

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, September 29, 1964.

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

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**COMPANIES 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.

**QUESTIONS.****HIGHWAYS BUILDING.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am impressed with the parking facilities provided at the new Highways Department building in Walkerville. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say what is the cost of the car parking space and the cost per motor vehicle that can be parked there?

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

**"SEMI-DWARF" WHEAT.**

Mr. HARDING: An article in yesterday's *Advertiser* headed "Semi-Dwarf Wheat Hint", states:

A hint that Australian wheatgrowers may soon be sowing "semi-dwarf" species of wheat that will give higher yields is given in an article in the *Journal of the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science*. Dr. A. T. Pugsley, Director of the Agricultural Research Institute, Wagga Wagga, reports that in the United States on the highly fertile soils of the Pacific north-west, yields from one of these "semi-dwarfs" exceeding 100 bushels an acre are common. During 1962, records of 132.1 bushels an acre and 155.5 bushels an acre were established for non-irrigated and irrigated land respectively.

Has the Minister of Agriculture information on this matter, and if not, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a statement from the Director of Agriculture.

**WATER SPEED ATTEMPT.**

Mr. CURREN: At the weekend, the choice by Donald Campbell of Lake Bonney, near Barmera, as the site for his attempt on the

world water speed record naturally pleased my constituents. However, certain facilities will be required to make the attempt in safety on Lake Bonney. Will the Premier make funds available to the Barmera council to assist it to provide the required facilities?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member's question is in terms that are far too wide for me to answer it specifically. The rule governing the Government's decision in these matters, as far as possible, is that we would like the spending of any money provided to result in some permanent value. One difficulty we had with the land speed record was that the money spent apparently produced little of permanent value, and the Government did not provide a substantial sum to assist in the second attempt. I should like to know from the council more specifically what assistance it desires.

**JUVENILE PUNISHMENT.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: By question on August 20 I raised the matter of the punishment that could be meted out to juvenile offenders in this State, and referred to comments by His Honor Mr. Justice Mayo in the Criminal Court. It was reported in the *News* last Thursday that Mr. Justice Travers had made similar comments in another case, referring to the leniency with which juveniles must be treated. I ask the Minister of Education whether his colleague, the Attorney-General, has been able to consider this matter and, if so, whether a report is available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter involves policy. Cabinet considered, about a year ago, whether we would provide for gaol sentences for juveniles, but it decided, on balance, that probably it would not be advisable to do so. Problems are associated with that type of sentence for a young person, as he may come in contact with more experienced and, in some instances, more hardened criminals. In those circumstances, Cabinet decided to take no action. However, I discussed this matter with the Chief Secretary this morning and it may be the subject of a further decision by Cabinet. In answer to the honourable member's specific question, I point out that Mr. Justice Travers's report has been referred to the Attorney-General.

**WHYALLA TRANSPORT.**

Mr. LOVEDAY: In the westernmost part of Whyalla the bus proprietor who serves the whole city is faced with a serious problem in getting children from that area to the Whyalla

West Primary School. The Minister of Education may know that the area is zoned and that children from that area have to go to that school. The bus proprietor finds it uneconomic to purchase more buses to meet a situation that occurs for a short period only twice a day. The position is steadily getting worse due to the rapid expansion of population in that area, and I should think that it would achieve acute proportions after Christmas. The completion of the Stuart Avenue Primary School has been delayed through shortage of bricks and it does not appear that the primary school west of MacDouall Stuart Avenue will be completed earlier than, say, the middle of next year. Will the Minister fully consider this matter to see what can be done to meet the increasingly difficult situation regarding the transport of these children to the primary schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so, and, if it is necessary (as I think it will be), I shall send the departmental Transport Officer to Whyalla to investigate the problem personally and to report back to the Transport Advisory Committee consisting of the Deputy Director, the Secretary, and the Accountant of the department, with the Transport Officer as the Executive Officer. In due course they will report and submit a recommendation to me which I shall consider, I hope favourably. I shall let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

#### FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. HEASLIP: Have you, Mr. Speaker, a reply to the question I asked last week concerning an article in the *News* reporting evidence that had been given to the Festival Hall Select Committee, the disclosure of which I considered was a breach of Standing Order 393?

The SPEAKER: I noticed that, following the article in the *News* to which the honourable member referred, certain disclosures of the evidence were also made over commercial television channels. I wrote to Messrs. March and Milne and also to the Managing Editor of the *News*. As I previously indicated, I received a reply from the latter with which I was not satisfied, so I again wrote to him and he has since replied. I received the following letter from Mr. Milne:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I acknowledge your letter of September 23, 1964, and respectfully submit the following explanations. What actually happened was that Mr. Don March went to the *News* quite early in the morning of September 22 and left with them a prepared joint statement on sites for the Festival Hall from himself and me as

members of the Town and Country Planning Association (S.A.). A similar statement was subsequently submitted to the Select Committee as part of our suggestions.

I draw the attention of the House to that fact. The letter continues:

Both Mr. March and I were under the impression that we were merely submitting ideas and opinions and not evidence in the strict sense. No matters discussed at the hearing of the Committee were disclosed afterwards, although the article in the *News* indicates that they were, and much of the information in the prepared statement had been made public before. Until I received your letter of September 23, 1964, I was unaware that what we were doing was improper, let alone committing an offence. The last thing we wanted to do was offend the Select Committee or Parliament, because we had gone to a great deal of trouble to put our thoughts in order, and we were hoping that the Select Committee would take due notice of them. Over the years I have been a member of many deputations to the honourable the Premier and Cabinet Ministers, where it is customary for appropriate information to be published both before and afterwards. It honestly never occurred to me that this occasion was different. The fact that the hearing was under Parliamentary Standing Orders and that Standing Order 393 applied was unfortunately not brought to our notice either in the letter inviting Mr. March and me to attend the hearing, or during the hearing or afterwards. I deeply regret not only any discourtesy to Parliament, which was definitely not intended, but also for any embarrassment caused the Chairman and members of the Select Committee. I tender my sincere apology to you, Mr. Speaker, and to Parliament.

I replied to that letter on September 28 as follows:

Dear Mr. Milne,

I am in receipt of your letter of September 28, 1964. Your letter was unsigned and I am returning it herewith for your signature.

The following letter was received from News Limited:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

In the publication of the article in the *News* on September 22 on Festival Hall sites no discourtesy was intended to either yourself or the Select Committee. The Select Committee's Chairman had some weeks earlier given the press a statement on an inspection made by the committee of possible hall sites. Our article of September 22 mentioned sites which were considered possible by the S.A. Town and Country Planning Association and which were referred to the association's spokesmen when they appeared before the committee. You draw attention to the fact that any evidence or documents presented to the Select Committee shall not be disclosed or published. Any embarrassment caused is regretted.

Yours faithfully,

R. Boland, Managing Editor.

The following letter, dated September 28, was received from Mr. March:

Dear Sir,

I wish to reply to your letter of September 23, 1964. At approximately 9.15 a.m. on Tuesday, September 22, I delivered a joint statement prepared by Mr. Lance Milne and myself on behalf of the Town and Country Planning Association (S.A.) Incorporated, to the office of News Limited, North Terrace, Adelaide. No suggestion was made by News Limited that this was improper or out of order.

A similar statement was subsequently handed to the Select Committee when we appeared. After our appearance before the Select Committee we had no further contact with News Limited on this matter and no information was disclosed to News Limited as to the nature of our verbal submissions to the Select Committee, although the report in the *News* newspaper said or implied that we had done so. The letter from the Clerk dated September 16, 1964, requesting us to appear stated that we were to do so "for the purpose of affording such information as it may be in your power to give", and we understood ourselves to be contributing ideas and suggestions already known to many people. I wish to express my deepest regrets at my lack of knowledge of the Standing Orders relating to the House of Assembly, and Select Committees of the House and the subsequent trouble caused by such ignorance.

I am aware that Mr. K. L. Milne joins me in expressing these feelings and ask that our apology be conveyed to the Chairman and the Select Committee. Unfortunately at no stage before our appearance, at that time, or afterwards, was any information given to us to the effect that a Standing Order precluded publication about a civic matter in which we were interested. Knowledge of these requirements would certainly have found us most willing to comply. I trust that this explanation contains the information necessary to clarify my position, and I wish to tender my sincere apology for the inconvenience I have caused you. I also wish to assure you that no discourtesy to the House was ever intended.

A letter from Television Broadcasters Limited, 125 Strangways Terrace, North Adelaide, states:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I beg to acknowledge your letter of September 24. On the evening of Tuesday, September 22, we televised an interview with Mr. K. L. Milne, one of the witnesses who appeared that day before the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Bill.

We were unaware that Standing Order 393 of the House of Assembly precluded such an interview, and greatly regret the occurrence. We tender our humble apologies.

I am Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) K. A. Macdonald,  
General Manager.

A letter from Southern Television Corporation Limited states:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 24 concerning the disclosure of evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Assembly, in our television news service on September 22. May I tender my admission of this breach of the Standing Order of the House, together with my apology to the House.

I would be obliged if you will explain to the House that this station covered the item in good faith, picking up from a newspaper report, which led us to believe that it was not the subject of any privilege. Will you please assure the House that it is not the intention of this station to breach the rules of the House.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. L. C. Davies,

General Manager.

In view of the circumstances and of the publicity that has been given this matter, which has drawn the attention of the public to Standing Order No. 393, I do not intend, at this stage, to take further action in the matter. I have reported it to the House and it is for the House, if it wishes, to take further action. Apart from my statement to the House, there has been no indication from members whether or not they endorse my action.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, want an expression by the House on this matter. I believe that the action you have taken will bring to the notice of the public the fact that evidence given to Select Committees is privileged under Standing Order No. 393, and for this reason your action has served a good purpose. It is necessary that evidence given to Select Committees should be their concern only and should be reported to Parliament in due course. I do not think there is any necessity for a resolution on this matter.

Mr. HEASLIP: I agree with your action, Mr. Speaker, and with the action of the Premier. Other than the *News*, the parties concerned pleaded ignorance and tendered an apology. I understand that the *News* was warned that it was a breach of Standing Orders to publish this evidence and it ignored this warning. I believe that the *News* is in a different category from the other parties, as the other parties did not know that the provisions of Standing Order No. 393 would apply. However, the *News* was aware of this, yet it printed the report. I should like to know whether what I have stated is true and whether the *News* offered an apology.

The SPEAKER: The letter sent by the *News* stated:

You draw attention to the fact that any evidence or documents presented to the Select Committee shall not be disclosed or published. Any embarrassment caused is regretted.

That indicates that the Managing Editor is penitent and does not wish to cause further embarrassment. However, the honourable member asked whether the *News* knew that it would be a breach of Standing Order No. 393 to publish the evidence. As I said earlier, I was informed by the Chairman and Secretary of the Select Committee that, when the roundsman and another reporter of the *News* asked whether they could publish the evidence, they were informed that they could not do so, as that would be an offence under Standing Order 393. I think that the statements made by the Premier and the member for Rocky River adequately cover the position for the time being.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Mr. March, a constituent of mine, telephoned me shortly after he was informed of the position. I gave him advice similar to that given by you, Mr. Speaker. I told him that he had made a mistake and I suggested that he write to you and explain the position. He wanted to know how anybody who gave evidence before a Select Committee could know he was doing wrong in speaking about it if he were not previously informed of the provisions of Standing Orders. I think he has a point there and, in order to avoid a similar occurrence in future, I believe that any person invited to give evidence to a Select Committee should be informed of the provisions of the Standing Orders and of the need for secrecy regarding the evidence until the submission of a report to Parliament. If that procedure were followed, we would not be faced with the excuse of ignorance when the evidence is given to the press after it has been given to a Select Committee. I suggest that that procedure be followed in future.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As this debate seems to be developing into a free-for-all, I shall add my small contribution as Chairman of the Select Committee. As Chairman, I must accept a degree of responsibility for what has occurred, because I can corroborate what Messrs. March and Milne have stated in their letters: that they were not warned either before, during, or on completion of their evidence that it would be an offence against the Standing Orders if they disclosed it. I believe that about 12 witnesses have given evidence before the committee and only two of them were warned that it would be an offence to reveal their evidence. They were the Lord Mayor and the Town Clerk of

Adelaide and it was merely as an after-thought that they were warned. After the Lord Mayor had concluded his evidence he turned to me and said, "By the way, I presume it would be in order for me to hand this précis of my evidence to the press." I said, "No, it would not be in order; it would be an offence against the Standing Orders." The Secretary (Mr. Dodd) handed me a copy of the relevant Standing Order which I read out to the Lord Mayor and the Town Clerk, and the Lord Mayor said, "If that is the case, that is the end of it." However, none of the succeeding witnesses (including Messrs. March and Milne) was told that it was an offence. I certainly did not warn them as Chairman, nor did other members of the committee. I was greatly impressed by the evidence submitted by Messrs. March and Milne; I was impressed by its quality, by their courtesy, and by the constructive manner in which they submitted their evidence.

#### SEAT BELTS.

Mr. LAWN: Can the Premier say whether the cost of purchasing and fitting seat belts in motor vehicles is controlled in any way by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Burnside asked me a similar question, which has been submitted to the Prices Commissioner. I have not yet received a report but, when I do, I will inform the honourable member for Burnside, and the matter will become public information. At present these items are not controlled.

#### SURVEYORS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, I sought information from the Director of Lands about the possibility of opening for selection certain areas of miscellaneous lease in County Chandos. These leases, together with other out-of-hundreds Crown lands in County Buckingham, were recently the subject of inquiry by the Land Settlement Committee. In his reply, the Director of Lands said:

The soil classification surveys mentioned in my letter of June 30 are normally carried out by surveyors of this department in the course of and as part of surveys for subdivisational purposes. Where necessary the assistance of the Agriculture Department is obtained in conjunction with the surveys. Because of the volume of survey work awaiting to be done and the depletion of the field staff there seems little prospect of the necessary work in this locality being undertaken before two years. It could possibly be even longer.

I ask the Minister of Lands the following questions:

(1) What is the full complement of surveyors in the Lands Department?

(2) How many are at present on the staff?

(3) If recruitment is necessary what is being done to encourage it?

(4) If there is a shortage on the staff of the Lands Department, when is it intended to do something positive about increasing the numbers so that the present back-lag of work and the increasing volume of current work can be adequately coped with?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I endorse what the Director of Lands has said in reply to the member for Albert. The answers to his specific questions are:

(1) Establishment is 16 surveyors (class 1 and 2).

(2) Nine surveyors.

(3) and (4) There has been an "articled pupil" system of recruitment in the past, and only three pupils remain from this system. This system has now been superseded by a student-ship system, under which prospective surveyors are recruited and given full-time training at the Institute of Technology for three years for the degree of Bachelor of Technology. During this period they are paid the normal student-ship allowance. At the present time there are also four graduates in training and 11 student-ships current. It is pointed out that after graduation at the institute, there is still a necessity for a considerable period of in-service training.

We have extreme difficulty in getting surveyors, and if those figures are analysed members will find that, where the establishment is for 16 surveyors, 28 are in training. The wastage, following normal obligations of these student surveyors, is such that we have to allow for it by educating many more than are required. After the periods under which they are obligated to serve, we lose them to other people and we are constantly short. Also, for some reason unknown to me, it is difficult to obtain people who are prepared to undertake these studentships. If the honourable member for Albert can induce more people to undertake them, officials of the Lands Department will be pleased.

#### GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: In the last week or so I have noticed two press statements referring to the proposed plan for the layout of the standard gauge line at Port Pirie. These statements have caused concern among sporting bodies and house owners living in localities referred to. Can the Premier say whether the Government has decided on any plan?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As two matters are involved in the question, I am not sure to which specific matter the member for Port Pirie is referring.

Mr. McKee: The layout at Port Pirie.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present, there are plans and work is proceeding to provide a standard gauge from Port Pirie to Broken Hill. Those plans are being prepared in co-operation with Commonwealth officers, and work has commenced on certain sections of the line. Some sections have not yet been surveyed and I believe that the plans do not exist for certain sections. Concurrently, the State Government has asked the Commonwealth Government that the standard gauge be brought from Port Pirie into Adelaide. The Commonwealth Government, in this year's Budget, provided £16,000 for an examination of the proposals of the Railways Commissioner, and I understand that the Commonwealth Commissioner is engaged at present in considering the State Government's proposals. I shall try to obtain plans for the proposed layout for Port Pirie. If I can, I shall have them exhibited on the board so that the many members interested may inspect them. I am not sure whether I can do that because I doubt whether the plans have progressed sufficiently to be available at this stage.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Premier information regarding the suggested replacement of the line from Merriton to Port Pirie via Wandearah by a new line from Merriton to Crystal Brook?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that there have been certain consultations between the Commonwealth Commissioner and the State Commissioner on this matter and my information therefore would not be entirely up to date. I shall be happy to get the information for the honourable member. Regarding the earlier question by the member for Port Pirie, in submitting the information I want it to be understood that the information may not at this stage be entirely conclusive, for it is merely a proposal rather than something that has been formally agreed to. One or two questions regarding deviation may require Parliamentary consideration. For instance, one matter involves the District of Frome, because if a survey showed that there were a more suitable line to Broken Hill than the present one, which is controlled by the Silverton Tramway Company, it might be necessary for the House to approve of a deviation which I think would run substantially south of the present line near the border. However, I will obtain such information as is available so that members will at least be able to look at what is being done and make any representations they think advisable.

### PARA HILLS SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: I received a letter from the Secretary/Treasurer of the Para Hills school committee headed "Completion of Toilet Accommodation", which includes the following statement:

I understand from the Headmaster that the rest of the buildings were completed about two months ago—

and that refers to the main toilet buildings—but in spite of several requests from the Headmaster through usual channels the extension is not usable. The committee feels that you will agree that this is a sad state of affairs especially as the enrolment is not now near 1,000 but has passed this figure to reach 1,024 as at last Thursday.

This letter has been sent also to the Minister of Education. Last night, after attending a meeting at the school, I inspected the toilets; I can confirm that the plumbing has yet to be completed and I believe that no such work has been done for at least six weeks. Will the Minister of Education take urgent action to have these facilities completed soon?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This morning I received a similar letter from Mr. Mills, the Secretary/Treasurer of the school committee which I referred to my colleague, the Minister of Works, who in turn referred it to the Director of Public Buildings for urgent attention. The report that I have received from the Superintendent of Primary Schools is as follows:

Due to the rapid and substantial increase in enrolments at Para Hills this year, the need for additional toilet accommodation is urgent. The Public Buildings Department was requested on March 17, 1964, to provide as an urgent matter additional toilets and ablutions. The extensions were commenced without delay and the actual building was completed in late July. No plumbing, however, has been carried out. This fact has been reported to the Superintendent of Primary Schools on several occasions by the Headmaster, and the urgency of the need of the toilets has been communicated from time to time to the Public Buildings Department. The Public Buildings Department has advised today (29/9/64) that plumbers will be on the site tomorrow (30/9/64), and that the outstanding work should be completed within three weeks. The Public Buildings Department, in explanation of the delay, stated that there are insufficient plumbers to meet the department's heavy commitments in metropolitan and country areas, and that advertisements for plumbers "have resulted in an unrewarding response".

That is typical of what has occurred in numerous districts throughout the State in recent weeks.

### LAND VALUATION COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. CORCORAN: The report by the land valuation inquiry committee, tabled last week in Parliament, contains recommendations on council rating as well as the recommendation for a central valuing authority. Several councils in my district are about to compile a new assessment. Has the Premier considered the report and can he say whether the Government is likely to adopt any of its recommendations, as this could affect assessments to be made in the future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The report contains important recommendations, as the honourable member's question implies, and it affects not only Government departments but also district council rating whereby councils can use the authority that is intended in the report, if they so desire. My view is that no action should be taken in connection with the report this session. I think honourable members generally would agree that it is proper to allow everybody concerned to study what is involved in this matter as the report could substantially affect taxation in this State. I know that honourable members generally realize that for water rating purposes for many years the Government has not rated premises to the full ratable value provided pursuant to the Act. If a central valuing authority were established I should think that almost certainly water assessments would increase, probably by 25 per cent, which would be substantial unless action were taken immediately to provide for a different basis of payment for water and a different *pro rata* rebate. The report should be examined carefully by local councils and the Government, and I do not think it should be the basis of rush legislation this session.

Mr. Corcoran: Would it be advisable for local government bodies to defer action for the time being?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think it would be.

### BANANAS.

Mr. LAUCKE: I read recently that Senator Paltridge, Minister for Defence, had suggested that any action that would prohibit the free movement of bananas from New South Wales to South Australia would be an infringement of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Can the Premier comment on this view, as it could have some bearing on the free movement of citrus and other fruits and vegetables to Broken Hill and other parts of New South Wales from this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am surprised that the Minister for Defence has seen fit to make a public comment about such a matter without knowing any of the circumstances involved. As far as I know, he has never tried to find out the facts of this case. I should have thought that, if he were to make an unbiased statement on this issue, he should also have said that the prohibition on taking citrus fruits into New South Wales would be equally unlawful.

#### SADDLEWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works any information to give the House regarding the building of the Saddleworth Primary School?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that this proposed new school is one of six schools to be erected in the new form of prefabricated construction. The programme for the erection of these schools which has been agreed to by the Deputy Director of Education is such that work on the Saddleworth school is due to commence early in the second half of 1965.

#### HOUSING LOANS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago concerning temporary finance for houses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Under Treasurer (Mr. Seaman) reports:

An analysis of approvals given in recent weeks suggests that about one-fifth of the new houses financed by Government funds, and those of its statutory bodies, have previously had recourse to temporary finance during the waiting period. Numbers of prospective borrowers do not arrange to commence erection or to complete purchase until their long term loan is available. A number of other new houses undoubtedly have been rented temporarily by their prospective owners from the builders whilst awaiting finance to complete the purchase, but the proportion of these is not known.

The analysis indicates that nearly half the temporary finance is given by builders, many of whom undoubtedly rely upon bank overdraft or other special finance to enable them to do this. Nearly half of the temporary finance comes from finance companies, whilst quite a small proportion is secured directly from private banks including private savings banks. The Leader has suggested that an approach be made to the private banks which operate savings banks to lend more extensively in this field of temporary finance. However it would seem preferable that these savings banks extend their activities more particularly to long term housing loans on the same lines as the Savings Bank of South Australia and the Commonwealth Savings Bank.

Such information as is available indicates that most temporary finance given by builders and by regular finance companies to persons

awaiting long term housing loans is at rates of about 7½ per cent or 8 per cent, though some are rather lower and some higher. Most builders who operate on bank overdraft would themselves be paying about 6½ per cent for their money.

#### TINTINARA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Education say what arrangements are being made for teaching boys crafts at the Tintinara Area School in 1965 and whether a new boys craft centre is contemplated?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: It is expected that a boys craft unit will be erected at Tintinara before school resumes after the Christmas vacation, but it may not be possible to have equipment installed by that time. At present the secondary boys from Tintinara attend Keith Area School for craft work. This arrangement will be continued until the new craft facilities at Tintinara are available.

#### BERRI FERRY.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a report from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, on the likely completion date of the duplication of the ferry service at Berri?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that it is expected to be possible to put the second ferry into operation soon after the middle of October.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD CROSSING.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to a question I resubmitted to him recently concerning the railway warning device at Port Wakefield?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that the year 1963-64 in the reply given to the honourable member recently was a typiste's error and that the statement referred to 1964-65. The Port Wakefield crossing is not included on the list for protection during 1964-65.

#### CADELL CHAPEL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Is the Minister of Works able to give me any information on the building of the new chapel at the Cadell Training Centre?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have recently given approval for the necessary funds for this chapel, and the Director, Public Buildings Department, informs me that it is proposed that construction will commence—utilizing departmental labour—in November of this year. The chapel is to be of timber frame construction.

## SUPREME COURT HEARINGS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, an answer to my recent question concerning prisoners awaiting trial at the Supreme Court?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: My colleague, the Attorney-General, has supplied me with the following report:

His Honor Mr. Justice Hogarth has now submitted a report to me regarding the delay which has occurred between the time when a person is committed to a circuit session for trial or sentence and the day when the case comes before the circuit court, from which it appears that unnecessarily long delays have occurred. It is pointed out that under section 59 (1) (b) of the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1963, an accused has the right to apply to the court for a change of venue from the circuit sessions to the court sitting at Adelaide. It will be arranged for the attention of prisoners to be drawn to the right to apply for a change of venue. If a prisoner desires to make such an application the proper procedure is for him to do so by application to a judge in Chambers on affidavit.

## SPRINGBANK ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of September 17 regarding the difficulties encountered by a constituent of mine living on the Springbank Road when the new Springbank Road bridge was built?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In asking his question, the honourable member did not mention the name of the person to whom he referred, but I think he is satisfied that the reply I have deals with this person:

My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that this property, before roadworks commenced, was fronted by a concrete block retaining wall, on an average five courses high, with a coping. There was no fence above the lawn which was level with the top of this wall. A wall was returned into the block between the lawn and driveway. The latter was unsurfaced and very uneven besides being very steep. On the western side of the driveway, which extended to the boundary, was a brick fence with a stepped top.

Departmental roadworks in front of this property raised the level of the footpath by a maximum of about 2ft. covering three courses of the retaining wall. Simultaneously the driveway was raised and completed with an evenly graded rubble surface with a uniform gradient from the front boundary to the house improving the entrance considerably. It was originally proposed to increase the height of the retaining wall by two courses. The owner has requested, however, three courses on the grounds that three courses of the original wall have been covered. This the Highways Department has agreed to do. He also requests that since the wall was originally returned between the lawn and driveway that the returned portion should also be raised by three courses.

There appears, however, to be no justification for this as he did not have a fence there previously and his driveway has been improved, but the department will agree to return the wall to a point where gates could be hung to open outwards without encroaching upon the road.

## SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding the construction of the intersection of the South Road, Shepherds Hill Road and Ayliffe Road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Jackman) reports:

The intersection of the South Road, Shepherds Hill Road and Ayliffe Road is at present being designed, and as soon as plans are completed the construction will be commenced. A sum of £25,000 has been allocated for expenditure during 1964-65. At Blackwood a sum of £21,000 has been allocated to commence the construction of the section of Shepherds Hill Road from the Main Road to Northcote Street during 1964-65 by the Corporation of Mitcham.

## KEITH-PADTHAWAY POWERLINE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works, representing the management of the Electricity Trust, say whether the contract for the construction of the powerline from Keith to Padthaway has been let and, if it has, can he say who is the successful tenderer and when work is expected to be commenced and completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask the Chairman of the trust for a report.

## FRUIT FLY.

Mr. CURREN: In the absence of the Premier, on September 17 I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the fruit fly quarantine regulations that the New South Wales Government intends to impose against South Australian citrus fruit. In reply, the Minister said that the Premier had arranged a conference with Mr. Renshaw (New South Wales Premier) in Sydney and would discuss the matter with him. Can the Premier say whether that conference has taken place and, if it has not, when is it likely to take place?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Only recently I received from Mr. Renshaw a letter in which he said that it would be convenient to discuss this matter with me on October 9. I will confirm this arrangement and take the opportunity to discuss the fruit fly regulations with him. I am not sure what the position will be concerning regulations in the meantime. I presume that they would be held in abeyance, but I cannot say definitely.



**BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.**

Mr. NANKIVELL: At present Bordertown High School teaches up to matriculation standard. In 1966 this standard will change and the teaching of a fifth year will be required in order to maintain the same standard in this school. Can the Minister of Education say whether Bordertown High School will have a fifth-year class in 1966?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A full and detailed investigation is now being made by the Education Department on the establishment of fifth-year or matriculation classes in 1966 in those high schools which will not have fifth-year classes in 1965. The claims of Bordertown for such a class will certainly be fully considered.

**MOUNT BARKER ROAD.**

Mr. SHANNON: The residents of the Adelaide Hills are particularly interested in the programme of work on the improvement of the access to the hills. Recently I noticed survey pegs on the main Mount Barker road, on the section between Crafers and Stirling. Much clearing has been done and trees have been removed obviously with the intention of widening that strip of road. I ask the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, how many lanes are proposed for the stretch of road between Crafers and Aldgate? Will priority be given to this section of the hills road over the proposed new highway? As it is likely to be some years before this can be built, immediate relief would be given if the section to which I have referred were improved promptly.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain the information from my colleague.

**ARTERIOSCLEROSIS.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH, for Mr. Lawn (on notice):

1. How many deaths occurred in South Australia in each of the financial years from 1962 to 1964 inclusive?
2. How many of these deaths occurred as a result of accidents?
3. How many were due to arteriosclerosis?
4. How many deaths occurred from heart complaints associated with arteriosclerosis?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government Statist reports:

1. 1961-62, 7,796; 1962-63, 8,123; 1963-64, 8,663.
2. 1961-62, 401; 1962-63, 488; July-December, 1963, 264; January, 1964, to June, 1964, not yet available.

3. Deaths from arteriosclerosis—so classified: 1961-62, 140; 1962-63, 176; July-December, 1963, 100; January, 1964, to June, 1964, not yet available.

4. Not classified in this manner.

The following comments may be of assistance:

3. Arteriosclerosis: By rules of classification when arteriosclerosis is reported as the underlying cause of certain other conditions, the death is classified to the condition other than arteriosclerosis. The principal of these other conditions is arteriosclerotic heart disease (including coronary disease not specified as arteriosclerotic). In addition, when it is reported with certain other conditions the death is classified to the other condition. Some of these conditions are cerebral haemorrhage, cerebral thrombosis, heart disease specified as involving coronary arteries, myocardial degeneration and hypertensive heart disease. Consequently the figures given for arteriosclerosis are only for those deaths not covered by the circumstances described in the previous paragraph, and represent only a small proportion of deaths in respect of which arteriosclerosis was reported on the medical certificate of cause of death.

4. Heart complaints associated with arteriosclerosis: All of the conditions covered by the rules of classification indicated under "Arteriosclerosis" above include also deaths of persons whose medical certificates of cause of death did not carry any mention of "arteriosclerosis" or synonymous terms. Because of this it is not possible to give separate figures of heart complaints associated with arteriosclerosis.

**HOUSING TRUST.**

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. How many and what type of flats are now being constructed by the South Australian Housing Trust at Walkerville Terrace, Walkerville?
2. What is the estimated date of completion?
3. What progress is being made by the trust in the planning of a large block of flats in Gilberton?
4. What number of flats is so envisaged?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust reports:

1. Thirty-two flats will be constructed in two-storey buildings.
2. About July, 1965.
3. and 4. Planning of flats to be erected on land acquired by the trust at Park Terrace, Gilberton, has not yet begun but it is expected that about 100 flats will be built at this site.

**PRICES DEPARTMENT.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many officers are there in the Prices Department?

2. How many have qualifications in accountancy?

3. How many have other qualifications?

4. What are these qualifications?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. Forty (36 males, four females).

2. Eight (includes one with cost accounting and secretarial qualifications, and also two with secretarial qualifications).

3. and 4. Nil, at academic level. The Prices Commissioner informs me that eight officers are satisfactorily qualified to work in the fields of plumbing, interior decorating, engineering trades, timber products, footwear, grocery, clothing, and primary produce.

### THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1058.)

#### MINISTER OF WORKS AND MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS.

Public Works Department, £10,559; Engineering and Water Supply Department, £4,579,000; Public Buildings Department, £2,762,000; Public Stores Department, £140,423—passed.

Department of Aboriginal Affairs, £618,334.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has suitable accommodation been provided for the Superintendent, the Overseer, the Nurse and the Welfare Officer at the North-West Reserve, and are they associated only with the station that has been set up for the Aborigines to work, or have they something to do with Ernabella Mission Station?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): The accommodation at Musgrave Park is first-class and is all new. I have seen it myself and have stayed at the Superintendent's house. These houses were specially designed for tropical conditions, electricity is provided, and there is no lack of amenities. The duties of the officers are not linked directly with Ernabella Mission. Their duties are to attend to the administration of the station and to supervise the livestock activities. Close liaison exists with Ernabella in many respects, and there is utmost harmony between Ernabella, which is conducted by the Presbyterian authorities, and the station at Musgrave Park administered by the department. We have difficulty in maintaining staff at Musgrave Park, and at present I think, there is a vacancy that we are trying to fill.

Mr. CASEY: Has provision been made for a lighting plant at Nepabunna Mission?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer specifically. This mission is controlled by the United Aborigines Mission, which would request the department for a grant-in-aid for the purchase of such an item. I do not recall seeing such a request, but I shall inquire.

Mr. RICHES: Has provision been made for the erection of a store at the Port Augusta Umcewarra Reserve, now known as Davenport Reserve. According to the Auditor-General's Report, 450 Aborigines are accommodated on that reserve, many of whom have to travel by taxi into the town to obtain supplies. This could be avoided if a store were erected and a storekeeper provided. A limited quantity of supplies can be obtained from the mission.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am afraid I cannot answer that precisely, although I think that provision is being made for it in this year's Estimates. I will check up and make sure. No real purpose would be served in providing a storekeeper if it were not intended to establish a store. The department is trying to develop its activities rapidly and has received generous support from the Government and Parliament by way of funds for this rapid expansion. The Aborigines Department, in its improved policy for the assimilation of Aborigines, is doing its best to cope physically and financially with heavy demands. If the store at Port Augusta is not provided this year it will be because the demands made on the department exceed the finance available.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works indicate his department's intentions in connection with Primrose Farm or the Block K section of Point McLeay Reserve? He is probably aware that the water position is rather unpredictable on Block K and that much of its development hinges upon the intended water scheme.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The exact programme for this block has not been finally decided. It is rather an untidy piece of land at present and requires much rehabilitation. Its utilization depends partly on the water supply.

Mr. BYWATERS: I notice that a shortage of sheep at Point McLeay has arisen from thefts that have occurred, and this is not the first time. Is there adequate supervision of stock? Why is so much more theft occurring here than at Point Pearce?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I share the honourable member's concern here. Some time ago when substantial losses were reported to me I immediately contacted the Commissioner

of Police by telephone and asked him to commence investigations. The Commissioner has reported that Criminal Investigation Bureau officers have investigated the matter and have found evidence of theft, but they have not been able to trace the culprits. I think the honourable member will appreciate that close supervision of stock over the area is difficult; sheep wander away and often are lost and it is difficult to establish whether they have died or whether they have actually been stolen and removed from the property.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It seems to me that it is necessary to connect the age pensioners' cottages at the Davenport Reserve to the electricity supply. That had not been done on my last visit to the reserve and, so far as I am able to ascertain, it has not been done since. The pensioners see no reason why they should be required to make do with kerosene heating for cooking appliances and for refrigerators (if they are able to afford them). I cannot see how the suggestion that a safety factor was involved could hold much water because if they can cope with kerosene they can certainly cope with electricity safely. I point out that the quantity of electricity used in these cottages would not be great. In addition, some form of the intermediate housing that has been placed on the reserve for transients needs to be provided also for permanents. Some of the people to whom the member for Stuart has referred come on to the reserve and are unwilling to go into the pensioners' housing that is provided because it is so different from the mode of living to which they are accustomed, and they want something nearer to their own form of living than a house with furniture. Indeed, several of them expressed the desire to go into the simple corrugated iron shelters with a concrete floor, and they were told they could not go in there because those were being provided for the transients. I do not know what provision the department is making for this kind of accommodation, but it seems to me that until some kind of intermediate housing of this kind is provided we will have the continued problem of the wurlies being built on the sandhills.

Originally the department's proposals for this reserve during the current financial year involved placing a staff of five on the reserve. However, it appears to me that nothing like a staff of five will now be provided this year. The provision previously made for a nurse at Umewarra Mission, of course, has not altered, and that nurse is coping with the children at the mission. On the reserve itself there is to be

an officer in charge and a storekeeper, and then there is a provision for £3,500 for labour as required. I am not certain whether that covers some further permanent position on the reserve or whether it is to cope with casual labour of the people on the reserve itself—the natives who are living there. I should be glad to know what the proposal is about the staffing of this reserve, because this in many ways is one of the most important reserves as it has become a sort of central staging camp in the State for Aborigines either going north or coming from the north to the settled area, and this is likely to increase considerably. Also, what will be done this financial year about staffing the old people's centre on the reserve? As I see it here, there does not seem to be adequate provision for the staffing of that centre.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is rather difficult to say with certainty just what staff can be provided, because the department is in constant difficulty in recruiting staff. Knowing that that is a fact, the department has, I think, taken an overall look at the position and come to the conclusion that it will not be able to fill all the positions on the establishment and therefore it has estimated in toto what staff it will be able to recruit and made provision accordingly. It does not necessarily mean that the items shown as relating to one reserve give the final answer to the position. I would think that is the Director's approach to the problem. We are making provision in terms of accommodation for the general superintendent, the caretaker and his wife. We are also making provision for the old people's home to be staffed with a nursing sister or two; from memory, I am not sure whether it is one or two nurses. Whether or not we can fill the establishment is a matter which only time will determine, but I think the honourable member can accept my assurance that if we can find the people we will find ways and means of meeting the salary requirements.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister say what progress is being made in the extension of electricity from Ceduna to Koonibba, and whether it is the intention of the Government to carry on with erecting cottages for Aborigines at Koonibba?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The erection of cottages at Koonibba is proceeding fairly rapidly. This is being done by the building superintendent and aboriginal labour. That is only one of the activities there. Additional water supply catchment is being provided, and a number of other similar activities are taking

place. For instance, tanks are being built. It is the intention, as far as funds permit, to continue erecting cottages there to the extent, of course, that is required by the estimated permanent population at the mission. Regarding electricity, agreement has been reached with the authority at Ceduna for the department at Koonibba to be a customer of that authority. The necessary financial provision has been made and the station will be connected as soon as the powerline being erected by the authority at Ceduna makes this possible. In the meantime, we are having some problems with the generating plant at Koonibba, but they are being overcome on a purely temporary basis because of the knowledge that the reticulation main will reach Koonibba soon.

Mr. RICHES: I urge the Minister that every effort should be made to carry into effect as speedily as possible the announced programme for the development of Davenport Reserve. An awkward situation could develop at any time. I mentioned earlier this session that the assimilation of Aborigines in Port Augusta had worked smoothly. That was true at the time I made the statement, but as the result of agitation from pressure groups there is building up a resentment in some areas and we have had evidence of colour bar right out in the open and have admitted that as a town we have had to take action to try to stem this. Unfortunately, some of the objectors had good reason for their objections. I impress on the Minister that there should be no hold-up in the programme announced for the Davenport Reserve. The matters mentioned by the member for Norwood are essential, and I hope there will be no delay in implementing them.

We were told that a completely new building would be erected close to the amenities block to house the elderly citizens. I think that if that were done these houses that are now occupied by the pensioners could be made available, with a little thought, to some of the transients. There has been a marked improvement since the officer appointed by the department has taken up residence at the reserve, and I think it would be fitting if I paid tribute to the interest he is showing and the work he and his good lady are doing. I have seen this lady going into pensioners' homes and actually scrubbing their floors and helping them gain a knowledge of all housekeeping requirements. Also, I am satisfied that the officer who has been appointed has an understanding of the job he has to do. He does not claim that he knows all there is to know and he acknowledges that he has much to learn and is willing

to learn. I believe that he has the confidence of the people on the reserve and that he is trying to use the full labour available from the reserve. I hope some of the permanent officers to be appointed to the department might be recruited from the Aborigines.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is the intention.

Mr. RICHES: I believe there will be a greater opportunity for recruiting Aborigines to maintain the amenities block than to do other work. The Minister of Works announced some time ago that special efforts were being made to provide employment for the young men. Can he now say whether any success has been achieved? I do not think Port Augusta should be singled out as the only town in which Aborigines should live. There are other towns in the north and nearer to Adelaide where employment might be found for Aborigines. They should be assisted to obtain homes in places where they can find employment. I am concerned with the matter of finding employment for younger men at Umeewarra. With a minimum period of unemployment Aborigines get into debt. I do not know whether a special officer is set aside to deal with the employment of Aborigines or whether it is the duty of Mr. Weightman. What is the position in this regard, and has any success been achieved?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member suggests, the employment position is important. This was recognized early in the re-organizing of the department and one of the first appointments made was that of a full-time employment officer. His job is to move around and seek opportunities for employment and select Aborigines who may be suitable for certain jobs. The honourable member said that the number of employable Aborigines in Port Augusta had tended to exceed the employment opportunities there. As soon as that position arises resentment develops among the existing population. People feel that Aborigines are tending to take work away from them. I am concerned with this aspect because it can develop particularly at a time when employment opportunities are not as buoyant as they are at the moment. There is a strong emphasis on employment in the department and the officer concerned has met with much success so far. He has had the utmost co-operation from both State and Commonwealth departments. I have not had any report from him that he has run into serious difficulties, but as more Aborigines come from the north his difficulties will obviously increase.

I agree with the honourable member that it would be advisable to encourage aboriginal families to spread widely throughout the State. However, Port Augusta is not the only place where we are accommodating Aborigines. In a wide area from Millicent and Mount Gambier to the far west in the district of the member for Eyre we are building houses for aboriginal families. Unfortunately we occasionally have some resistance from local people, but this is gradually diminishing. It is the Government's policy to house Aborigines in any country town where they might expressly desire to live. There are the usual employment opportunities under that provision. I will refer the honourable member's remarks to the Director of Aboriginal Affairs and have a discussion with the Director on the points raised by the honourable member and by the member for Norwood. I thank the member for Stuart for his constructive criticism.

Mr. CASEY: Regarding "Purchase of houses for Aborigines", I am glad to see that there has been an increase this year. Can the Minister of Works say whether any new houses are being constructed or are going to be constructed in areas such as Copley, Marree and Beltana?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Under "General" appears a figure of £204,088, but it is not voted for the purchase of machines and equipment. Some problems have been associated with the accounting of this department and the preparation of documents for Aborigines who have money held in trust by the department. Can the Minister say whether this sum is shown as payment or is it money for the purpose of providing new and more speedy methods of accounting in the department?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know whether this has any specific reference to the changeover in policy of keeping trust accounts. I think it refers to a general provision for office equipment because of the growth of the department generally. The department is abandoning the long-standing practice of keeping thousands of trust accounts, in its policy to make individual families more self-sufficient. As a result, officers are being made available for more important matters.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £20,250.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works explain the £8,000 discrepancy between last year's figure and the figure of £2,000 provided this year for "Contribution to Metropolitan Drainage Maintenance Fund towards deficiency"?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): This obligation is in respect of a long-standing agreement under the Metropolitan Drainage Act under which the Government undertook to maintain these works and at the time agreed to fix the annual contribution by the councils concerned, which of course with the lapse of time and change in the value of money has left the maintenance largely the financial responsibility of the department. The work largely concerns the removal of silt and reeds which, of course, is not a necessary expenditure every year.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Education Department, £17,921,252.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Minister of Education say whether provision has been made for the erection of a house at the Naracoorte High School, and also for the old high school to be renovated for the establishment of an adult education centre?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): No, not on this line because the provision would be made in the Loan Estimates in both of those matters; in fact, provision has been made.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education say when the Commonwealth report on tertiary education will be available and whether in the meantime something could be done about increasing allowances for student teachers in this State?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I took this matter up comparatively recently with Cabinet and it was decided to await the outcome of the Commonwealth report, which has been expected for months. As soon as the report is published it will be examined and a further decision will be made concerning these allowances.

Mr. CASEY: Can the Minister of Education say whether travelling expenses are to be provided for country people, often with large families, who have to bring their mentally retarded children to Adelaide for specialized schooling?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No definite conclusion has been arrived at concerning this case. We did start out two or three years ago (I think originally at the instance of the member for Burnside before she became a member) to institute a new policy of assisting in the transport of handicapped children—handicapped for a variety of different reasons—to and from special schools. That was done by using taxi-cabs, the Government paying two-thirds of the cost and the parents

of children paying one-third. That has been working most satisfactorily, much better than I had expected. We have extended this policy to country districts such as the Upper Murray and elsewhere, and only last Monday I obtained a further slight extension inasmuch as children suffering from muscular distrophy can now benefit. These children do not attend any special schools, because there are no special schools for them, but some of them are attending high schools and primary schools, particularly in the western suburbs, and cases were put to me by the Muscular Distrophy Association that there should be an extension of the scheme whereby the parents of these children should enjoy the same benefits, even though the children were not attending special schools. Townsend House is a special school, but it does not come within the provisions of this arrangement. I do not know the number who would come within the proposals suggested by the honourable member, but I should be only too pleased to take the matter up with the special transport committee which is advising me on this matter and with the Superintendent of Primary Schools, under whose jurisdiction Townsend House lies. I do not know whether the Oral School at Gilberton or any other such school would be interested, but I would be very pleased to collect all the information and endeavour to obtain a Cabinet decision on the matter in due course, at any rate in time for the next school year.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The sum of £612,100 is provided under the line "Cleaners, Playground Supervisors, labour as required". As cleaners and playground supervisors do much extra work beyond that for which they are paid, could they be rewarded adequately rather than go unrewarded?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: We are gradually increasing the number of caretakers in our high schools and secondary schools, and each year we are adding a small number of caretakers to our largest primary schools. I strongly favour having caretakers, and I think this is a very good investment.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The sum of £153,000 is provided under the line "Private Schools—Transport of students, boarding and book allowances". Can the Minister explain this line?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This line is in accordance with the regulations which Parliament has approved from time to time. The increase that has taken place both for book allowances and boarding allowances applies to students of secondary schools whether they

be departmental or private. These allowances are for country students who are obliged to live away from home and who attend a secondary school. The numbers of these children increase from time to time, and increased provision is made accordingly.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I should be grateful if the Minister could ascertain for me the position regarding the development of the reserve off Marian Road, South Payneham. This reserve is subject to the joint scheme between the Education Department and the local council, and it has been available for some considerable time. I understand that grading work was done there some time ago, but it is still not a playing area available for the St. Morris school, for which it was originally provided. I believe the sooner we can get something done effectively on this reserve the better. Certainly local residents are very keen for it, as are many of the parents of the boys.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be happy to obtain the information. I do not want to do an injustice to the local council, but I think it is because of a lack of urgency on the part of the council.

Line passed.

Libraries Department, £365,970; Museum Department, £68,000; Art Gallery Department, £35,505—passed.

Miscellaneous, £5,324,459.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Regarding "University of Adelaide—Additional general purpose grant", I have a sense of disquiet on the subject of university fees. As a member of the Council of the University of Adelaide, I am well apprised of the fact that the university, in order to attract the maximum sum of money for development, has been forced, as have other universities in Australia, to increase its fees. The fees that are now charged for many courses preclude the children of the average family from doing them. The cost of books and fees is so heavy that many families with children, who have the qualifications to enter upon these courses, simply cannot sustain the cost of maintaining the children and giving them a university education. This has been commented upon by the university council, which pointed out in its last report that many young people in Australia, adequately qualified to undertake higher education, are prevented from doing so because of the cost. Many Opposition members know of families with an income higher than the basic wage who cannot afford to send their children to the university. I have often had to find a cadetship or part-time employment to

assist young people in my district, from families of average income, to get some kind of university education.

At the moment, Commonwealth scholarships are inadequate to meet the situation. When I was at the university anybody who had attained an adequate academic standard could get a Commonwealth scholarship because enough were then provided in relation to the number of students coming forward. Now, even if a student passes the matriculation examination with a couple of credits, it is not possible for him to get a Commonwealth scholarship. Although there has been some increase in the number of Commonwealth scholarships, sufficient are not yet available. As far as I know, the State is not bringing any pressure to bear or attempting to use any influence on the Commonwealth or the Universities Commission to keep fees as low as possible. I believe that the fees have already reached the stage when it is time for a reduction. Under the present finances of the university this is, of course, extremely difficult. Unless further assistance is provided for the university it will not be possible for it to reduce fees and continue with its development. However, it is urgently necessary that the Government take action so that talent in the community is not wasted. Other countries spend far more of their national income on education than does Australia. Many of them are prepared to provide not only free education right through the tertiary stage, but also living allowances for all students who are undertaking higher education. This is supposed to be one of the most prosperous countries in the world and it is time we took stock of this situation. We cannot afford to allow the talents of young people to go to waste. Can the Minister of Education give any information as to how this situation can be coped with?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, unfortunately, I cannot. I am at a disadvantage compared with the honourable member because I am not a member of the Council of the University of Adelaide, which is an autonomous body. However, where I have had some powers of persuasion I have endeavoured to persuade the university not to increase its fees, for example, in the Public Examination Board fees. I have done that on two occasions in two succeeding years. I am sure that action has the support of the member for Norwood and all members. I share his views and I believe the cost of university fees is increasing far too much. I think that is happening in some States more than in South Australia, but it is a bad investment because we may be deny-

ing some of the best intellects in the State the opportunity for a tertiary education and denying ourselves the opportunity in the future of receiving the benefits of the higher education of these people.

Mr. CORCORAN: The sum of £213,300 has been allocated to the Kindergarten Union of South Australia. Last year I said that the Millicent Pre-School Play Centre had had difficulty in obtaining a trained director. The Minister raised this matter with the Kindergarten Union for me. The problem still exists because the person who was employed by the school last year was appointed to be in charge of the school, but under the direction of a trained director who visited the school occasionally. Because of this, this girl was not able to be paid by the union the salary that I believe her services warranted. As a result, the committee that cares for the school was compelled, in order to retain her services, to pay her a certain sum over and above the salary she received. Of course, this has been a drain on the resources of the committee and a burden that it has found difficult to carry. The girl has cared successfully and efficiently for the students of this school during the last eight or nine months. I ask the Minister whether he will see, if a trained director cannot be made available to this school next year, whether the salary of the girl at present in charge of the school may be raised in accordance with the services she is now providing?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be only too pleased to comply with the honourable member's request. However, as I have often said, this State has never accepted full responsibility for pre-school education, which is conducted very efficiently by the Kindergarten Union of South Australia. A small token grant of £3,000 was made by this Parliament in 1945, and it has grown to £213,300. There are now 110 kindergartens, and even with this large grant and the substantial contributions made by parents all the trained teaching staff required cannot be provided. Millicent is one of several kindergartens whose demands are still unsatisfied. I shall take up the honourable member's request with the union.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY.

Department of Labour and Industry, £172,102; Miscellaneous, £6,814—passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS.

Minister of Agriculture Department, £8,284; Agriculture Department, £1,041,061; Agricultural College Department, £147,000; Produce Department, £284,515—passed.

Fisheries and Game Department, £55,995.

Mr. CORCORAN: In certain parts of the coastline in my district many people wish to do angling, but as nets are used extensively these areas are virtually useless for them. Will the Minister say whether any provision has been made whereby parts of the coast can be declared to be fishing reaches, what reasons normally have to be given for this to be done, and what conditions apply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): These matters are dealt with by regulation. Protection is given anglers who fish off jetties and similar structures, where netting is not permitted. Apart from that, regulations have been introduced to provide where netting is prohibited and the type of net that can be used. These regulations apply to many parts of the coast. Any request will be taken seriously and its merits will be examined closely by the Government.

Line passed.

Chemistry Department, £89,000—passed.

Miscellaneous, £592,783.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The sum of £125 was voted last year as a subsidy towards the Ridley Centenary Scholarship, but nothing is provided this year. Will the Minister say when this scholarship was last awarded and whether there is any way in which it can be made more attractive to students at Roseworthy Agricultural College?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot say when it was last awarded, but it has not been used much lately because heavy land settlement programmes carried out by the State in the last few years have superseded the provision, which was a small land settlement provision. However, I shall obtain details for the honourable member, and possibly some correction may have to be made to my statement.

Mr. CORCORAN: In a recent question I said that a statement had been made by a councillor that he had been told that the future of Mount Burr township was limited to 15 years. Several houses have been put up for tender recently. Will the Minister comment on the councillor's statement?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know where the honourable member obtained that information, as the matter has not been brought to my attention before. Comparatively recently a fine district hall was constructed by the Government at Mount Burr, sewerage was provided, and improvements were carried out to the mill. These things make the statement appear pointless. No time limit has been set.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have received a letter from a member of the Weeds Advisory Committee, for which £300 is provided this year, expressing concern that, although the committee has made recommendations, they have either not been accepted or have been rejected because of the finance involved. Will the Minister indicate the functions of the committee and say how often it has met and whether much notice is taken of its recommendations?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This committee is very important, and much notice is taken of it. Much care is given in selecting members to see that they adequately represent different shades of experience in agriculture and that they are prepared to give of their best. I am happy to say the committee has worked extremely well and has attended to its duties diligently. I do not know what can be involved in the statement that little notice is taken of what the committee says: that is so untrue as to be ludicrous. If I were given specific details I may be able to take this matter further, but without them I cannot. Many suggested regulations made under the Weeds Act either originate or are discussed by the committee or are referred to the committee, and they can be the genesis of a proposed regulation. Regulations have to run the gauntlet of many councils, first, within the department, the advisory committee, the Minister, the Government, Parliament (through the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation), and Parliament itself. It is possible that many recommendations of the committee are not adopted, but I do not know to what the member for Albert is referring. In general, the work of the committee is greatly appreciated and valued. I know of another committee that will be established in a different type of work, and it is to be modelled on the Weeds Advisory Committee.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I apologize to the Minister for not having specific information. If I make this available I understand that he will inquire into the matter and give me further information about the specific cases.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF IRRIGATION.

Department of Lands (Irrigation and Drainage), £506,380—passed.

#### MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, £903,892.

Mr. COUMBE: Research work undertaken by the Mines Department in oil exploration has been spoken about. Public statements last week indicated a distinct possibility that



natural gas may be brought to Adelaide. It is realized that the Mines Department has played a leading part in assisting oil exploration companies in the search for and discovering of these products, and that it will be required to do research and investigation work, and assist companies in the future. If the natural gas product is brought to Adelaide, the Mines Department will be required to assist with regulations and legislation. I understand that a Canadian expert has been advising the department on procedures to be adopted to handle this new product. Also, when he returns to Canada he will send information back to this Government, and that further information will be sent to Canada for processing. What is this Government doing about recruiting staff for the Mines Department, in association with the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories at Parkside and Thebarton, to carry on the work of this Canadian expert? In the past special sections for specific work have been set up in the Mines Department, and these have played an important part in the development of this State. I hope the Mines Department will set up a special section to handle this new product. Perhaps the Director of Mines (Mr. Barnes) or the Deputy Director (Mr. Parkin) should be sent to the United States or the Continent to see what developments are taking place in those countries, and on their return the Government would have the advantage of their advice.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The honourable member knows that recently a Canadian, a senior officer in a large natural gas corporation in Canada, came to Australia to advise this Government. He visited the field and made a complete inspection, and has arranged for detailed information to be supplied to the Government from time to time. He has agreed for an officer, with academic qualifications, to be sent from this State to his organization, to be trained. Rather than send the Director of Mines, it is intended to select a young officer with degree qualifications, and to send him to a large organization in Canada for him to be trained in the work necessary to enable him to look after this State's interests. That is the best answer to the particular query about recruiting officers to this department.

Line passed.

#### MINISTER OF MARINE.

Harbors Board Department, £1,697,010;  
Miscellaneous, £2,100—passed.

#### MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Railways Department, £15,056,486; Transport Control Board, £19,548—passed.

#### MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER OF ROADS.

Office of Minister, £11,142—passed.

Highways and Local Government Department, £867,535.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: According to a press statement on September 24 a contract has been let for the construction of a bridge across Pedlar Creek as part of the project to straighten the South Road. In addition, local residents have expressed some concern at the possibility of a bridge being constructed over a railway line that is used only once a week. I should like some further information about the Highways Department's plans in this regard. I should like to know also the department's plans for Dukes Highway from Adelaide to Bordertown.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall get a full report for the Leader so that he will have the opportunity to put up counter plans, if he so desires.

Mr. CURREN: Some time ago I accompanied a deputation to the Minister of Roads concerning a request for a bridge across the Murray River at Kingston. At a later date the Speaker and I submitted further submissions to the Minister, but as yet we have received no indication as to the department's intentions. Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads any information on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I shall endeavour to get some information for the honourable member but I point out that this matter does not come within the purview of this debate. The matter must either be one of road expenditure or be one for discussion under the Loan Estimates.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £72,465—passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

The Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for £82,884,109 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Honourable Sir Thomas Playford, and read a first time.

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

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

It is for the appropriation of £82,884,109, details of which are set out in the Estimates which have just been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 provides for the further issue of

£54,884,109, being the difference between the amount authorized by the two Supply Acts—£28,000,000—and the total of the appropriation required in this Bill. Clause 3 sets out the amount to be appropriated and the details of the appropriation to the various departments and functions. This clause also provides that increases of salaries or wages which become payable pursuant to any return made by a properly constituted authority may be paid, and that the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount necessary to pay the increases. It further provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, from bores in the Adelaide Water District, and through the Morgan-Whyalla water main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may authorize the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time authorized by warrants issued by the Governor and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by the Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1964, or at a rate in excess of the rate which was in force under any return, award, order or determination. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The matters contained in this Bill have been discussed at great length during the debate on the Estimates. However, I think this is an appropriate time to reflect on the increases that are to be imposed. We will soon have an opportunity to consider stamp duties, the foreshadowed increase of which somewhat surprises me, for according to my figures the total increase over the last six years will amount to 144 per cent. A definite increase in revenue will result from increased duty on mortgage documents, and certainly there has been a big increase already in revenue from the increase in publicans' licence fees. These increases and the proposed increase in hospital charges will usurp more than one-third of

the workers' recent basic wage increase, and that is a serious matter. However, as I have already indicated, these matters have been discussed at length, and knowing that this Bill must pass another place I will not delay the House with further comments. I will have an opportunity later to speak at length on the increase in stamp duty.

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

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1051.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The omissions from the original Bill call for comment. I referred to this matter during the Budget debate and subsequent events certainly indicate that the Government conceived an idea for the taxing of certain share transactions but, after approaches by share brokers and the like had been made, it was necessary to introduce another amending Bill. Personally, I still hold the view that the original Bill was ill-conceived and that it would have been more appropriate to offer some consultation in the first place with the people dealing with these matters continually. I referred to this matter in the debate on the Budget, when I also said that those people dealing in shares would find loopholes and transfer their activities to another State. However, I do not propose to elaborate on that now other than to remind the Government of it.

As the Treasurer stated in his opening remarks, this is the enabling legislation to give effect to the alterations in stamp duty charges that were mentioned during the Budget debate. There are four main sources of revenue open to the Government, namely, State taxation, receipts from public works and services, territorial receipts, and Commonwealth grants. Our main Budget problems seem to emanate from the fact that we do not appear to be doing very well under the Commonwealth grants, but the Treasurer has given this House to understand that, whilst he is dissatisfied with the grant, he is not in a position to do any better. If that is the case, I think it is about time he went back to the Commonwealth Grants Commission for a special assistance grant instead of imposing disproportionate and sectional taxes on the people of this State.

Another major item in the State revenue is, of course, receipts from public works and services, but the Treasurer has never been prepared

to admit that his works are expensive. Consequently, he apparently prefers to increase taxes at random so long as he raises the additional finance that he requires. Rejection of the two major items brings us to the relatively small items of State taxation and territorial receipts. No doubt, the Government also considered the possibility of increasing territorial receipts, which relate to such items as Crown rents and leases and mining royalties but, as they in total comprise only about £1,000,000, which is less than 1 per cent of the total Budget payments, it was apparent that it was not possible to raise sufficient additional finance from this source. Even though State taxation is increasing at a much faster rate than the Commonwealth grants, the Government in its wisdom has decided that it is from this source that additional revenue is to be received, and once again the little man is being singled out for the greatest impost.

The motor vehicle industry is a large employer in this State, but apparently the Government is prepared to ignore the adverse effects that its additional taxes on new car registrations will have on this industry. To place a new vehicle on the road in future will immediately involve an additional payment of stamp duty, via the Motor Vehicles Department, of £10 to £12 on account of an original registration. Extra charges will also be incurred in the purchase contract, but I shall refer to this matter a little later. All these charges will be in addition to existing registration and insurance charges. In the first instance, I am concerned that the additional charges being imposed on the motorist may have the effect of creating a buyer resistance which would adversely affect not only the motor industry but all subsidiaries that supply spare parts. The numbers of people in small industries dealing with small parts associated with the motor industry who can be affected are unknown.

This industry was severely hit several years ago when the Commonwealth Government imposed credit restrictions as part of its financial policy, which had the ultimate effect of forcing motorists to postpone the purchase of new vehicles. Exactly the same process can occur on this occasion if prospective purchasers consider that the additional taxes being raked off by the Government are too severe. This can occur because, besides additional tax on the new vehicle and the extra charges involved with the purchase contract, a 1 per cent tax is to be imposed on the transfer of the old vehicle. The total of all these charges could

easily become a serious deterrent to the purchase of a new vehicle.

In an attempt to justify the additional tax, the Treasurer has stated that the cost of various police services is about £750,000 a year and that motorists in the past have not been obliged to contribute towards this cost. As motorists are already paying well over £5,000,000 each year in registration fees and for drivers' licences, I should have thought that this would be sufficient money out of which to provide adequate police and ambulance services.

Clause 4, together with clause 8 of the Bill, enacts new sections 42a, to 42e, and amends the Second Schedule of the Stamp Duties Act whereby the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is to collect the additional duty for new registrations of motor vehicles and the transfers of existing registrations at the rate of 1 per cent *ad valorem* with provision for a minimum of £2. This minimum tax is equivalent to duty on a vehicle of between £100 and £200. There are many transactions where vehicles are transferred at figures much less than these and, if the Government is determined to raise additional revenue, it should at least consider the ability of the person to pay. Under the Motor Vehicles Act there is already provision for a transfer fee of 10s., which should more than cover the administrative costs involved. Consequently, I believe the Government should consider the deletion of the minimum duty of £2 provided for in paragraph (b) of clause 8 of the Bill.

The opportunity is also taken in paragraph (a) of clause 8 to substantially increase the licence fee applicable to fire and general insurance. The Treasurer's explanation that the imposition of a licence fee equivalent to 5 per cent of the net premiums received by insurance companies was placing South Australian companies in a position comparable with that of insurance companies in other States seemed fairly reasonable but, on examination, I found that the increase in the licence rate would be 300 per cent whilst the licence fee applicable to life assurance and personal accident insurance was still to be charged at 10s. per cent on the net premium. By imposing this licence fee of 5 per cent on fire and general insurance while still retaining the 10s. per cent on life and accident insurance, this State has now achieved the unenviable record of charging the highest rate in Australia.

Another provision of clause 8 where a tax is being imposed on persons least able to pay is in paragraph (j) where a 1 per cent tax on money-lending transactions, which are

set out in clause 7, is imposed. I referred to this subject in my opening remarks because of its possible adverse effect on the motor industry, but as I have just mentioned the tax will eventually fall on the person who is least able to pay. The Treasurer, in his explanation, stated that the lender was to pay this additional fee, but I am sure in the long run it will be recovered from the person who borrows the money, even though it may be called any of several names such as extra administrative, service, or interest charges.

Another stamp duty item that is to have a substantial increase is the duty payable on mortgage documents which is to be increased from 2s. 6d. a £100 to 5s. a £100—that is a 100 per cent increase in this particular charge. The Treasurer, in an attempt to justify this particular tax, made the point that the rate applicable to conveyances of property was less in this State than it is in the other States. It seems to me that the Treasurer switches his argument in an attempt to justify what his Government is doing because he is quite prepared to argue that we should be a low-wage State in order that we should progress, but the whole tenor of the Bill before us on various taxation measures is that our taxes should be equal to or higher than those in other States. Perhaps it would have been preferable for the Government to have considered economies of expenditure instead of striking out in all directions in order to rake in as much income as possible to meet its expanding expenditure. Whilst some members may be prepared to agree that some increases or alterations may have been desirable to rectify anomalies, I consider that they will find when they make a close examination of the Bill that the increased taxes have, in most cases, been imposed on people least able to afford them, that in all cases the increases have been excessive, and that in many cases the impositions have been sectional. All of these matters are contrary to accepted taxation practice. I have indicated what effect the 1 per cent tax can have on the economics of the motor vehicle industry. What will be the position in the case of a trade-in? The dealer may still get away with an impost that is not provided by this legislation in respect of used cars. In the Budget debate, I said that this tax would hit hardest on the purchaser of a house. The Government has introduced legislation providing for a £50 deposit for the purchase of a Housing Trust home, but the very people to benefit from that legislation will be hardest hit by this new impost. In

the Budget debate, I suggested that the Government might consider exemptions in this regard, and that suggestion should be considered before the debate on this legislation is concluded. I am utterly opposed to this Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I, too, oppose the Bill. In examining the tax to be imposed in South Australia, one has to see to it that tax is levied within the State according to what are the properly instituted canons of taxation. That is to say, that those people in the community who can best afford to contribute towards the cost of maintaining community services are the people who should pay the taxes and that it is unfair to tax the poorer sections of the community and to allow the richer sections to go scot free. That would be the generally accepted idea under any Government but a Government of the kind that is sitting on the Treasury benches in this place at the moment. Any examination of this Bill shows clearly how sectional and discriminatory against the poorer sections of the community these taxes are designed to be. Instead of proceeding according to the proper canons of taxation, many of these taxes have been carefully designed not to affect the wealthier interests in the community one jot, but to see to it that the average man working for his living in this community is paying through the nose. Already within South Australia the richer sections of the community pay a smaller proportion of the taxes than they do in any other State in Australia. Here, people who are the wealthy interests supporting the Government and paying it money that keeps the Liberal Party going are the people who reap the benefits from this Government because they are exempted from taxation in this State in many instances.

I shall examine some of these tax proposals and show just what the Government is designing to do and just from whom it will take the money. Let us take at the outset the first proposal, the proposal to tax the transfers of registrations on motor vehicles by 1 per cent of the declared value of the vehicle. This is not a tax merely on new vehicles: it is a tax on every transfer of a vehicle, and every buyer of a secondhand car is going to be involved in a considerable increase in the price of that car by this duty. Not only will it affect the motor industry in the way the Leader has said, but every working man in the community will be affected, because a car is no longer a luxury in a community such as ours. A vast number of working men in this State

require cars in order to get to work. With the development of the metropolitan area that is taking place at the moment, the public transport system is insufficient to cope, under the policies of the Government, with the needs of people for transport. For instance, in the city of Elizabeth how are people adequately to get to work without some form of public transport? These people must have cars, yet they are to be taxed in this way. People are forced out of houses in districts like mine and are offered by the only public housing authority in this State houses 15 to 20 miles from their work. How are they to get to work without some private transport? Having a car already takes a considerable sum out of their weekly wages, and now there is to be this additional impost.

What is the reason advanced by the Treasurer for this tax? It is that this State needs to recoup some of the cost of police, safety, and ambulance services from motorists—those working men who need their cars to be able to get to work or cope with the needs of their families. He justifies this by saying that other States are recouping part of the cost of these services. A swift look at what this State spends on these services shows how far this form of taxation is necessary. According to the Grants Commission report the average per capita expenditure on law, order and public safety—and this figure is brought down by our own expenditure—is £3 7s. 10d. per annum. Our figure is £3 3s. 11d., which is by far the lowest in the Commonwealth. Queensland is spending £3 13s. 2d., Western Australia £3 10s. 9d., and Tasmania £4 6s. 4d. per capita in this direction. We provide an inadequate police service, and I am talking not about the administration of the department but about the fact that to be able adequately to staff the Police Department with young and dedicated officers we must make the service more attractive than it now is. Although we are not spending enough to do this, the Treasurer wants to take money from the motorist for a service he is not getting.

The next impost is the proposal to put a stamp duty on memoranda made pursuant to the Money-Lenders Act. Who will pay for this? This is an impost on contracts now used by money-lending firms in South Australia—the hire-purchase companies—to evade the provisions of the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act. It has been suggested by the Treasurer that, because of the provisions of clause 8, this will not be passed on to the borrower. Clause 8 provides that a money-lender shall not add the amount of any duty on the note and otherwise

demand or recover or seek to recover any amount from the borrower, and that the borrower can get it back from the money-lender if he does. How will the borrower be able to prove this? In the vast majority of these transactions the money-lender operates directly through a retailer, and the charges will not appear on the note; the retail price will go up. How will that be controlled under the provisions of the Bill?

Mr. Clark: It will be evaded in the same way as the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it will, and the impost will be passed on to the borrower under the hire-purchase agreement, the personal loan contract, or the unregistered bill of sale, which will all be caught under this proposal. The people who need to make use of hire-purchase or money-lending finance are the poorer sections of the community. They are the people who go to money-lenders for assistance; they are the people responsible for the very large sum in time payment contracts outstanding in the books of money-lenders in this State. The wealthier interests are not using money of that kind.

Mr. Clark: They are using overdraft.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course they are. They will not be paying any stamp duty; the small man will be paying this sum. Hire-purchase is called the small man's overdraft, and it is the small man who will be paying. The big man has no impost on him at the moment despite the fact that already he pays less in State taxation than is imposed in any other State in the Commonwealth.

The fourth impost is an increase in stamp duties on mortgages and comparable documents from 2s. 6d. to 5s. per cent on the amount secured. Who is it who needs to seek mortgage finance in this State? Overwhelmingly it is the smaller people in the community—the house buyers, the people on wages or salaries. The larger pastoral and company interests are not buying property on mortgage, so the only taxation they will be paying is stamp duty on transfers. The Treasurer tries to get out of the position which differentiates our charges from those in the other States by saying:

But all the States except Western Australia impose a higher rate of stamp duty on conveyances of property than does South Australia, so that the net effect of the proposed increase will be that in relation to property transfers involving mortgage finance the total stamp duty payable in South Australia will be less than in New South Wales and Victoria because the higher rate of duty on the transfer in those States, based on full value, will more than offset the duty on the mortgage document which relates only to portion of the value.

However, what is the effect of his statement? It means that instead of increasing stamp duty on conveyances, which would be paid by every-one purchasing property, he has increased it on mortgages so that the smaller people in the community will be paying all the increased taxes and the other people, who are not using mortgage finance, will not pay a penny piece. That is the effect of this tax—to tax the small man and let the man who does not buy on mortgage finance pay nothing. The Treasurer will not bring our taxes in line with those of other States so that the larger the transaction the more the tax. Oh, no! The larger transactions not carried out with mortgage finance will not be taxed. Certainly some of the larger institutions sometimes seek assistance from the banks to carry out their transactions, but they do not register mortgages and no stamp duty is payable. All that happens is that there is a deposit of the title as against the overdraft. This is an informal mortgage on which no stamp duty is paid. The small man does not get away with that sort of thing, as he has to register his mortgage. He will be paying the duty, but the big man will not. Again, this is a vicious sectional form of tax, as the Treasurer well knew, when he was drafting the proposal, that the section of the community he was seeking to hit was the smaller people.

This contrasts with the way in which taxes are designed in all other States of the Commonwealth. One thing that can be said about the Treasurer is that he is not a fool. He can see the effects of this taxation, which was deliberately designed to have the effect I have outlined. In every one of these ways, it is quite clear that the proposal is to see to it that the people in the community who will pay the extra taxes are those who are already paying more than their fair share towards taxation, for under our existing taxes the smaller people in this State are paying more heavily than are people in the other States. It may be said, "Well, where would you get extra revenue if you were to admit that extra revenue was to be provided?" If one considers the existing taxation in the State one can see where it is that this State is out of line with other States. Clearly probate and succession duties are out of line. We have heard a suggestion that our Party intends to tax people out of existence with probate and succession duties. That is entirely untrue: we have never proposed such a thing. We do not see why probate and succession duties in South Australia should be levied more heavily on the poorer people in the community and

more lightly on the richer, than in any other State, and that is the position now.

What is our position? We have a lower exemption rate than have the other States, but at the lower levels of our taxation rate we tax more heavily than do many of the other States. The highest level of our taxation in probate and succession duty is reached at £200,000 compared with £100,000 in other States. However, the wealthier interests are paying less and the poorer interests paying more in probate and succession duties than anywhere else in Australia, and we believe that this is unjust. The people who are already getting the benefit are not being taxed to any significant extent in these proposals. The people who get no benefit under probate and succession duty and who are paying more than their fair share as compared with the rates in other States, the poorer section of the community, are being taxed by these proposals. To clear up that particular position, it has been suggested that the Labor Party, in effect, in proposing alterations in probate and succession duty to bring it into line with other States, is not dealing with the difficult situation that could face some people in the farming community. The Party makes it clear that it is entirely alive to the difficulty of people in this class. This section of the farming community comprises the small farmers, the settlers who have gone on war service land settlements, and others who have properties of a like size.

Mr. Clark: That would be a large section, too.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, a considerable section is placed in difficulties by any proposal to bring the probate and succession duties into line with other States, because in this State the inflated value of land has meant that the market value, on which a property would be assessed for succession duties, is completely out of proportion to the return to the owner from that property, that is, if one considers the capital market value on which it would be assessed. The owner has nothing like a reasonable return on that market value for his property. In consequence, he is in an artificial position that is unfair to him, for if he were to be assessed for probate duty on that market value, sometimes his dependants would be faced with the sale of the property in order to meet the large succession duties then payable. We wholeheartedly agree that that situation should be allowed for and a special concession given in those circumstances, to

ensure that no hardship is imposed on such an estate.

Mr. Hall: Did you support the Bill when it went through the House?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Which Bill?

Mr. Hall: The Bill introduced by the Government, doing just that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not agree that the Bill that passed this House does adequately what we believe should be done.

Mr. Hall: You don't agree with the principle in it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: At that time I was not in agreement with the principle of giving rebate in succession duties to properties with a value in excess of £200,000, and I am still not. What I agree with is the principle I have stated, that special concessions should be given to those people who are in the category that I stated, and who cannot, on the returns from their properties, make adequate provision for the payment of probate and succession duties and whose families would face difficulties. We in this Party (and I was one, as members know) fought most vociferously for the adoption of this principle. We should not impose an unfair taxation on people who are put in an anomalous position because of the inflated market value of their property, an inflation that this Government improperly allowed to go on. We have to cope with that situation and we intend to do so. Under our proposals there would be no provision that would hit those people in such a way that they would be faced with undue difficulties.

Mr. Hall: You passed a properly graduated scale that benefited the small man.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It gave little benefit to the small man but all the benefits went to the richest interests in the State.

Mr. Hall: That is not so.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have read the legislation in detail. The honourable member is upset that I am talking about this, because he does not want the farming community to learn that this is the Labor Party's policy. We made it clear what our policy is on this matter, and we are not going to put up with the misrepresentation of it that is stated from the other side of the House about it. We believe that there are several other ways in which taxation should have been assessed. In the area covered by this Bill, additional taxation could have been imposed which was not unfair to the smaller sections of the community, and which was properly graded. This has not been done. We believe in taxation that would allow the incidence of tax to fall on the community so

that those best able to pay can pay their fair share, as they are not doing now. This proposal is discriminatory, it is unfair and is allowing the Premier to act as a Robin Hood in reverse, to take from the poor to give to the rich, in this community. We believe that it is wholly wrong and that the form of these proposals is completely contrary to the proper canons of just taxation.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Like the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Norwood, I oppose the Bill and, as it has been aptly described by the two previous speakers, I do not intend to go too deeply into it. It is a class legislation Bill. Members opposite should remember that next March there is a general election, and no doubt when they go to the people they will claim, on behalf of their Party, that the Liberal and Country League represents all sections of the community. During the period of this Parliament, the L.C.L. Government has taken a halfpenny in the pound land tax off people on land worth over £5,000, and including amounts in excess of £100,000. The large landholders have had a halfpenny in the pound taxation reduction, whereas small people, referred to in detail by the member for Norwood, have had heavier taxation inflicted upon them. The Government has goofed in introducing a Bill of this description prior to the elections. At least the Bolte Government did it after the election, and the Menzies Government always does it after.

Mr. Clark: What would happen if this goes through after the election?

Mr. LAWN: This Bill would not go through the House after the election if we were in Government, if that is what the honourable member means. We would not introduce such a Bill: we would introduce a Bill along the lines indicated by the member for Norwood. At the same time it is not our duty to tell the Government what sort of legislation it should introduce. Suggestions have already been made as to how the Government should economize. Indeed, during the Budget debate I indicated the economics it should effect in regard to the electoral roll. How much has it cost the people of this State for having two enrolment forms, two envelopes, two electoral rolls—

Mr. Clark: We could save much money by abolishing the other place.

Mr. LAWN: We should have one roll for the election of both Houses. I want to give an indication of the effect that this Bill will have on purchasers of motor cars. The member for Norwood said that cars were no longer

luxuries. I agree with that and would add that it is a long time since they were. It costs a family man more to use public transport today than it would to run a small car. The cost of taking the family out in a small car is all in the car's initial purchase price and registration. It would cost a man with six or eight children less to travel by taxi! I shall outline what both the Commonwealth and State Governments have inflicted upon the owners of cars such as the Standard Valiant model and the Holden 149 manual special. The Commonwealth Government recently increased the sales tax on the Valiant by 2½ per cent, resulting in an increase in price of £20. If this Bill were passed this Government would inflict another £12 by way of transfer tax, making a total of £32.

Mr. Hutchens: It puts off the purchase of a car for at least 12 months for the worker.

Mr. LAWN: Sales tax increases imposed by the Commonwealth Government in the past have thrown thousands out of work. The recent 2½ per cent increase in sales tax on the Holden 149 manual special model amounted to £19 10s. 5d. and the intended 1 per cent transfer tax would mean an additional £11 6s. In other words, the purchaser of such a car would pay a total increased tax of £30 16s. 5d. if this legislation were passed. Liberal Party Government is responsible for both those taxes. Another point to be considered in this regard is that sales tax is paid on replacement parts but it is not paid the second time when the vehicle is sold as a used car. The Holden to which I refer is selling at present at £1,130 3s. 8d., of which £195 3s. 8d. is sales tax. By adding the additional £11 6s. the purchaser will be paying £206 9s. 8d. more than he would otherwise pay if no sales tax or transfer tax were imposed. The Bill means that every time the car is sold this 1 per cent transfer tax has to be paid, which makes it an even more vicious piece of legislation in one respect than the Commonwealth Government's sales tax.

Mr. Jennings: It gets back to a recurring tax.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I am coming to that. The proposed tax is a compounding tax and while the purchaser of a new car such as a Holden will have paid £11 6s., should he sell it later for £900, the new purchaser will have to pay a further £9, and so it goes on and on! Every time the car is sold somebody will have to pay a further tax to the Government. Although the Premier would have us believe the contrary, he has yet to satisfy the House that a 1 per cent transfer tax applies in the other States. Clause 9 (b) of the Bill specifically

provides, "For every £100 or fractional part of £100 of the value of the motor vehicle to which the application relates £1". For these and other reasons that will be placed before the electors next year, I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I was somewhat amazed and amused at the reversal of form by the member for Norwood when he spoke of his Party's policy in relation to succession duties, namely, how they would be levied on agricultural land by a Labor Government. A short while ago he said that Labor policy was for assistance for the primary producers in regard to the maintenance area which has been outlined in previous debates in this House this year, and that this assistance was necessary because of the increased and inflated values of farm lands in this State, which imposed a great hardship when succession duties were levied. He went on to develop this theme, and he pointed out how the Labor Party would assist the primary producer. I then challenged him regarding his attitude to the Bill which went through this House in 1959 and which actually helped the landholder in this State, especially the small landholder, regarding succession duties. I have not yet had time to look at the Bill, but I have read the honourable member's remarks, which appear in *Hansard* of 1959 at page 1743. Those remarks are pertinent to the remarks the honourable member has just made. In 1959 he said:

I do not intend to be very long, but the member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Heaslip) made it clear that the reason for the measure was that primary producers were in a special class of their own and, because of inflated land values, they were hit more heavily by succession duties than other sections. I do not agree with that for one moment.

It is a pity that the honourable member is not in the House to hear those words now.

Mr. Millhouse: Actually he is here.

Mr. HALL: I hope he will revise the text of the speech he has just made, because it does not line up with the text of his earlier speech. The honourable member went on to say:

True, land values have become inflated since pre-war days, but so have the values of practically every other class of property or business in South Australia.

I believe this is a principle which the honourable member has adhered to until recently, when he has seen, or thought he has seen, some political advantage in adopting a public attitude at least which is supposed to win votes in some primary producing areas. I would think that anything that is said now in a speech on this



present financial measure is not nearly as important as the attitude of a member when he is considering a legislative proposal in this House, and if the Bill relating to succession duties could have been defeated in 1959 by the member for Norwood he would have so defeated it, and the primary producer today would be paying a good deal more in succession duties than he is now paying.

I commend the legislation that was enacted in 1959, for it has greatly assisted in the case of small properties which have been bequeathed to working landholders. I reject a policy which has been put up purely as an opportune one to gain votes at the right time. I remind honourable members again of the member for Norwood's remarks in 1959. The proposition which he put to the House a few moments ago is the very one which he would not agree to in 1959.

Mr HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I oppose the Bill. It has been attacked by a number of Opposition members, and I am amazed at the lack of defence of it by members opposite. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) rose not to defend the Government but to attack the member for Norwood.

Mr. Hall: Not the honourable member, but his statements.

Mr. HUTCHENS: There is little difference, and the honourable member is splitting hairs. He rose to attack not the statement but the honourable member, because he went on to say that the honourable member's move was a political one. Let me tell the member for Gouger that the member for Norwood and I fought for this amendment to Labor's policy. In fact, the member for Norwood fought strongly against some pretty vocal opposition and was able to convince the majority at our conference that the amendment was a desirable one because of the inadequacy of the present legislation.

Mr. Hall: Is that any reason for opposing this Bill?

Mr. HUTCHENS: The reason for opposing this Bill was fully explained by the member for Norwood this afternoon.

Mr. Hall: Not at all.

Mr. HUTCHENS: It is impossible to explain things to some people because they do not have the ability to understand, and the member for Norwood cannot be blamed for that. The honourable member showed then, as he did on the occasion the legislation was before the House previously, that that legislation was to the advantage of the already privileged, whereas Labor policy was solely

designed to keep on the land the farmers who were being driven off it because of heavy succession duties and probate. The legislation the member for Gouger claimed the Opposition opposed on that occasion gave great advantages to people that needed them least of all. That is what the member for Norwood said this afternoon. We on this side of the House say that the Government has to raise revenue when revenue is necessary to keep our services functioning. We do not deny a Government that right. We believe it is the right of Parliament to see that sufficient revenue is made available to keep our essential services operating. Opposition members believe that in imposing taxes to provide necessary services the money should be taken from those who can afford to pay.

As honourable members have clearly pointed out, this present taxation is unfair and unjust upon the people that can least afford to pay it. The tax on the registration of motor vehicles was referred to by members on this side of the House, but we heard not a word about it from the honourable member who rose to support the Government. Of course, there is no argument against what members on this side have said about the unfairness of this tax. Apart from that, it is an unwise tax, as the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) pointed out. The honourable member said that this was a most damaging tax to an important industry and one that will certainly tend to create unemployment. He referred to the sales tax that had been imposed by the present Commonwealth Government in the last 13 years, during which time eight variations had occurred, four of them being increases and four being reductions. Following every increase in this tax on motor vehicles there has been a slump or a decline in the industry. Of course, a tax on motor cars must cause a decline and create temporary unemployment in the industry. This is a dangerous tax for any Government to impose, because not only is the motor industry of great importance to those who are employed and engaged in it but it is important to the economy of this country and particularly to South Australia. If one takes into account its associated industries, one realizes that it is undoubtedly the greatest employer of labour in this State.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. HUTCHENS: The increase in sales tax is unwise, because the motor car industry is important to the defence of Australia. This was proved in the Second World War when

it was this industry that was converted to manufacture articles needed to prosecute the war. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who has a great knowledge of that industry, agrees with me because he was at one time Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Union; he knows exactly what happened and how many members of that union engaged in building motor bodies were transferred to the production of war equipment.

This unemployment, though it may be only temporary, will have a definite bearing on our revenue because, while those men are unemployed, their purchasing power is being reduced and, therefore, the revenue from sales tax on the goods that would have been purchased but are not purchased is reduced. It is a short-sighted policy. Honourable members who have spoken from this side of the House rightly claim that the motor car industry is essential. Changes in communications and transportation have made it necessary for people to travel at high speeds from place to place—for instance, from their homes to their places of employment—and the cost of public transport is so comparatively high that it is advantageous for a man to own a motor car. The Housing Trust is building houses in areas developing industrially, which means that some people have had to move far from the metropolitan area. Accordingly, many people are moving to areas like Elizabeth, Modbury and Tea Tree Gully, where there is not much employment. To shorten their travelling time to and from work, they need adequate transport. Public transport is not capable of moving them at a reasonable cost, so they must have motor cars. Who are these people? They are those who, in the main, are buying their cars under hire-purchase contracts.

Mr. McKee: And they are responsible for building them.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. They have to pay this additional tax not only on a new car but also on a car that changes hands. Each time that happens, this additional tax is imposed on those people who can least afford to pay it. That is our complaint. We acknowledge that any Government needs the right to raise revenue to provide the social services, but the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has pointed out clearly that the excuse for imposing this tax is to recoup expenditure on some services like law and order. Law and order is costing less in this State and accordingly is less effective by comparison with other States. People who can least afford it are being asked to pay for something that

is non-existent in some parts of the State. This is, in the opinion of members on this side of the House, contrary to the general principle of taxation.

Mr. Lawn: And of good Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS: That goes without saying. We are told that by Act of Parliament taxes on money-lenders' contracts will be allowed to be passed on! If it were not so serious, it would be a joke! The money-lenders have a very strange way of financing transactions, and this has been demonstrated. For the benefit of some members it should again be pointed out that money-lenders deal through retailers. When the retailers sell the goods on money advanced from a money-lender those extra charges are added to the retail price, which must be paid by the purchaser. The man, however, with the wherewithal who has some standing and can buy on an overdraft is not subject to this taxation at all! We have said that hire-purchase is the small man's overdraft; it is a pretty costly type of overdraft and we believe that many reap an excess profit from the rates charged over what they should get. This increased cost must be borne by the consumer, the person least able to afford it.

My concluding remarks concern stamp duties, that is, the additional duties on mortgage documents. I consider this the most offensive of all the taxes as it affects the people who have to pay additional charges because they are going to purchase a house. They enter into a mortgage contract to buy that house, and it is usually the small man, the man with a limited amount of money, who is forced to do so because of his financial position. If that were not so he would pay cash for the house. That is the most annoying point to members on this side of the House because it affects most the people who have sufficient confidence in our country to proceed with a venture of this kind. They are the type of people who are prepared to rear a family for Australia; the best type of people we can get in this country. But they will be almost prohibited from buying their home and having a family. Not so for Johnny Wealthy, who has been able to exploit the people of South Australia by passing on the charges of the money-lender referred to. Such a person accumulates great wealth and can buy a farm and pay cash for it, with no increased charges on the transfer. That is the person who is most able to pay for it. Why? The answer is plain: it is for political purposes. Such people are those who finance the campaign

funds for members opposite and the Government will not touch them! It is an unjust, unfair and unwise method of taxation, and members on this side of the House strongly oppose the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—“Interpretation.”

The Committee divided on the clause:

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

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Hughes.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 17 Noes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Speaker was in the Chamber when the division was taken. Did he vote on the clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The Speaker was in the Chamber and he was recorded as voting in favour of the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—“Amendment of Stamp Duties Act, Second Schedule.”

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

In paragraph (a) after “£5” to insert: and by striking out the words “fire or marine” in the twenty-second line of the said second column of the said paragraph, and by inserting after the word “State”

in the twenty-third line of the said second column the words “except life and personal accident insurance risks out of the State”.

I have listened to all representations that have been made by various interests about this matter. As honourable members know, the Bill we are now considering is really an amendment of the first Bill introduced on this subject because various organizations have suggested improvements, and I assure members that I have seriously considered every suggestion. I find in the commercial world an extremely understanding approach to this problem. People realize that if we are going to have government we must have money, and it is undesirable at present to put in charges which can be passed on to things that affect the lower wage earner. This amendment deals with Broken Hill and the Northern Territory. In New South Wales the tax is as high as in South Australia but is levied in a different way. If the Bill as first introduced were passed, taxation might have been paid in South Australia and in New South Wales, too. In other words, there would have been a double taxation. In New South Wales a slightly different method is used from that used in South Australia. No-one contemplated charging double taxation on New South Wales or Northern Territory insurance, and these provisions are particularly designed to meet the position in those States. For Victoria, it would not have made any difference as that State uses the same method as we do and there would not have been double taxation. In the Northern Territory the amendment means there will not be a tendency to take business away from South Australia. This amendment does not provide an additional impost but rather a relief in certain instances.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In paragraph (k) after 5s. to insert: and by inserting therein after the paragraph under the heading “Exemption” the following new paragraph: “Every mortgage to secure an amount not exceeding £3,500.”

At present the Act provides:

Exemption—

Every collateral or auxiliary or additional or substituted security, or security by way of further assurance for the abovementioned purpose, where the principal or primary security is duly stamped.

The Bill seeks to increase the duty by 2s. 6d. in every £100 to 5s., which is beyond all reason, particularly where the purchase of a new house is concerned. The Government should further consider this matter because the Bill if passed

will impose a hardship. Existing legislation provides that people can purchase houses with a £50 deposit, requiring a mortgage of up to £4,000. Most of these people would be young couples having been married only a short while and looking forward to raising a family. Surely giving such couples an equity in their home will make for a more contented community. What effect will this increased stamp duty have on such couples? Should they be submitted to further hardship? My amendment is designed to relieve the savage burden of taxation on the young people of this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot accept the amendment, which has all sorts of implications. Let us consider the case of a wealthy person who has a property worth £100,000 and who wants to raise mortgages to the extent of, say, £7,000. All that person has to do is have two mortgages and he is completely excluded from the taxation. The second peculiar application of the Leader's proposal is that everybody is completely exempt on mortgages up to £3,500, but the moment the amount is above that the borrower pays the lot.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Treasurer is not correct in the position he has put to the Committee. In fact, if he looks at the schedule he will see that the description of "mortgage" there does not tally with the description he has given. The purpose of the amendment is to provide for an exemption to the extent of £3,500. True, a second mortgage, which is not the principal security as defined in the Act, could attract thereafter an amount of 5s. in the pound. However, the small people who require a second mortgage would still not pay as much as they would pay under the Treasurer's proposal right now. Therefore, the proposal to provide an additional exemption to the extent of £3,500 as drafted by the Parliamentary Draftsman is, I submit, satisfactory and in order. In effect, it provides that the people who will be paying the additional stamp duty are the people who have very large sums secured on mortgage, but that the small people are not the people who are going to be hit by the additional impost.

We have already dealt with the fact that basically this impost upon mortgages is an unfair impost. Instead of having provided, as has been provided in the other States, that the additional stamp duty will take effect on conveyances so that everybody who is involved in a property transaction, be it a very large one or not, would be paying their due amount in stamp duties, the Treasurer is providing

that those people who are making large transactions in relation to land, because of the way in which they raise the finance they need to raise, will not be paying the additional stamp duty because, as the Treasurer well knows, they do not register mortgages. If the Treasurer had put the impost on conveyances there may have been something in it, but by putting this additional impost on he is in fact hitting the small people all the time, and the only way to see to it that the people who most need finance are not the major group who are going to pay this additional impost is to provide an exemption. The exemption was submitted to the Parliamentary Draftsman, who agreed that this was proper, and he has drafted it in accordance with the submission that was made to him.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbc, Ferguson, Frocbairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No—Mr. Nankivell.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 21) and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

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

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): It is not the custom in this Parliament to debate the third reading of a Bill except where members are unalterably opposed to the contents of a Bill, and that is the position on this occasion. Opposition members are opposed to the provisions of this Bill because it imposes sectional taxes on the people of South Australia. We heard a little while ago the suggestion made by the Treasurer that this legislation was designed to see that it did not hit the smaller people in the community in that business would not be able to pass on the taxes. In three of these cases each of the proposals is designed to hit the wage and salary earner and not the wealthier interests in the community that pay

the money that keeps the Liberal Party going. In fact, as far as the younger people in this community are concerned, the taxes are designed to take away some of the benefits promised to them by the Commonwealth and State Governments recently. The Government gives with one hand apparently and takes away with the other.

As well as this, I am at a loss to understand how the Treasurer can suggest that this taxation is not going to hit the poorer people in the community. Does he seriously suggest that the clause that says that money-lenders are not to pass on the additional impost is going to work effectively and that they will require the retailers, through whom they make personal loan contracts, not to pass on the impost in the price of retail goods? The price does not appear on the contract but is there at any rate. How is the Treasurer going to control that? Why is it that he has put on the extra charge as far as property is concerned on mortgages and not on conveyances? The large group of people who register mortgages are the smaller people in the community (the salary and wage earners) who need mortgage finance, while the larger interests in the community, who would have to pay on conveyances (if the Treasurer had left it at conveyances, as is done in other States), do not register mortgages for the most part, as the Treasurer well knows. They deposit their titles if they need overdraft finance, but they do not register the mortgages at the Lands Titles Office. Many of them are paying spot cash and the people who have the money to do that do not pay anything extra. They are the wealthier people, and the people who pay extra are the small people.

Mr. Riches: The young people of the State.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Loveday: The harder up you are the more you will pay.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is correct. How can the Treasurer say that the small people in the community will not be hit by this taxation? This legislation has been carefully designed to see that the people of South Australia who are to provide the money required to finance these Estimates will be the working people in the community (the salary and wage earners), while the wealthy people in the community, who live off investments, and those with large landed interests, these people who are already making only a small contribution to the taxation of this State, will avoid these charges. This happens in no other State in the Commonwealth, and I believe that that is a wrong

basis of taxation. It is utterly unjust that it should be imposed on the community at this time. I am unalterably opposed to the measure and I know that every member on this side of the House also opposes it.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is not able to reply on the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Nankivell. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

#### METROPOLITAN AREA (WOODVILLE, HENLEY AND GRANGE) DRAINAGE BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that report be printed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1954-1960.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

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

Its object, broadly stated, is to raise police pensions by about 17½ per cent with slightly less proportionate increases in contributions and certain additional increases in relation to the pensions and contributions applicable to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner and

Superintendents. It is based upon a full report by the Public Actuary and, I may add, its terms have received the approval of the Secretary of the Police Association. Clause 3 provides that the proposed increase shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed in order to enable the necessary arrangements for the changes to be made. This will be done as soon as practicable. Clause 4 amends section 11 of the principal Act, which makes provision for the contribution payable from Government revenue towards the cost of pensions payable from the fund each year. The only change is that the Government will in future pay for 70 per cent of the cost of pensions paid each year in respect of all such pensions which commenced before the commencement of this Act. The present provision is for a contribution of two-thirds and it is estimated that the additional cost for a full year will be £27,000.

Clause 5 provides that constables who become members of the force before the age of 21 will, in future, commence to contribute to the fund on attainment of 21, whereas at present they contribute as soon as they become members of the force. They will in future pay a special contribution appropriate to entry at age of 21, whereas at present they must pay the higher contribution appropriate to the age next birthday, 22. Clause 6 amends section 14 of the principal Act by providing the increased scale of contributions necessary to finance the increases in benefit now proposed. Subclause (1) sets out the contributions which will become payable in future by present members of the force. As I have said, special provision is made for present members who entered prior to the age of 21. The overall increase for present members is about 15 per cent which is smaller than the percentage of increase in benefits. Subclause (2) sets out the contributions that will be payable by members who join the force after the commencement of the Bill, and also provides the percentage of increase in contributions to be paid by sergeants and commissioned officers corresponding to the increased benefits provided for them. Whereas present members who commenced to contribute at ages over 27 pay the same contribution, the scale for new members provides a graduated scale applicable to each age at entry over 27 and under 34.

Dissatisfaction has been expressed by the Police Association about the admission of men over 27 on the same terms as men of 27. The present scale was enacted because of difficulties in recruiting men during the post-war period.

In recent years few older men have joined the force, and a return to the former system of graduated contributions over a greater range of entry ages is now considered desirable. The percentage increase in the contributions payable by sergeants has been increased from 10 per cent to 15 per cent, for the Deputy Commissioner from seventeen-twentieths to eight-sevenths and for the Commissioner from nineteenth to ten-sevenths. These increases correspond to the increased benefits now proposed for these officers in clause 14 of the Bill. Subclause (3) makes the necessary changes in the maximum contributions payable by present members who were in the force on January 1, 1930.

Clause 7 amends section 15 by providing fortnightly contributions in place of the present bi-monthly contributions. This is desirable for administrative reasons. Clause 8 has been inserted at the request of the Police Association. It provides that members between the ages of 55 and 60 may elect to retire from the force before attaining the age of 60, provided that the Commissioner of Police gives his consent. The Commissioner's consent is considered necessary particularly at times when recruiting is difficult. Reduced benefits for those members who elect under the provisions of this clause are provided in clause 9.

Clause 9 makes many important changes in section 20 of the principal Act which enacts the benefits for members on retirement at the age of 60. Paragraph (a) provides that the cash sum payable will be £1,650 in place of the present provision of £1,500, an increase of 10 per cent, while paragraph (b) alters the present life pension of £480 per annum to £570 per annum, an increase of 19 per cent. It is believed that the wishes of the majority of members will be met by providing a greater percentage increase in the pension than in the cash sum provided. Paragraph (c) inserts two new subsections in section 20. New subsection (2) provides for the reduced benefit payable to those members who elect to retire from the force before attaining the age of 60. The subsection provides a proportionate payment of the cash sum available at the age of 60 depending on the length of service of the member, and provides further that the reduced pension payable will be prescribed by regulation. The regulation will set out in tabular form the pension provided as a percentage of the amount of £570 payable for retirement at the age of 60. The percentage will depend on the member's age at entry into the force and his age attained at the date of electing to retire. The table will

be calculated by the Public Actuary in such a manner that the combined benefit payable will be the actuarial equivalent of the benefit payable at the age of 60. It is considered desirable to state this benefit by regulation in order to facilitate changes arising from changes in the rates of interest earned on the assets of the fund and changes in mortality.

New subsection (3) of section 20 is designed to meet the desire expressed by both the Police Association and the Commissioned Officers' Association to have available some alternative options in exchange for the cash sum of £1,650 and the life pension of £570. The cash sum may be exchanged for either a life pension or a pension payable only between the ages of 60 and 65, while not more than one-quarter of the life pension of £570 may be exchanged for a pension payable only between the ages of 60 and 65. Because the police pension scheme is basically one to provide members who retire with a pension payable during their lifetime, it is considered that at least three-quarters of the life pension of £570 should be retained. The clause provides that the rate of exchange applicable to the options provided shall be prescribed by regulation. This is desirable for similar reasons to those explained by me previously.

Clause 10 enacts the necessary increases in the benefits payable to members who retire through invalidity occurring as a result of an injury received on duty. The increases provided correspond to those provided in respect of retirement at the age of 60. The present pension of £480 per annum will be replaced by one of £570, which is the same pension as that provided for retirement at the age of 60. The cash sum payable under the principal Act commences at £500 for retirement at ages less than 41, and increases by £50 for each complete year of age at the date of retirement in excess of 40, up to a maximum of £1,500. These provisions are now replaced by a cash sum of £600 increasing by £60 a year up to a maximum of £1,650.

Clause 11 amends the provisions of section 22 of the Act, which prescribes the benefit payable from the fund to a member who retires on the grounds of invalidity not due to an injury received on duty. At present section 22 provides a pension, when the member has served for 10 years but less than 15 years, of £240 per annum. Paragraph (a) increases this amount to £300 per annum. For members who retire after serving over 15 years in the force the present pension is £240 per annum, increasing by £13 a year for each complete year

of age at retirement in excess of 40 years, subject to a maximum of £480.

Paragraph (c) alters the present provision to £300 increasing by £15 a year, the maximum pension being £570 per annum, which is the same amount as that payable in respect of retirement at the age of 60. The cash sum payable to members who retire on the grounds of invalidity is at present £500 plus £50 for each complete year of age at retirement in excess of 40. Paragraphs (b) and (d) alter these amounts to £600 plus £60 per annum for each complete year of age in excess of 40, and paragraph (e) alters the maximum amount payable from £1,500 to £1,650, which is the same amount as the cash sum payable in the event of retirement at the age of 60.

Clause 12 provides that a member over the age of 55 who resigns from the force shall be deemed to have elected to receive the reduced pension and benefit. If the Commissioner does not consent to the member's retirement on pension, the member will receive a refund of the contributions he has paid to the fund. Section 38 of the Superannuation Act contains a similar provision. The purpose of this new provision is to give a member who inadvertently resigns without realizing that he has a right to elect to retire on reduced pension an opportunity to make the election provided the Commissioner consents.

Clause 13 amends the provisions of section 29 of the Act. It enacts the pension and cash sums payable to widows of members who die after the commencement of the operation of the provisions of the Bill and the pension payable to widows of deceased pensioners who die after the commencement. At present the pension payable is one-half of the pension of £480 payable on retirement at the age of 60. In the South Australian Superannuation Fund, the proportion of widows' pension to members' pension was recently increased from one-half to 60 per cent. Clause 13 makes a similar change in respect of the Police Pensions Fund. The widows' pension now proposed is 60 per cent of the amount of £570 payable in respect of retirement at the age of 65, a pension of £342 per annum compared with the present £240, an increase of 42½ per cent.

The present cash allowance payable in the event of death of a married member of the force is £500 plus £50 for each complete year of the member's age at the date of his death in excess of 40, subject to a maximum of £1,500. These amounts are increased to £600 plus £60 per annum subject to a maximum of

£1,650. Clause 13 (e) provides that the pension payable on the death of a pensioner who retires on a reduced pension prior to attainment of the age of 60 shall be 60 per cent of the amount of the husband's pension.

Clause 14 inserts a new section 30ca in the principal Act setting out the proportionate increase payable to sergeants and commissioned officers who retire from the force or who die as members after the commencement of the operation of the provisions of the Bill. These proportionate increases are based on the relation between the number of units that a member receiving the salary of senior constable could purchase from the South Australian Superannuation Fund and the number of units a member of the rank of sergeant and each commissioned officer could similarly purchase according to his salary.

A comparison of current salary and allowances has indicated three necessary changes, which are provided by this new section. First, the previous increase of 10 per cent appropriate to the rank of sergeant has now been altered to 15 per cent. The Deputy Commissioner's increase is eight-sevenths compared with the previous seventeen-twentieths, and that for the Commissioner is changed from nine-tenths to ten-sevenths. A special explanation of the last two increases is necessary. When the Police Pensions Act was last amended in 1960 the amount of pension which a public servant could purchase from the Superannuation Fund was limited to £1,638 for officers receiving over £3,275 per annum. The Superannuation Act was amended in 1961 to provide increased pensions for such officers which are limited only by 50 per cent of salary. It is considered that the Deputy Commissioner and the Commissioner are entitled to corresponding increases. The remaining provisions of this clause are machinery measures made necessary by these amendments.

Clause 15 makes two necessary amendments to section 30d, which enables a member who is reduced in rank to elect to continue to pay contributions applicable to the rank for which he was contributing before his reduction in rank. As worded the section could mean that such a contributor would become eligible for any increase in pensions while contributing at the old rates. Since both rates of pension and rates of contributions are being increased, it is clearly equitable that a member making an election should be in the same position regarding rates of contribution (which may be altered from time to time) as other members of the

force who are required to pay at the rates in force from time to time.

Clause 16 provides for increases in all pensions which are payable at the date of commencement of the Bill. On previous occasions when the Act has been amended pensions payable at the time of amendment have been increased according to changes in living costs which had arisen between the date of the last amendment and the date of the proposed amendment. A similar provision is now proposed. Since 1960, when the Police Pensions Act was last amended, the consumer price index for Adelaide has risen by only about 4½ per cent. After due consideration of the position of the fund, the Public Actuary recommended an increase of 7½ per cent in current pensions, which is greater than the increase justified by changes in living costs. Clause 16 makes provision for this increase in new section 32c (1). A special explanation is necessary in connection with the increase of 29 per cent provided by subsection (2). The previous widows' pension was at the rate of 50 per cent of the pension provided in respect of retirement at the age of 60. This provision is now increased to 60 per cent. Thus a pension of £240 per annum, being one-half of the husband's pension of £480, would become £288 being 60 per cent of the sum of £480. When the overall increase of 7½ per cent is added, the pension becomes £309 12s. the total increase over the previous £240 being 29 per cent. This general increase therefore is now proposed.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, 1936-1962, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

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

Its object is to enable arrangements to be made with the Commonwealth for the transfer to the Commonwealth of meat inspectors



employed by the Abattoirs Board and by the State Agriculture Department, such officers to continue to perform on behalf of the board and of the State respectively meat inspection functions under the State Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act.

The necessity for the legislation arises from the fact that in connection with the export of meat from Australia, particularly to the United States of America, it is desirable that all inspections of meat for export should be made by officers of and directly under the control of the Commonwealth Government, which, of course, represents the whole of Australia in international affairs. Accordingly, the Commonwealth Government is proposing to enact legislation that will enable it to take over the present State and Abattoirs Board inspectors, who would thus become members of the Commonwealth Public Service and as such perform their functions in accordance with Commonwealth law. In particular, they would act as inspectors of meat for export purposes. However, as is obvious, not all South Australian meat is exported out of the country and it will still be necessary for meat inspections required for domestic purposes under the State Act to be carried out. The Commonwealth legislation and this Bill will enable arrangements to be made between the board and the Commonwealth for the taking over of the board's inspectors and the performance by those inspectors of inspections on behalf of the board, the board paying to the Commonwealth an agreed contribution towards their remuneration in accordance with the amount of work done on the board's behalf. Clause 4 so provides. Clause 3 makes a necessary amendment to the interpretation section of the principal Act by extending the definition of "inspectors" to include Commonwealth inspectors.

Clause 5 makes similar provisions in relation to meat inspectors in the employ of the Agriculture Department, the only difference being that the necessary arrangements in this connection will be between State and Commonwealth Governments since these officers are not employees of the Abattoirs Board. The Bill merely authorizes the necessary arrangements to be made, and discussions are now proceeding as to the terms and conditions of those arrangements. As I have said, the Commonwealth intends to enact complementary legislation on the subject.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 907.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In Australia, with our long distances between markets, an efficient transport system is the life-blood of our economy in bringing raw materials to the manufacturers and the finished products to the markets, but there needs to be a complete co-ordination of the whole transport industry. This State has established a railway system in which more than £85,000,000 is invested, and side by side with the railway system a flexible road transport industry has developed in keeping with our expanding economy. There are many owner-drivers in the road transport enterprise who are committed for expensive equipment and naturally they seek an assured income so that they can be fairly certain that the cost of their equipment will be met from their particular transport industry. As both systems involve a large outlay in the first place, it is necessary that we should have a complete co-operation and co-ordination of these systems so that idle capital, both private and public, is kept to a minimum. The machinery is provided in the Road and Railway Transport Act for this co-ordination to be effective *per medium* of the Transport Control Board which, among other things, has power to declare certain roads to be controlled routes, over which no vehicle may operate for hire in the carriage of passengers and goods unless they have a licence or permit from the board. It also has power to close or re-open any railway if it considers such action to be in the interests of the State. There is a proviso in regard to this matter, however, that it may not order the closing of a railway line if it is contrary to a report from the Public Works Standing Committee. It must also see that there is suitable alternative transport available if it does so order the closing of the line. A further power of the board is to allocate traffic between road transport and railways.

Receipts by the Transport Control Board last year for licences and special permits totalled £70,000, of which more than £19,000 was obtained from permits about which this Bill is concerned. The Bill before us rather has the appearance of stop-gap legislation for there is only one operative amendment, which is contained in clause 3. It states:

Notwithstanding any provision of this Act the Board shall, upon application therefor promptly issue to an applicant a permit

authorizing the applicant to operate vehicles for the carriage of goods for hire on any route or road in any part of the State except where the Board is satisfied that the issue of any such permit would operate to the detriment of the holder of a licence to operate vehicles for the carriage of goods for hire for the time being in force or to the detriment of the operator of a co-ordinated service for the carriage of goods for hire.

This makes it quite clear that the Government wishes to issue a directive to the board on this particular matter, but I believe that this legislation should be under the effective administration of a Minister. As far back as 1931, a proclamation was issued which placed the administration of the principal Act under the Minister of Railways, but apparently there was some omission, for the Minister, as far as I can ascertain, has not been given any duties or powers under the principal Act to administer. Consequently, I believe that the Transport Control Board has been given autonomous power as regards the control of transport, which is completely wrong because amendments become necessary as weaknesses develop, and operators in the industry cannot be assured of stability. The correct procedure, instead of adopting this patchwork approach, is to have a co-ordination of transport services under a Minister of Transport, responsible to this Parliament, and one of his duties would be to encourage road transport as an auxiliary of public transport. Therefore, I oppose the provisions of this Bill.

I believe that any licensed operator will continue to be a licensed operator within the meaning of this Act. I assume that when that licence expires the Government will implement its other road tax provisions of one-third of a penny a ton-mile. That may sound all right, but many vehicles could operate to the detriment of the industry. Instead of one licensed operator there could be other operators using the same road that should be used only by the licensed operator. The matters about which I have been speaking were mentioned in another debate when we were dealing with the problem of Eyre Peninsula. It was intended to support the railways, but this Bill will result in the railway losing protection that is vital to it. An investment of £60,000,000 represents an important equity in this State. If South Australia is to have a proper transportation system, a definite policy should be adopted to co-ordinate road and rail transport. I have to be convinced that we cannot use the pick-a-back system on our railways. Perhaps the Railways Commissioner may be preventing the introduction of this system; I do not know.

I do not know whether a directive is issued to the Railways Commissioner on this matter; if it is not, then it seems that he is satisfied with the static proposals so far as tonnages are concerned. In the interests of a co-ordinated transport system for this State we must review this matter and retain the Act which the Government seeks to abolish. I therefore oppose the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I have some difficulty in assessing the Opposition's stand on this matter. If it could benefit its friends and let its enemies suffer it would probably be all right. That is what would appear to be the Labor Party's policy on this vexed question of trying to obtain some reasonable return for the maintenance of our roads from people who contribute nothing at all and who are avoiding tax completely—the heavy hauliers. Perhaps the Opposition has a soft spot in its heart for these people, and that is why it opposes making them meet at least some of the cost of the wear and tear on the roads, for which they are responsible.

Mr. Riches: There is no impost on them.

Mr. SHANNON: I am sadly misled, if this Bill will not reach the people who use the roads so much. I am of the opinion it will.

Mr. Riches: It will not.

Mr. SHANNON: It is all wrapped up in the one measure.

Mr. Riches: No it isn't.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Stuart endeavours to draw a red herring across the track; he knows that what I am saying is true about his own Party. He has tossed up a two-headed penny and wants it both ways, but obviously the Opposition cannot have that. What the Premier promised this House when this matter was first mooted was that if it was agreed that we tax certain people to help the State maintain the roads for their benefit, the strict controls which then prevailed over the use of the roads generally by way of licences for ordinary carriers within the State would be somewhat relieved. Almost on the eve of the Premier's making that promise—and certainly before the legislation was introduced—certain licences were renewed for a further period of five years by the Transport Control Board, which was an obvious avoidance of the policy enunciated by the Premier at the time of initiating this system of collecting for the maintenance of roads. It was an attempt to defeat what Parliament intended to do. Although the Government had actually not introduced the scheme, it was well known that it intended to, and that it would be well received

when it was brought forward, because I think everybody at that time favoured trying to make hauliers who transported goods to other States contribute something towards the maintenance of the highways they were using. That in itself did a great disservice to the State. It gave certain people a franchise (perhaps "monopoly" would be a better term) to operate in certain areas without any competition. Admittedly, we had some control over their charges and we took 5 per cent of their gross takings. Those factors are not denied. Under the proposal the Premier brought forward there was to be no such thing as a 5 per cent tax on their gross takings, and we were going to be happy to take the ton-mile tax and let it go at that; that was all they would have been charged. I believe that in some cases had those people carefully examined their accounts they would have found that the ton-mile tax was not hitting them at all heavily and that in fact it could have been a very good *quid pro quo* for the 5 per cent impost on their gross takings.

I have talked to some of these people. I admit that any form of tax is unpopular, and I know that it is a simple thing to beat up opposition on matters where taxes are involved. It is not difficult to say to a person, "Look, old chap, you are going to be penalized; you are picked out to pay when others are not going to pay." I know that the 8-ton limit which we have imposed in this State does not conform to the provision in some of the Eastern States. I was surprised at one member of the Opposition suggesting that we should reduce that 8-ton limit to a 4-ton limit. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) made that suggestion; I do not know whether he had very much support from his Party, but I hope he did not, because obviously that would have resulted in an impost on some people whom we should consider.

Mr. Riches: You are right away from the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON: I am discussing this question in general terms, and it happens to suit me to do that.

The SPEAKER: Although this and another Bill are inter-related, I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill now under discussion.

Mr. SHANNON: We are dealing with general principles, Mr. Speaker. I always look upon a second reading debate as an opportunity to speak on general principles as they are related to the principles in the particular matter being discussed. It is when we get into

Committee that we stick rigidly to the Bill under discussion, and I know my friends opposite would like me to do that all the time; they like to cramp my style and not permit me to take a broad brush and draw the picture more clearly so that everybody will understand the drift of my argument. The question is whether there should have been uniformity regarding the upper limit of the vehicle in respect of which the ton-mile tax is to be imposed.

Mr. RICHES: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member's comments have nothing whatever to do with the Bill, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member's point of order is well taken. Although this Bill and another Bill are inter-related, I ask the member for Onkaparinga to bring his remarks back to this Bill, which concerns an amendment relating to the Transport Control Board and its issuing of permits on controlled routes. The point of order is upheld.

Mr. SHANNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I am the first to recognize the correctness of your ruling. You did give me the opportunity (and I am grateful for it) of using the broad brush for a while. If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I would carry out the policy the Premier enunciated when he first dealt with this matter regarding the Transport Control Board and leave it with nothing to handle but passenger traffic. That was the original intention, and that was what we all thought was desirable. However, by virtue of the action taken by the board itself on the eve of the passage of this legislation, of necessity we now have to deal with the facts as they are. These people have their franchise and their monopoly. Obviously, they are justly entitled to some compensation (that I admit; I cannot see how we can avoid that), but I am not certain whether in the final analysis it would not be sound business from the State's point of view to compensate these people for the loss of their licences and do what the Premier intended to do in the first place—open up the roads a little and provide more competition. I am sure we should have had a much better service at least for our people on the land, and secondary industry too would have benefited.

It may not be a bad plan to look at what would be involved in compensation for the existing licensees and carry out the policy that we first announced we were proposing to carry out and that we could have carried out had it not been for the prompt action taken by the Transport Control Board in renewing licences.

There is all sorts of talk about railway deficits, and the argument is used that we have to protect railway revenue at whatever cost. One thing that the man on the land understands is that he is an expert at producing his goods. He realizes he is not quite so expert at disposing of them. Hence, we have for the wheatgrowers of Australia the Wheat Board. The grower is happy with that arrangement. He has not only to grow the wheat but to get it to market; he has to produce and deliver the goods. Transport costs are a major factor in production. Whether or not we like it, the times have now proved beyond all shadow of doubt that road competition with railways is here forever. That can never be denied; it will continue. Are we to cry about that? Isn't there such a thing as the overall picture of the prosperity of the State involved in this problem? I know that we are paying about £4,000,000 from the Treasury to balance the railway accounts. That is not embarrassing and will not embarrass us, for the good and valid reason that these people using the railways are producing the wherewithal to provide our means of livelihood in this country. It is the primary industries largely that set up the credits for us to buy whatever we require to bring into this country. The more prosperous our primary industries become, the better it is for every person in this country.

Road transport has quietly taken over in most parts of the world, although not for everything. The question is asked, "Why don't they cart their superphosphate and wheat? Why don't they do many of these heavy chores that the railways do for them?" The railways will always have an opportunity to handle the commodities required in large volume, with which the roads cannot deal at the rate at which we require them to be delivered. I do not know that there is anything to worry about in that regard. If, for instance, railway freight rates on wheat, wool and superphosphate do not give the railways a sufficient profit margin, it is virtually out of one pocket into another, from the State's point of view, because finally

the grower who is prosperous and pays his rates and taxes has to remit to the Treasury, through taxes, his share of the profits. So the overall picture is not as black as some people would try to paint it because of the railway figures taken on their own. It is likely for any business to have one line, perhaps a service line, that it is important for it to maintain, even at a loss, because it wishes to give a service to its clients. Businessmen would not mind making a loss on a service because to cut out that service might mean losing a customer completely. The businessman considers the overall position and whether he can provide a service that is of some value to his clients even though that service runs at a loss. He continues to run that service because it enables him to hold business on which he makes a profit. South Australia is in a similar position. I do not think that trying to prevent expansion of road haulage by control will achieve anything more than a willingness on the part of the grower to decide to change the form of government.

We must face up to the facts of life, and in this case the facts of life are that many people in industry (particularly in primary industry) have made plans for road haulage. Their whole businesses are wrapped around the door-to-door delivery they want. This suits their convenience and their pockets. If it suits their pockets it should be in the interests of the State generally because, after all, we want our people to be prosperous. Some secondary industries reap rich rewards from the Treasury to keep them in business. I regard this measure as nothing more than assistance to the primary producer to keep him on a profitable basis. I heartily support the Bill and in Committee I will comment on the individual items.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 30, at 2 p.m.