draining surface water into the sea. There is an ever-increasing demand for irrigation. I am not a geologist but I believe that if we continue to deplete our underground reservoirs we shall run the risk of causing either salt water seepage or creating a high salinity in the water. Then it would be

unsuitable for pasture and stock purposes. Now is the time to consider this problem, which is, indeed, becoming a serious one.

I travelled to the centre of Australia earlier this year and I know of some of the conditions under which many people in areas of low rainfall live today. However, everybody is pleased and relieved that the Far North has recently received good rains. While the rain has not reached the centre, it has given the northern part of this State a great lift. I hope that the people who over the years have shown great fortitude in going to and remaining in these areas will be blessed with follow-up rains.

Often when I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I introduce a subject that is most important to the area I represent. On this occasion I shall refer to the question of water charges. Over the years our engineers and our public servants have assisted in bringing water to various parts of the State, and it has been of great benefit, not only to industry but to the people living in the outback. In fact, this water has been the salvation of many people. Two or three months ago the Minister of Works announced that his department was considering a uniform price for water sold by measure, and I hope this question will be pursued. I believe that the working out of a system to sell water by measure will present many problems. The State must receive an adequate return from any extensions to our water systems to those towns that do not now have an adequate supply.

If a plan of selling water by measure were introduced, I believe that it would be necessary to carry out a plan to educate people in the conservation of water, whether those people were in Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Adelaide or anywhere else. The more water we pump the higher are the charges, and the more water we conserve the less our pumping costs will be and the less will water be wasted. As I said earlier, great quantities of water are being wasted in the South-East. We shall have to conserve water even there, because large quantities of water will be used there soon, not only for agricultural purposes but for the expansion of an industry that has been foreshadowed. I have no doubt that this industry can be profitably expanded with the materials that we have available in the South-East.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): When His Excellency the Governor opened this session of Parliament he referred to the fact that South Australia had been blessed with a good season, and that there had been an increased cereal acreage, which together combined to make the 1963-64 harvest

the best on record. His Excellency also said that the season had been bountiful for fruit-growing and that the value of mineral production in South Australia had only been exceeded in one previous year in the history of the State. He referred to the excellent work of the Electricity Trust and to the fact that the revenue from that undertaking was an all-time high. When the Treasurer introduced the Budget he said:

Whilst the South Australian economy is in excellent condition and the outlook very good

In spite of that, he has introduced a Budget which, for a number of reasons, presents some difficulty. That is the situation that has always presented difficulty to me. I have always tried to think of public finance in the terms of finance as I understand it in my home. When things are prosperous in the home and more money is coming in, I usually think that there is more money to spend. However, when it comes to public finance, the situation is that whenever there is a good season and the country is in a state of prosperity somebody says that the country is headed for inflation, and that we must cut down expenditure and have increased taxation. That is precisely what this Budget is doing.

The Treasurer blames the Commonwealth Government for causing this, and he is right. However, I would have thought Government members would have stood with members on this side who object to that kind of thing year after year. What has the Commonwealth Government done this time? According to the news that came over the wireless tonight, the Commonwealth Treasurer, in New York, said that last financial year in Australia was a finance Minister's dream. Apparently this is the morning after the dream because, if I read my newspapers aright, the stock markets have been tumbling because of the fear of still another Commonwealth Budget's being introduced. The Commonwealth Government has decided to reduce grants to the States for special undertakings. According to the Commonwealth authorities, as I understand them, this has been done with the idea of curbing inflation, but works embarked upon by the States that have been considered absolutely necessary for the development of the country cannot be stopped overnight. They have to proceed and when the Commonwealth Government cuts its grants to the States the States have to increase their taxation. If that is not the direct cause of inflation I do not know what is.

The Treasurer says that that is the sole reason for the five new charges levied in the Budget that we are asked to approve. Members cannot be expected to do that and this is the time when we must protest as strongly as we can. This method is wrong and the State Governments should tell the Commonwealth Government so in no uncertain terms. If a country suffers a drought, as some countries in the world are experiencing, I can understand that it must reduce expenditure. Instead, when we have a record harvest, good prices, bumper crops and record production from our mines and from every revenue-earning function of the community, private as well as Government, that is the time when assistance is withdrawn and increased taxation has to be levied. Essential services are being delayed. During the debate the member for Mitcham and other members have chided members on this side because we have drawn attention to the savage increases, not only in this Budget but those relating to fares, freights and hospital charges. There can be no justification for demanding of the sick an extra £5 a week when the State and the Commonwealth are in the financial position they are in today. This money must be found because the edict from the powers that be at Canberra states that we must provide this additional money. We acknowledge that, but claim that, first, there should be a new relationship between the Commonwealth Government and State Governments for the provision of public finance. I notice with much pleasure that members opposite have been reading the best literature that can be found on financial provisions and the best type of reading matter available on sound economy for the future well-being of Australia. The member for Mitcham has quoted from a booklet I should like all members to read, *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party*.

Mr. Lawn: Members opposite are interested in the booklet and get a copy from our office every year.

Mr. RICHES: I hope they continue to do so and continue to quote from it, but I ask them to quote all of it and to quote it fairly, as they cannot render a better service to the State than by doing so. I am one that believes the answer to our economic difficulties lies in Socialism. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has been reading about Socialism, and when he has seen some of its effects in operation he wonders whether it is Socialism. He acknowledges the worth of the Electricity

Trust and what it has done for the State, and acknowledges that large sums would have been paid to shareholders in dividends if they had collected 8 per cent on the undertaking. He admitted how advantageous to the State had been the trust's extensions of services. However, he says that this is not a socialistic enterprise. He said:

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

He said later that he obtained that definition from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* in the library.

Mr. Lawn: He only quoted part of the definition.

Mr. RICHES: The pity is that he quoted one definition only. "Socialism" is a great term than can be capable of as many interpretations as can other great terms like "Christianity" and "Democracy". President Soekarno has a democracy, too, as he calls it.

Mr. Lawn: So has Playford!

Mr. RICHES: Yes. We have some sort of a democracy in South Australia. But I want to read the rest of the definition of "Socialism" given in this dictionary. The honourable member did not even complete the sentence that he quoted. This dictionary defines "Socialism" as follows:

Principle that individual freedom should be completely subordinated to interests of community, with any deductions that may be correctly or incorrectly drawn from it, e.g., substitution of co-operative for competitive production, national ownership of land and capital, State distribution of produce, free education and feeding of children, and abolition of inheritance.

Listen to this:

Attempt to apply Christian precepts in ordinary life resulting in some approximation to the aims of Socialism.

Socialism can be subjected to a number of interpretations and, because that is so, I want to tell the Committee what we mean by "Socialism" because the Labor Party, like Parliament, has included its own interpretation, so that there can be no ambiguity about it and it can be clearly understood in the book that has been quoted from during the course of this debate. We understand "Socialism" and we define it thus:

The democratic socialization of Industry, Production, Distribution and Exchange—to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features in those fields. . . . Labor believes that democratic socialization is the utilization of the economic assets of the State in the interests of citizens

I think the Electricity Trust would fairly fit into that definition. Then it is stated:

Labor believes that scientific and technological advancement shall serve the interests of all and not be the exclusive right of the few. The economic aims of social ownership or social control are full employment, higher production, a rising standard of living and social security. The Australian Labor Party seeks to secure through democratic socialism:

- (a) Social justice and economic security;
- (b) Freedom of speech, education, assembly, organization and religion;
- (c) The right of the development of the human personality protected from arbitrary invasion by the State.

Let the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) pay special attention to that: no subjugation of the rights of any decent citizen only in so far as they interfere with or seek to exploit the wellbeing of the whole. Then we state:

- (d) Free elections under universal adult, equal and secret franchise with Government by the majority with recognition for rights of minorities.
- (e) The Rule of Law to be the right of all.

I want to make a plea to the Government that that policy be adopted in several fields of special interest to my own electoral district and to the State and which are pertinent to the Budget we are now considering. Just as the Electricity Trust has been established under this system, I want to suggest to the Treasurer that if there is to be any Government expenditure on the proposed pipeline to bring natural gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide it should be State-owned and State-financed. It is important that the people should always have control of that pipeline, and the interests of the State would not be well served if any other arrangement were arrived at, even if during the period of actual construction it could be shown that Delhi-Santos could construct it a little more cheaply than the estimate from the State might suggest. This is a long-range project; as the Treasurer has said. Unless it is a long-range project, it will not be a project at all and the control of that service and that pipeline should never be out of the hands of the people. I do not believe that any natural resources should be left languishing because private enterprise is not interested in them at this particular stage. This State has heard from time to time of the potential salt production in my district. People know of the very valuable source of raw material for other industries that could be made available if salt were produced on a large scale. It does not stand to the credit of this State that while we have been dilly-dallying waiting for private enterprise

in many cases to settle differences and get moving, Western Australia has established and Queensland is establishing an industry supplying this article.

Japanese buyers were introduced to the Treasurer when the film *Robbery Under Arms* was made; I forget how many years ago that was. Because private enterprise that owned the leases was not able to settle its differences, the industry was not established. Japan is importing salt from Queensland, Western Australia and, I think, some of the other leases in South Australia. The company interested in the purchase of salt from Port Augusta was ready to talk business but a delay was caused because of the reluctance, so we are told, of outside capital to come to the party. We do not know if negotiations are still proceeding; if they are, I do not want to say anything that may embarrass the negotiations. However, if private enterprise is not prepared to establish industries based on our natural resources, the Government should step in and do it. We cannot blame private enterprise altogether in these matters. If people have money to invest, they may well be convinced that an industry can be established and that it will pay for itself, but that is not sufficient. They must be convinced that they can make more money in this field than by investing in Nestle's, Santos, or some other firm that catches their imagination at the time. Whether we like it or not, this policy is wrapped up with the development of this State, and it will have to be applied. Nobody else has been able to find any other solution.

Port Augusta has been waiting for a new hospital and has been living on promises for several years. In 1957, in reply to a question the Treasurer, as reported on page 229 of 1957 *Hansard*, told me that the Port Augusta hospital board was aware of the preparation of a long-range development plan for the hospital. That was the result of several years of negotiations, so it certainly was a long-term project! As reported at page 1286 of 1961 *Hansard*, the Treasurer said:

It is expected that a decision will soon be reached.

That is the answer today.

Mr. Lawn: What is a year here or there?

Mr. RICHES: The reason has never been satisfactorily explained to the people of Port Augusta, and the construction of the building has been delayed. Since negotiations were first opened at Port Augusta, a new hospital has been built at Port Lincoln. Port Augusta does not seem any closer to success than it

was at the time these unsatisfactory replies were given six years ago. People there are asking whether the Government can give some word as to when a start will be made on this institution. The hospital serves the whole of the area north and west of Port Augusta and is the centre of operations for the Flying Doctor Service. In spite of that, I do not suppose there is a more inconvenient hospital anywhere in the State, and it must be costing the Government large sums to maintain it. Nobody in Port Augusta expects a hospital to be built over-night, but the patience of residents has long been tried and the building is long overdue. During the last State election campaign (or about that time) the Minister of Works visited Port Augusta and addressed a meeting of his Party. According to the local press, he was asked when a start could be expected on the erection of the hospital and he replied, "I can give you an assurance that there will be something concrete done this year." **We are still waiting for something concrete to be done.**

I must also mention the construction of the adult education centre at Port Augusta. I know that the Minister has been sympathetic towards representations made to him and I believe that, as far as he is concerned, the adult education centre will be built as early as he can authorize it. We have been told on the grapevine, however, that the edict has gone out that, because of the budgetary situation, anything to do with cultural activity is out for this year as far as adult education centres are concerned. Unless a proposition can be brought forward based on the training of apprentices it cannot be considered.

Mr. Jennings: That is because the Minister of Education is the only cultured gentleman in a Cabinet of Philistines.

Mr. RICHES: I think the Minister of Education is right behind the local people in this matter and, if it is true there is not sufficient money to cater for the legitimate needs of primary and secondary education, then nobody can argue the point with the Minister. However, nobody can convince me that South Australia cannot afford to provide this legitimate requirement for the department at that stage and implement the policy of adult education as well. I ask that the Minister's application for approval to establish an adult education centre at Port Augusta, with a full operative capacity capable of engaging in the full programme, should not be denied. The centre serves not only Port Augusta but Quorn, Hawker and the district

round about, and the interest created when we had a principal who was able to visit those places was terrific. Unfortunately we have been without a principal for nearly two years as he has been on loan to Nigeria. I think he is due back any time now. In spite of that, the interest shown in that centre has been encouraging. That is one reason why I viewed with some concern the plan to spend a large sum of money on a Festival Hall when activities in adult education centres were being curtailed. Indeed, I would view with disfavour the curtailment of primary or secondary education to carry out the cultural activities of adult education. The Port Augusta gaol undertaking has been recognized as a necessity for a long time.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That has been started, hasn't it?

Mr. RICHES: No, the Public Works Committee has inspected the present gaol and approved the work, but no money is provided for it in the Budget.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Aren't there houses for warders?

Mr. RICHES: Yes, they have been there for a couple of years. I am not criticizing Ministers and those responsible for what is not in the Budget, but there should be some financial tie-up between the Commonwealth and State Governments. Local Government, like the State Government, often experiences financial difficulty. There seems to be no delineation of responsibility between Commonwealth and State, whether it be in education or in road construction. I point out that the road from Port Augusta to Woomera is a project for which nobody seems to claim responsibility. Local Government bodies appeal to the Government for special consideration, and the only progressive areas are those that have obtained finance outside the Local Government Act. This practice will continue; the Treasurer is investigating applications now, and I assure him more are coming.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): At this stage of the debate I find it difficult to speak on a topic that is fresh. I express my appreciation to the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) for his kind remarks about myself. This will be the last time that I shall speak in a debate of this kind and I thank Government members for their co-operation through the years, particularly the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education for their response to the many representations that I have made to them concerning matters affecting the district I have had the honour to represent. I am pleased that after several years

of agitation on my part a sewerage scheme for Fulham Gardens, Henley East, Grange East, Seaton and Kidman Park is to commence, as well as a scheme to drain surface water in that area.

The Auditor-General's Report criticizes the laxity of Government departments in certain respects. The Auditor-General points out that Government cars are taken home by officers of different departments, parked at their homes, and used over the week-end for private purposes. I know it to be a fact that in certain departments official cars and utilities are used by officers, and not the most senior officers of the department either. Perhaps this misuse of the cars is unknown to the higher officers of the department. Some of the vehicles have tow-bars attached for pulling caravans and trailers; they are used on holidays and week-ends, and they are generally accepted as belonging to the people who have them at their homes because there are no number plates to enable the general public to recognize them as Government cars.

As I said, this misuse of vehicles probably would be unknown to the heads of the departments and the higher officers, and certainly it would be unknown to the Ministers in charge of the departments. As a result, these officers get away with it. Whether or not the Auditor-General is referring to instances such as I have mentioned, I do not know, but what I have said is a fact and I think inquiries should be made. I do not wish to make the information public, but I suggest to the Treasurer that if he wishes to have further information about the department to which I refer I can give it to him. I think it is entirely wrong that these cars and utilities should be used for the purpose I mentioned.

A pleasing feature of the report concerns the operations of the Municipal Tramways Trust, referred to on page 239. The Auditor General states:

Operations for the year resulted in a deficit of £119,000 before taking into account the Government grant of £30,000. This was an improvement of £14,000 compared with 1962-63, making the tenth year in succession in which a reduction had been effected in the trust's annual deficit, and was achieved despite further substantial increases in wage costs during the year.

The report also said there had been no variation in the fare schedules. Unfortunately, since the report was printed the trust has seen fit to increase fares. The Railways Department has done the same thing, so the position in regard to its annual deficit should improve

considerably next year. In my opinion the Tramways Trust should further consider (as it promised more than once it would do) taking over the private bus services in the metropolitan area. Several of those services operate in the metropolitan area on remunerative routes. Some are the services to Ascot Park, Paringa Park, Daw Park and Ferryden Park. Many others are probably known to members as being lucrative for their proprietors. While these buses are licensed by the trust, they should be run by it. If the transport system in the metropolitan area were run by the Tramways Trust we would have a far better and more efficient system than we have. There would be fewer grounds for complaint by the travelling public, fewer people using their motor cars to travel to and from the City, and less need for the Government to subsidize the Tramways Trust. It is immaterial whether it is called a trust, corporation or board. The fact remains that the old Tramways Trust, as we knew it, is now out of business and it is more or less a semi-governmental organization. Therefore, I believe the whole question of the public transport system in the metropolitan area should be considered by the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council with a view to giving effect to my suggestions for a more efficient service to the public, and with a view to eliminating the need for the Government to continue to subsidize the trust as it has done for many years.

In about 1951 I remember Sir William Goodman giving evidence before the Public Works Committee when it was dealing with the acquisition of land for the extension of the Henley Beach railway line. I asked Sir William about the Tramways Trust taking over some of these private bus services and suggested the Ascot Park service, which I know well because I travelled on it. He said that the trust was going to take over that service next and then the Edwardstown service. However, no attempt has ever been made to take over either service or any other. Services have extended further out and more private buses have come into operation. I believe that is to the detriment of the Tramways Trust. I suggest that the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council should consider whether the trust could absorb these private bus services.

I was going to speak about the Electricity Trust, but so much has been said about it in this debate that anything I said would be only repetition. Reference has been made to its being a socialistic organization but certain aspects of that suggestion could be questioned. It is a State-owned organization in the real

sense of the term. People are inclined to be confused in their thinking about Socialism, and particularly members opposite when they talk of Socialism and Communism and other "isms".

In the main, members on this side talk of State ownership, which more clearly defines the system and is better understood than Socialism and Communism. We do not stand for Communism and we want that clearly understood by members on the other side. It is unusual for a Minister to enter a debate of this kind. I do not remember a Minister doing that in all the years I have been here, other than the Treasurer. I do not deny the Minister of Lands the right to do that, and it was good to listen to him, although I consider he was wrong in many of his statements. It is good to be able to express an opinion contrary to his. He seemed to want to get back to what I have known for many years is his pet subject, social credit. That can be linked with Socialism in its basic aspects of bank credit and the like. He spoke about the Governor of the Bank of Canada and said:

Recently someone asked the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Graham Powers, "Would you admit that anything physically possible and desirable could be made financially possible?" He said, "Certainly." He was then asked, "Why is it not done, then?" He said, "If our Parliament wants to change the form of operating the banking system, certainly that is within the power of Parliament."

That is exactly what Ben Chifley thought, and if one asked the Governor of the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, he would say the same thing; there is a similarity of thought with the Minister of Lands. When all is said and done, there is a basic agreement. The Minister compared Socialist and Capitalist countries, and said that the standard of living was high in Capitalist countries compared with that in Socialist countries. He does not know what the standard of living is in the Socialist countries he referred to, China and Russia, except from what he has read. He apparently does not remember that one country has only been in existence as a Socialist country or Communist country (I am not arguing their case, do not misunderstand me: I am trying to be fair) for about 15 years, and the other country since 1917, virtually you could say, from about 1929, when it started to get balanced.

I was in that country in 1929 and I know that conditions obtaining then were not good. I travelled 14,000 miles from east to west and north to south, and I should like to see it

today and make comparisons. I am not arguing in favour of that country's system, which I do not subscribe to. I have never been associated with it and had never visited that country before. I have never visited it since. Under the conditions prevailing before the First World War most people outside the cities were virtually starving. The position was the same in China when I saw Shanghai in 1929. Outside the cities of Hong Kong and Shanghai and other big cities the people were practically starving, and one wondered how they lived at all. Conditions could not have been worse. There must be an improvement and it is wrong for us to make comparisons.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: There must be a tremendous improvement.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Of course there is; I admit that. But we object to the Minister's statement that they are not able to feed themselves. They have been virtually cut off from the rest of the world. They have bought millions of bushels of wheat from Australia, Canada and America. That is because there has been a failure in their harvests brought about by Nature more than anything else. India is not a Communist country by any means, although it may be referred to as a Socialist country. Whether or not it is I do not know: I do not know much about it except that I have travelled through it a few times and seen how bad things are there.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The tragedy is that they themselves do not know.

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is not to Australia's credit that, while we allowed ships to be diverted to India, provided they got the approval of the purchasers of the wheat in England, we were not prepared to send wheat to India otherwise. Surely we could have arranged to send a few shipments of wheat to India, a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, at no charge at all? But that is getting away from the matters to which I rose to speak.

The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. H. Quirke) dealt with the basic wage increase, to which the Minister subscribed in every possible way. He admitted that the increase in the basic wage was an entitlement for the workers at that time. He then said that, as a result, prices were increased. He cited the case of his own business, not so much the effect of the basic wage increase on it but the cumulative effect of the increased prices it was obliged to pay for materials it purchased. My point is that the firms must have been making excessive

profits up to that point, that they should have been able to absorb the basic wage increase, which was expected by the commission when it determined the increase. The same remarks apply to the member for Albert, who quoted the commission's report in his speech yesterday. The honourable member said:

On June 9 the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission delivered its judgment on the basic wage case. The increase has been reflected in the Budget. I studied the judgment and discovered one important aspect to which I should like to refer. In a large measure the £1 a week marginal increase—and I shall not say whether I believe it was right or wrong—was made up of two factors: one was the 2s. cost of living increase over a certain period, and the other was the productivity factor, which was responsible for an award of 18s.

Later in his speech he implied that the 18s. came as a result of exports of rural products.

Mr. Nankivell: Principally.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I do not think that is entirely correct. If the honourable member had studied the report, which he suggested he had done, he would have found that the commission took into consideration a number of factors and that the case made out by the union advocate, Mr. Hawke, took the whole matter back to 1953 with a view to levelling the basic wage in real value with that date.

Mr. Nankivell: That submission was not accepted.

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is true that the C series figures can be taken only up to the time when they were discontinued, and that from then on the consumer price index figures must be assumed. The commission disregarded the other aspects and accepted only the 2s. The question of productivity, with which it was more concerned, came up. This involves the economy of the country and its ability to pay. The union advocate argued for 31s., but I do not want to go over the case in detail, because that will take too long. The commission took into consideration in relation to the state of the economy what it called indicators, which had commended themselves to the commission and which had been examined by it to ascertain as far as possible their present and future effect on the economy; these were rural industry, overseas reserves and trade, the competitive position of secondary industries, non-rural production, company profits, investment, employment and unemployment, money and banking, and retail sales. In stating his conclusions, the Chief Judge said:

In my view if a question of altering the basic wage arises it should be determined only

after all the relevant factors have been examined and each of them weighed and balanced against the rest. A situation could arise in which an upward movement in the index would lead to an application which might not be opposed by employers who would simply increase domestic prices. In such an event there could be an increase in the basic wage without regard to the public interest and to the consequences it would produce for the people on fixed incomes and those obliged to live on their savings. Of course if the increase in prices contributed to a wage-price spiral it would produce serious consequences for earners of low wages and employees not in receipt of over-award payments as well. It is natural that the commission should hope that the basic wage which it fixes should not decline in real value. This is no doubt the hope of the whole community. Under the system of annual reviews a complete consideration of an application for an increase in the basic wage proceeded on the basis that a rise in capacity to pay should lead to a rise in the wage. Such a rise would ensure that the real value of the basic wage would be protected. But this would happen not because prices had risen, if that were the fact, but because capacity to pay had increased.

The commission proceeded on the basis that prices would more or less remain stable as far as was reasonably possible; but what do we find? As a result of the £1 a week increase, wherever possible the avaricious producer and manufacturer have taken the opportunity to increase prices. I commend the Prices Department, as well as the Government, for the action taken this week in regard to certain commodities, and I hope such action will continue to be taken and that prices will be stabilized as much as possible. That action should have been taken earlier in order to preserve the increase that was awarded, for until now it can be safely said that about 75 per cent of it has been absorbed by increased prices. That was never intended; everybody agrees with that! The net result is that a further application is to be made to the arbitration court next year for an additional increase in the basic wage. True, we on this side believe in quarterly adjustments because that is the policy of the trade union movement. The court in this case has determined that there shall be annual reviews upon either party making an application and establishing a case. An increase or decrease (as the case may be) will not be granted otherwise. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), as is customary, referred to the Budget and lauded the Government for its efforts which, indeed, is also customary.

Mr. Jennings: He will be the next Minister!

Mr. FRED WALSH: At least we know that he is a candidate for the Ministry. He made comparisons between this Budget and one

that was introduced 20 years ago. He lost sight of the fact that the basic wage had increased four-fold: in 1944 the State living wage, as it was then called, was £4 14s., whereas today it is £15 3s. Further, the value of the pound has been depreciated by 50 per cent since the end of the Second World War, so one would find that the real value to be obtained from the total expenditure under this Budget would be about equal to that obtained from the expenditure under the 1944 Budget.

Mr. Jennings: And what about the increased population of South Australia?

Mr. FRED WALSH: That is another factor, too. Nobody disputes the fact that people enjoy more good things today than they did in years gone by. Not only have many people greater material wealth: they also have more leisure because they now work a 40-hour week compared with the 44-hour week worked years ago. Further, they enjoy three weeks' annual leave compared with the two weeks' leave enjoyed previously. One must also consider the way in which the family wage is supplemented by excessive overtime, by a man working in two jobs, and by wives who go out and work during the week. This all means that the family has extra money to spend and it also means that more money circulates. I do not wish to be critical of this state of affairs: I merely point out that these are some of the reasons why there appears to be so much enjoyment, pleasure, and prosperity. If, however, everybody was working for a wage just above the basic wage, people would not enjoy the pleasure and the extras referred to.

Mr. Bywaters: Extra income is required to meet hire-purchase commitments.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, and I understand that those commitments now total about £500,000,000 throughout Australia.

Mr. Loveday: Without the additional purchasing power industry would not function, would it?

Mr. FRED WALSH: That is so. I do not think I should let the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) escape a mention. He likes to belabor the city, and particularly the railways, and he likes to talk about the disadvantages suffered by the country people. However, he forgets the advantages the country people gain because of the people in the city. I am not one who likes to set country people against city people; in fact, quite the contrary. I am an Australian, not just a South Australian. I maintain that the country people are enjoying many benefits as a result of a

financial sacrifice, in a sense, the people in the metropolitan area make. The honourable member may not believe this, but let us take our railways as an example. The Railways Department grants concessions for country people in the way of freights and other things. I think the honourable member knows that the use of the railways in the metropolitan area ensures that the passenger traffic pays its way, whereas I am sure the passenger traffic in the country does not pay its way. Country sewerage and water schemes probably never will pay for themselves, but they are necessary. Concessions are granted to primary producers for motor vehicle registrations and other things.

I believe that people should be encouraged to go on the land, and that assistance should be given to those engaged in primary production. When primary producers have served a few years on the land and reached the age of retirement some of them buy a nice property at Brighton or Marino where they can spend the rest of their lives. There is nothing wrong with that. That person can leave his sons on the land, and he can tell everyone how he pioneered the country. The point I make is that the member for Rocky River is always talking about the country as against the city, and about State enterprise as against private enterprise (which is a bone of contention with him), but if it were not for the State-owned services the people in the country could not get the concessions they are getting. I want the honourable member to recognize and appreciate that fact, because it is only through that appreciation that we will get a real understanding of things.

Mr. Heaslip: Could there have been a city had we not had the production of the country first?

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, I do not think so; I agree with the honourable member there.

Mr. Heaslip: The real wealth comes from the country.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No; I think the country people have got it all wrong, and that they are all mixed up in their thinking. I invite the honourable member to ask the Treasurer, any of the Ministers, or anyone else for that matter, how far we would have progressed had we remained a purely primary-producing State. Secondary industries have developed the State and the member for Rocky River knows that.

Mr. Heaslip: The country comes first.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier have large industries and will have larger ones. I agree with the member for Rocky River up to a point,

but I want him to realize that all State-owned instrumentalities are of benefit to country people as well as to city people and they should make provision to serve both. The sooner the Government realizes that, the sooner there will be clearer thinking. Government members should not say between elections that Opposition members are Socialists and then at an election say that they are Communists. That is the point Government members have reached and it is not a statement expected of intelligent people. I give them credit for being more intelligent than that.

Mr. Jennings: You are being very charitable.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, I am in a charitable mood tonight. In conclusion, I want to refer to a picture about the economy that has been painted by the Chairman of the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, Sir Warren McDonald. I want members to relate this to the absorption of the basic wage by manufacturers and producers. In the *Advertiser* of September 15, in presenting the Corporation's annual report, Sir Warren McDonald was reported as saying that the Australian economy had achieved near-full productive capacity with little evidence of boom psychology. He said that Australia's prospects were bright, and added that it was most important that additional wage costs be absorbed to the greatest extent practical without an increase in prices. He also said:

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

He emphasized that Australia must continue to look to her manufacturing industries as an ever-increasing and stabilizing force in her external payments position, and to satisfy the growing demands of her home markets. The member for Rocky River was not paying attention to this, and I draw his attention to it. Home markets keep people employed and without them primary producers and everybody else would fall. Exports by themselves are not sufficient.

Mr. Heaslip: I agree.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I am glad. The Chairman of the Commonwealth Banking Corporation spoke along the same lines as the Governor of the Bank of Canada, whom the Minister of Lands quoted. In saying some of the things I have said to members opposite I have been somewhat charitable. I have tried to condone their offences towards

members of my Party. I hope to have an opportunity later of speaking on a Bill that has been introduced.

First line (Legislative Council, £15,452)—passed.

House of Assembly, £22,984; Parliamentary Library, £9,569; Joint House Committee, £14,157; Electoral Department, £84,255; Government Reporting Department, £60,917; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, £4,308; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, £2,495; Miscellaneous, £63,803—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, £11,507; Chief Secretary's Department, £25,803; Statistical Department, £34,744—passed.

Audit Department, £100,024.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): As I have said earlier, I received the Auditor-General's Report about half an hour prior to the Budget debate. That report states:

Staff difficulties have been accentuated by the transfers of officers to other departments without suitable officers being available as replacements. This unavailability is because of a general shortage of trained officers.

I am concerned whether this department has sufficient staff, particularly trainees. Secondly, what is happening to the other departments who need qualified staff for auditing purposes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): True, the Auditor-General has not sufficient staff. The recruitment of additional officers has been authorized but whether it will be possible to fill the positions soon I do not know. Those positions can be filled only by taking men from other Government departments, and they need to be highly qualified accountants. However, the Public Service Commissioner will provide the additional staff as soon as possible.

I do not believe it will ever be possible for the Auditor-General's Report to be made available at the same time as the Treasurer delivers his Budget. A problem is involved in printing the two sets of papers simultaneously. We cannot ask for them to be printed until the end of the year and we can proceed with them only at a certain rate because of the peculiarities involved in the printing of Budget papers. It is desirable to prepare the Budget as early as possible in the new year. As soon as the Loan Council has finished its determination and has decided the Loan appropriation for the year, work is put in

hand upon the preparation of the Loan Accounts, which are presented to Parliament as quickly as possible. While those are being debated in Parliament the Treasurer's Budget is being prepared and printed. Although running audits are proceeding all the time in most departments, there is so much printing to be done that I doubt whether it will be possible to produce the Auditor-General's Report until after the show week adjournment each year. Honourable members who have been here for some time will remember that this report years ago used to turn up frequently long after the Budget had been presented, dealt with and passed. It arrived here much later in the session than the Budget Papers. So the position is that the staff increases have been approved, but how quickly the Public Service Commissioner will fill the positions will depend upon the extent to which he can withdraw officers from other departments.

Line passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, £389,394; Police Department, £3,483,800; Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department, £629,000—passed.

Hospitals Department, £8,385,134.

Mr. JENNINGS: I want to relate the line we are now discussing to page 208 of the Auditor-General's Report. I think I can read, as I did yesterday during the debate on the first line, from the Auditor-General's Report, which contains the following:

The excess of receipts over payments for 1963-64 was £56,094. Receipts for the year on this account were £68,391 including a contribution from the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary of £3,500. Payments were £12,297, of which £8,631 was for administrative expenses, maintenance, rates and taxes on city properties and £2,926 for supplies of drapery, bed linen, etc., from funds provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary. The balance, £740, was spent on patients' comforts.

Over the past five years, excluding amounts provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary, the Commissioners have spent £5,456 on patients' comforts. During that period the funds held by the Commissioners on account of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, excluding those contributed by the Auxiliary, have increased by £368,122. Cash and investments now total £857,100. The market value of a number of the investments exceeds the book value. In addition the Martin Bequest includes Town Acre 86 with buildings thereon, the value of which is estimated at more than £500,000. Two bequests to the Commissioners are still held in securities by trustee companies, one of them having been so held for a number of years.

I have questioned whether this accords with the terms of section 11 (2) of the Public Charities Funds Act, 1935-1940. If legal

advice confirms my view that the Act is not being complied with, the securities held do not conform with section 14 of the above Act. I have previously reported that there does not appear to be any reason why considerably more of the funds held on account of the Royal Adelaide Hospital by the Commissioners should not be spent for the benefit of that hospital—surely that is the reason why there are those funds—

and its patients as envisaged by the Act. Funds and assets held on behalf of this institution are valued at more than £1,357,000; the income during 1963-64 (excluding Auxiliary funds) was nearly £65,000 but of this only £740 was spent on the hospital.

Surely much needs to be done for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the fact that more than £1,300,000 is tied up doing nothing and losing its value every year because of the increasing inflationary process is, I think, a public scandal. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to comment on the latter part of the question first. This money is not tied up or being wasted. All moneys in the hands of the Treasurer are put to revenue-earning jobs and are earning interest. Parliament is providing moneys to carry out all of the essential purposes of the hospital. These funds are not being wasted; they will be used in due course.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am by no means satisfied with that explanation; many things could be done at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the benefit of patients, which require only the expenditure of some of the income that is available from this source. Moneys expended on the Outpatients Department would considerably alleviate the long waiting periods that are endured by people having to attend it in circumstances that are anything but comfortable. Enormous sums of money are provided for the benefit of these people by persons who have made bequests to the Commissioners for Charitable Funds, but it is not being spent; £740 out of a total income of about £65,000 spent in this way in a year makes one boggle. Can the Treasurer say who the Commissioners for Charitable Funds are at the moment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: These funds are part of bequests that have been provided for the Government and, if honourable members will study this line, they will see that one part of a bequest is a town acre. These bequests are vested in the Commissioners by Act of Parliament. I can get the names of those Commissioners for the honourable member but I can assure him that they are all reputable and honest people. I know that

honourable members opposite would spend the money as fast as was possible, but I know that this money is being properly applied. The Commissioners are not under Treasury control.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I regret to have to take a stand on this point, but the Treasurer's comments are unfair as well as unjustified. These moneys are provided for a specific purpose, although the Auditor-General is doubtful of the legality of this particular fund, but I believe that honourable members on this side, in the public interest, are duty bound to take notice of the Auditor-General and to raise this matter. Members representing the industrial areas of South Australia are aware of the inconvenience and difficulties suffered by people who attend the Outpatients Department and various clinics at the hospital. Much comfort could be supplied by the spending of some of this money that is put there for that purpose. The Treasurer said that he is putting this money to other purposes, and this, of course, amounts to a misappropriation of funds. In fact, in many societies it would be an illegal act.

Line passed.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £1,095,000.

Mr. DUNSTAN: While it is true that the boys reformatory at Magill is now better staffed than at one time it was, and while much money will be spent in future for the rebuilding of the reformatory, there are certain things about the practices of the department in relation to the reformatory which I think require some comment. Apart from the Superintendent at Magill, the officers of the department directly concerned with the boys there do not take part in any concerted overall training programme as trained officers. They do not act in the same way as officers in Borstal institutions in England act. Most of them are not given specific training for the job of reform of the boys in the institution. Those officers themselves are very keen to have such a training programme, but they are not trained social workers and they are not "in the know" as to precisely what it is that the department is seeking to do with each of the boys under their care. Either they act as warders or they act as people who are giving technical training, that is, training perhaps in the dairy, the machine shop, the carpenter's shop, or the boot shop.

The actual training to be given a boy for the purpose of reform, how far the training in which they themselves are involved is being used as remedial to his character, and the

problems of the particular boy involved, are things that are unknown to these people, with the exception of the Superintendent. The board members themselves are the only people who are directly involved in this. This is not a satisfactory method of proceeding with the institution. It is certainly not the attitude which is being taken in the new series of training courses introduced in the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department, which is seeking to involve all officers concerned in an overall picture about how to deal with the men under their care.

A further difficulty exists in this matter. In other countries, in many instances the people who are involved in the reform of boys (the probation officers, the officers within a department in any institution, open or closed or semi-closed) are officers of the court, and they act in concert with the magistrate who has to deal with the boy in the children's court. That position does not obtain in South Australia. Before the boy has been dealt with by the court here, a report upon him may be given by an officer of the department to the Juvenile Court Magistrate, but once the magistrate has dealt with the boy in the court that is the end of his connection with the matter. He is not in a position to find out and to be involved in the treatment that he has ordered for the boy. Indeed, there are difficulties in the way of the juvenile court magistrate's finding out precisely what it is that the Children's Welfare Department is doing with the boys who have previously come under his judgment. Liaison between the Children's Welfare Department and the magistrate is not effective as to the after-treatment of the boy on whom the magistrate has had to give judgment. I do not think this is a satisfactory way of working at all: there should be closer liaison between the magistrate and the department. In fact, I think we may have to take some action in the reconstruction of the kind that I hope will occur in the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to provide just that kind of close care.

Little work is done by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department in the prevention of delinquency. That is to say, we have nothing operating in our department of the kind that is encouraged in most modern societies for the social welfare of families who may face family stress. In Israel, for instance, in the new housing settlement the treatment of juveniles within that settlement is not left to people who deal only with those who have fallen into delinquency. Clinics are

established, and social welfare officers visit every family in the community and see to it that family difficulties are kept to a minimum. Attention is given before any member of the family gets into a delinquent situation. Indeed, as members of the clinics have said to me, "We consider that disease in a community means dis-ease. If there is trouble or stress within a family in the community, then we have to give assistance to see that that is obviated. In this way we can keep down the kind of delinquent situation that would otherwise arise."

Valuable work is being done in this sphere by the two full-time officers of the Service to Youth Council, of which Mr. Scales, S.M., has been the Chairman for some time, and of which the chief officer is Mr. Gary Killington. This organization has performed good work with limited resources in dealing with lads and girls who might conceivably fall into a delinquent situation. But that is only scratching the surface! We need a concerted effort in South Australia to provide those facilities within the community and social welfare officers to do preventive work in the area of assistance to youth, rather than rely on the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, which is understaffed and at the moment deals mainly with those who fall into problem situations.

I again protest at the way public relief is administered in South Australia. I have raised cases of this kind before and I hope that on this occasion the Treasurer will take this particular case to the board to see why it is that the board has taken the attitude it has. In my district, in St. Peters, lives an invalid pensioner. He and his wife and three children are in a house that is rent free. It is not a good house and needs some maintenance. If the rent of it were to be fixed by a fair rents authority it would not be more than £3 a week. The total income to this man and his family is £10 9s. 6d. a week. The children are of school-going age (the eldest boy is attending Urrbrae).

Mr. Bywaters: Does that include child endowment?

Mr. DUNSTAN: It includes everything: the invalid pension, the wife's allowance, the allowance for the eldest child and the child endowment. They are unable to obtain one penny assistance from the Children's Welfare Department. They have to exist on this money, which is substantially less than the basic wage, even taking into account the value of the house. The reason the department has given, first, for not assisting them is that the breadwinner (the

pensioner) has an interest in houses that are in the hands of the Public Trustee. His sister has written to the Treasurer protesting about the fact that the Public Trustee has not distributed to the beneficiaries moneys from the estate. The Public Trustee's answer is that the estate consists of a number of old houses that require much maintenance, that the present beneficiaries simply have a life interest in the income and, therefore, the pensioner has to maintain the houses, which is a first charge on the income. He has spent practically all the income for the past two years on maintenance of the houses. It is useless for officers of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to say that the family has an interest in an estate if, in fact, no income comes from it. In the meantime, this man cannot get money from the Public Trustee who, I understand, is applying to the court for a direction in relation to the estate before he spends further money. The man cannot get assistance from the department. I told an officer of the department that this family needed more money and could not exist reasonably on the money they had. I asked him how this man could be expected to feed and clothe his children and provide them with an education. The officer replied that he was better off than a man earning £15 a week with eight children to support. When a man adopts that attitude about disbursing public relief, it leaves me mouthing in speechless fury. The attitude unfortunately taken by some officers of the department is that they are auditors and must conserve public funds as much as possible. This is a genuine case where the family needs assistance. I understood that public relief was given to assist people in these circumstances, but it is denied to this family. Will the Treasurer consider this case? I shall give him the names and details, although he knows the family because of the correspondence I mentioned. I hope he will take up the matter with the department to see why something cannot be done for this family. The man came to me in great distress again only a few days ago. This is not the first time I have mentioned the family.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should have thought that the Public Trustee would have made some portion of the income available and not used it all for the repair of the properties, because a life interest, in this case, means nothing. If the honourable member gives me the details I shall make the necessary investigation.

Mr. HARDING: During this year I visited New Zealand as leader of the Anzac delegation

and saw a Borstal institution that was a teenagers' gaol. In the past I have been critical of the management of the Struan Farm School. However, I am now pleased that the farm has developed, has good stock, is well managed, and the boys are well cared for. A few years ago they grew vegetables that were fed to the animals and this discouraged the boys. This has all changed, and I commend the management on the good job it is now doing.

Line passed.

Department of Public Health, £407,882; Public Service Commissioner's Department, £126,622—passed.

Miscellaneous, £4,414,254.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: During 1963-64, £245,967 was set aside for certain miscellaneous expenditure, but only £91,760 was spent. For the Burnside War Memorial Hospital £17,600 was voted last year but only £243 was spent. This year it is estimated that £17,741 will be spent. The estimated capital expenditure on the Burra Hospital last year was £9,577; the actual expenditure was £3,559, and for this year the estimate is £12,917. The amount voted for capital expenditure at the Kangaroo Island General Hospital last year was £1,779 and the actual expenditure was £599. This year £48,000 is proposed. For the hospitals I have just mentioned together with Cleve, Kimba, Mallala, Northern Community, Queen Victoria Maternity, Waikerie and Whyalla hospitals, a total of £779,427 is estimated for this year. I am greatly concerned about the disparity between estimated and actual expenditure, and the Auditor-General comments on it. The Auditor-General states that many departments did not spend the money allocated to them. The Treasurer's estimated State taxation this year is £17,118,000. Last year there was an excess of £1,030,130 over the Estimates.

How can we reconcile these figures? Why should the Auditor-General have to come to the rescue and point out these wide disparities? Last year I told the Minister of Education that he could not spend all the money set aside for building purposes. My greatest objection is that this system of having miscellaneous items inflates the Estimates and in order to reach the amounts estimated for this year taxation is to be increased. The expenditure estimates are not accurate: they are inflated and taxation has to be increased to remedy the situation. The Auditor-General stated that in the last two months of the financial year there was a speeding up in order to spend the money voted.

The Auditor-General's Report was probably ready the day before we resumed after the show week adjournment, and if I had had it then it would have assisted me to prepare my speech on the first line. I do not know whether the Treasurer has the answers to my queries. For the Meningie Hospital, over £36,000 has been provided for several years in succession but nothing has been spent. Will members opposite say that that is not an inflated estimate? Estimates of expenditure are made for various things but labour is not always available for the work to be carried out and, because of the non-competitive market, there is a tendency for prices to increase. I should like to know why estimates in relation to miscellaneous items are so inflated. This has the effect of bringing about increased taxation to meet the situation despite the fact that last year taxation receipts were over £1,000,000 more than the estimates.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The miscellaneous items provide for the Government to give grants mainly to various hospital boards throughout the State to build or improve hospitals. The control over this expenditure is not in the hands of the Government but is in the hands of the respective hospital boards, which estimate their requirements. Their requests for funds are examined by the Public Health Department and, if a request is properly balanced and the provision is necessary, a sum is placed on the Estimates. It is true that sometimes hospitals do not progress with the work as advantageously or quickly as desired. Last year we provided two amounts for the Whyalla Hospital. The expenditure on one of the items was double the amount estimated; the other amount was not spent entirely because the contractor could not proceed with the work, but I have no doubt that all the money that has been provided will be spent this year; in fact, it might even be exceeded. For the Leader to say that this particular line has been inflated is completely answered if he looks at the final result of last year when the sum voted was £2,200,000 but £2,100,000 was actually spent. The hospital boards throughout the State did not quite realize their full programmes. If we had budgeted any more closely than that, some hospitals anxious to proceed with certain works might have been held up through the lack of funds.

There has been no over-budgeting. We must remember that many hospitals and many programmes are involved, requiring architectural and contractors' services at a time when a

heavy demand exists for labour and materials. I believe the hospital boards throughout the State have done remarkably well in getting so close to the overall amount provided last year. True, some hospitals have lagged a little; the Leader mentioned the Meningie Hospital. A spokesman for that hospital approached the Minister and said he thought the hospital could raise its share of the money and proceed with certain works. Provision was made for this but the sum was not reached, although I think it is hoped to reach it this year. Are we going to say to such a hospital, "Unless you can give a certificate that you can use the money this year we will not put it on the Estimates"? Obviously that would be a foolish procedure. There is no foundation for the Leader's concern about this matter.

Mr. BYWATERS: When speaking to the first line I referred to the situation at the Lower Murray District Hospital at Tailem Bend. I draw the Treasurer's attention to the £350 on the Estimates for this hospital for maintenance expenditure. This amount of £350 has been the amount provided every year going back to the time before I entered Parliament, and we all know that the cost of living has increased considerably in that time. This year the Lower Murray District Hospital Board, together with the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and I, waited on the Minister of Health with a view to bringing this Hospital into line with others in the vicinity as a subsidized hospital, but this request was rejected. The board then asked that the grant be increased, but this, too, was rejected. The people served by this hospital are at a disadvantage compared with the people in towns like Murray Bridge, Mannum, Keith or Strathalbyn.

If people are pensioners or are indigent they cannot get the same free treatment at this hospital as they can get at a subsidized hospital under the new arrangements with the Commonwealth Government. I believe the grant has not been increased because the charge for a bed at this hospital is higher than the charge in subsidized hospitals, and for that reason it has been able to keep its head above water. However, this is hardly fair to those people who must attend that hospital. It was suggested at the time that its proximity to Murray Bridge was the reason for its not being subsidized. However, as I pointed out previously, the hospitals in the Upper Murray area at Loxton, Barmera (which is a Government hospital), Berri, and Renmark are close together and they are all subsidized hospitals,

This is a distinct anomaly, and I consider that in fairness to the residents of Tailem Bend and the surrounding country areas this hospital should be subsidized.

The Treasurer referred to the Meningie Hospital. The Meningie council has one ward in the Murray Bridge Hospital area, and for that reason it is paying a contribution to that hospital. In effect, the council is paying something to the Murray Bridge Hospital in its rating. The Lower Murray District Hospital cannot claim rating from the three nearby council areas that are served by the hospital which it could do if it were a subsidized hospital. Will the Treasurer take this matter up again with the Minister of Health to see whether this anomaly can be corrected?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I agree with what the member for Murray has said. The honourable member and I attended a deputation to the Minister of Health seeking some assistance for this hospital. One of the biggest problems associated with having this hospital subsidized was the difficulty of establishing a ratable area. This hospital serves a big portion of my district. A considerable amount of money that was contributed towards the hospital's funds came from country people within a 40-mile radius of Tailem Bend. The hospital provides a necessary casualty station along one of the most dangerous stretches of the Princes Highway. Apart from the difficulty with which the hospital is faced in collecting its charges, it also has the problem of recovering money from insurance firms involved in civil actions in the courts. I support the honourable member in asking the Treasurer to see whether the Minister of Health could not find it within his capacity favourably to consider increasing the grant for the maintenance of this hospital.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Concerning Archway Port, Port Adelaide, to which £4,000 is granted, I compliment this organization on its work amongst alcoholics. It is worth every penny granted and possibly more. Other organizations tackling this terrible disease are also worthy of some support, although it may be difficult to find all the money required. I make a plea for assistance for the South Australian Foundation of Alcoholism. The work of this body is supported by eight denominations and it is backed by a worthy list of patrons. Over 600 cases were assisted during the year under review and over 100 lectures have been given by officers of the organization, while over 22,000 pamphlets and brochures have been distributed.

The member for Port Pirie will join me in vouching for the director of this organization. (Mr. Gordon Swanbury). Mr. Swanbury freely acknowledges that he owes much to people who helped cure him of this terrible disease of alcoholism, and he is prepared to work day and night to help others. The Government is trying to help alcoholics by founding an institution associated with our prisons, but the people in that institution will be there under compulsion mainly, whereas people treated at Archway Port and the South Australian Foundation of Alcoholism are those volunteering for treatment. Many alcoholics would have no treatment were it not for such organizations as those to which I have referred. The adverse effect of alcoholism on the morals and the economic position of the country is such as to require this disease to be tackled with all the force at our disposal. I trust that the work of these people will be sympathetically considered.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the remarks of the members for Albert and Murray regarding the Tailem Bend hospital, as this affects the people of Jervois. This hospital should be given a subsidy.

Mrs. STEELE: I desire to mention the Burnside War Memorial Hospital as I know that the hospital board is grateful for the grant that has been made. As the Leader mentioned this matter specifically, I shall explain the grant to the hospital. The chairman of the hospital board rang me some months ago, prior to the Estimates being prepared, explaining that plans had been delayed and that he was concerned because the hospital might lose its grant. I was able to arrange for him a meeting with the Minister of Health, and this matter was satisfactorily concluded.

The grant to the Mentally Retarded Children's Society will enable the society to appoint a manager-organizer. The case that I put to the Treasurer on behalf of the society was sympathetically received by him. The society had previously received a grant from the Treasurer towards the purchase of a second sheltered workshop at Brompton. With the completion of that workshop it was found that the voluntary system whereby somebody looked after the contracts for these mentally retarded children was beyond the capabilities of a part-time worker. It was decided to appoint a full-time manager-organizer and, with the grant given to the society and a promise that this would continue for a certain number of years, it has now been possible to make the appointment and enable the work to be managed

on a more business-like basis. It is possible now to go out after contracts and compete with other people in getting the right type of contract for these children to fulfil. I say "children", although they are adults as far as years are concerned.

Concerning the South Australian Symphony Orchestra, in all modesty I mention that I had a little finger in the pie in obtaining this grant, as I spent some time with the Treasurer pleading the cause of the orchestra and the need for a further grant to be made so that it could be on some kind of parity with the symphony orchestras of the other States. I did not know at the time that the Treasurer would regard the application so generously, and I was pleased that he acceded to this request and increased the grant to the symphony orchestra. As I am fairly closely associated with it and on several advisory

committees of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, I am happy to express publicly the gratitude of the A.B.C., as the grant has enabled it to increase the size of the orchestra. People closely associated with the orchestra are also most appreciative. There is no doubt that this increased grant gave symphony concerts a tremendously improved orchestral balance.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

HONEY MARKETING ACT REVIVAL AND AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council, with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 24, at 2 p.m.