

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday, November 23, 1965.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS****FAUNA CONSERVATION.**

The Hon. D. N. **BROOKMAN**: An article in one of yesterday's newspapers, under the heading "Birdnesting pays dividend", stated that a small boy took 15 baby rosella parrots from somewhere and that, because he could not feed them, he had to advertise them for sale. The article goes on to say that there were plenty of takers and that the birds were now placed in what were no doubt happy homes. Although everyone may be happy, apparently no-one has thought about whether or not the parrots were protected. I understand that there are four species of rosella parrot, and as the common ones are not protected I suppose there would be a 95 per cent chance that the birds involved were not protected. However, after so much has been said and done regarding conservation, it seems that we should be careful not to praise the taking of wild birds, protected or otherwise, or to encourage their being caged. Without entering into a controversy on the general question of keeping birds that are bred in captivity, I think it is rather a bad thing to encourage people to take wild birds. As the Minister of Agriculture has access to methods of publicity regarding conservation (and I know he is interested in this subject), will he comment on this matter from time to time?

The Hon. G. A. **BYWATERS**: I appreciate the honourable member's drawing this matter to my attention. I did not see the article to which he refers, but I will now read it and will refer the matter to the Fauna Conservation Department to see whether it would not be wise for an officer to go out and talk to this lad, who apparently is rather keen on bird-nesting. It might be a good idea if someone from the department had a chat with the boy, for that, too, could be given some publicity. I should be happy to comment on this matter from time to time so that the public's attention may be drawn to it.

**MOUNT GAMBIER INFANTS SCHOOL.**

Mr. **BURDON**: Last week I directed a question to the Minister of Education concerning a new infants school at Mount Gambier. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. **LOVEDAY**: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that Cabinet yesterday accepted a tender for the erection of the new Mount Gambier Infants School at Reidy Park. It is not possible at the moment to say when building will commence, but the tender calls for the completion of the school within a period of about 40 weeks. The new building will be erected on a 2½-acre site adjoining the primary school-grounds. It will provide accommodation for about 400 children in a single-storey building of Mount Gambier stone, consisting of 10 classrooms, activity room, administrative offices and the usual store, toilet, ablution, cloak and shelter facilities. The new school will enable the infant children to vacate the present accommodation on a small site of only half an acre which is seriously overcrowded, the classroom accommodation is inadequate and the buildings are incapable of modernization. The removal of the infants school from its existing location will also provide space required for the expansion of the adult education centre.

**INDUSTRIAL SAFETY.**

Mrs. **STEELE**: Earlier this session I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, a question about industrial safety. In view of the expressed concern of the Minister, as reported in the press yesterday, at the steadily increasing toll of industrial accidents, will he ascertain whether the discussions, which were to have taken place between the Minister of Labour and Industry and the President and Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council following my earlier question, have led to a greater participation by shop stewards and union officials in a stepped-up programme of safety courses, and to what extent workers in industry are encouraged to actively interest themselves in measures for their own safety?

The Hon. C. D. **HUTCHENS**: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague and to obtain a reply. When I have it, I shall inform the honourable member.

**E.&W.S. DEPOT.**

Mr. **McKEE**: As the Minister of Works is probably aware, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has a depot and a motor vehicle and maintenance workshop in Senate Road, Port Pirie. I draw the Minister's attention to the conditions obtaining at the temporary wood and iron office block, which is most unsuitable for Port Pirie weather conditions.

—Will the Minister investigate the unsuitability of the present office block, as it is impossible to keep the dust out of it, and as it is very hot in summer and very cold in winter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department desires to provide the best possible accommodation for its employees, and now that the honourable member has drawn my attention to the conditions at Port Pirie, I shall ask for a report and inform him of its contents.

#### CITRUS COMMITTEE.

Mr. QUIRKE: Can the Minister of Agriculture say when the report of the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee will be available? If it will not be available soon, will he expedite its printing?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Realizing that I hoped to introduce the Citrus Marketing Bill tomorrow, I consulted with the Government Printer last week to see whether the report could be ready and placed on member's files before the debate on that Bill. I was informed that, because of pressure of printing work at the moment, the Government Printer would have extreme difficulty in having the report ready by then, much as he would like to have it ready. However, he has assured me that, if there is any chance at all, he will comply with my request. Although I have not heard today whether that is being done, I am sure that the Government Printer is doing everything he can to expedite the printing of the report, because he knows that I desire to have it available for honourable members as soon as possible. In the event of its not being available in time, I have a copy of the report which I am prepared to lend to any member who wishes to read it before the Bill is debated.

#### PORT RIVER.

Mr. RYAN: I was recently approached by residents in a certain part of my district who are greatly concerned about the odour emanating from the upper reaches of the Port River now that it has been closed as a sea-lane because of the building of the new causeway. I believe that, as a result of my raising this matter with the Minister of Marine on November 9, an investigation has been made. Can the Minister report on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that an inspection of the area in the vicinity of the Port Adelaide treatment works was made last Friday by the Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment to ascertain whether any objectionable conditions were present. No such evidence

was found; the effluent, as usual, was clear, as was the pond formed by the discharge from the pipe. A British Royal Commission for treated sewage effluent which discharged into streams has determined the limits within which the quality of such effluent must lie. The discharge from the Port Adelaide treatment works is constantly maintained well within those limits. Both the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and the Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment have assured me that the Port Adelaide treatment works in no way contributes to any odour or nuisance in this area and, if odours do exist, they must emanate from another source. The report of the Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, on his inspection of the area, concludes as follows:

The conditions near the causeway outlet sluices were not pleasant, as stagnant water seems to collect at this point, but no odours were evident here. On the northern side of the causeway, floating rubbish, possibly from ships, had collected, and this side was no better than the south side, but somewhat worse.

Burning rubbish was observed north-west of the railway bridge and the wind was blowing smoke from this area towards the bridge. This burning rubbish was the only odour producer in the area on the day.

#### FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a report on the establishment of a fauna and flora reserve on part of a lease now occupied by the Gypsum Waratah Company in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may be aware that a discussion on this matter took place the week before last with Mr. Innes and his brother, as a result of which I hope that a recommendation will be made by Mr. Innes to his board favouring surrender of the lease, thereby allowing the reserve to be established. Mr. Innes said he would contact the department as soon as he had made the recommendation to his board, but up to the present no word has been heard from him. However, immediately he has contacted the department I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member.

#### BERRI EVAPORATION BASIN.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to the question I asked last Thursday concerning testing in the Berri evaporation basin by departmental officers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The investigation has been completed, and it is expected that a full report will be received by the Department of Lands within a few days. It is understood that, included in the report, will

be a recommendation for a round table conference with officers of the Engineering and Water Supply and Lands Departments, the district council, and the firms involved in the disposal of industrial waste into the basin, for the purpose of discussing the findings of the investigation.

#### WAIKERIE COURTHOUSE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Attorney-General give me any information about the progress made in the building of the courthouse at Waikerie?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A short time ago I went to Waikerie and consulted with the council officers concerned with planning the civic centre at Waikerie. On examining the plan, which I considered impressive, I agreed that it would be entirely suitable to provide the courthouse buildings in the civic centre and not, as originally planned, on another site in the area. I have therefore sent to my colleague, the Minister of Works, a note advocating that plans proceed for a courthouse building in the civic centre in accordance with the council's request.

#### FOOT-ROT.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of three weeks ago concerning foot-rot in the South-East?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to send me a statement that he took from a deputation he received from people in his district who were concerned about foot-rot, and I have had this matter examined. The report I have is rather lengthy and I believe it would be wise, rather than for me to go into all the ramifications of the report, if the people concerned were to invite the chief inspector of stock, together with the local inspector of stock, to address a public meeting on this matter. If the honourable member concurs in this, I suggest that he take it up with his constituents with a view to their arranging a meeting and inviting both the gentlemen to whom I have referred. I am confident that these gentlemen will be able to go to the South-East and allay many fears that exist there.

#### PARKING METERS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Premier ask the Road Traffic Board to investigate the number of parking meters in the city of Adelaide, the justification for them, and particularly the justification, if any, for the additional meters proposed to be established soon?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take the matter up with the Minister of Local Government and ask him for a reply.

#### VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from his colleague, the Minister of Mines, concerning the proclamation of the Underground Waters Preservation Act in the Virginia district?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Mines informs me that the proposal of the Government to proclaim the Underground Waters Preservation Act in the Adelaide Plains market garden areas arises from the very substantial fall in the water level of the underground source, and the very real danger not only of failure in actual supply but also of ingress of salt water. The proclamation of the Act will permit rationalization of pumping rates and quantities, and will ensure that damage to the underground source is avoided. At this stage it is not possible to forecast the permissible pumping rates, or the extent to which the construction and spacing of new bores will be limited. However, the Government's sole objective will be to preserve a vital asset for the benefit of the gardeners and the community generally.

Mr. HALL: Part of the reply of the Minister of Agriculture concerning Virginia water level states:

At this stage it is not possible to forecast the permissible pumping rates or the extent to which the construction and spacing of new bores will be limited.

Although I appreciate the Government's intentions in this matter, I am afraid that that part of the reply seems to imply that the Government does not intend to take urgent action. If certain factors cannot be forecast, I take it that that means the relevant work is not to be implemented immediately. Over the weekend I received an urgent telephone call from a Virginia councillor, who said that local residents had approached him and were worried about the water levels in the area. He said that the livelihood of some people was immediately threatened this summer by the severe drop in water levels at the beginning of the season, and he urged me to take up this matter. Will the Minister of Agriculture apprise his colleague of the need for some action in this regard, and ascertain whether the Government will treat this as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the difficulty outlined by the honourable

member, and I will take up this matter with my colleague as one of urgency.

#### EYRE PENINSULA POWER LINE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Last week I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding the reticulation of power from Whyalla to Port Lincoln. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Manager, Administration, of the Electricity Trust reports:

Survey work for the 132,000-volt transmission line from Whyalla to Port Lincoln is now being carried out and a contract for the construction of the line is about to be let. It is expected that the line will be completed by March, 1967. A substation supplied from this line will be constructed between Cleve and Rudall. A number of secondary transmission lines will be built from this substation, including a supply for Lock and Poldia, but a specific programme for this work has not yet been determined. Present indications are that the supply to Poldia will be required by the end of 1967.

#### NATURAL GAS.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week I asked the Premier a question regarding natural gas supplies in this State. Following the Premier's visit to Mereenie over the weekend, can he say whether he saw anything that would assist this State in its investigation of the use of natural gas?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This supply is not situated in this State. There appear to be large quantities of natural gas in the areas of Palm Valley and Mereenie. Natural gas has been discovered in some wells. I saw gas being used for further boring, and I also saw gas being lit, similar to the action taken at Gidgealpa. This proves that gas is there. The Government's big problem is that it is still awaiting a report from its fact-finding committee. That report will have to be closely examined when it is presented, possibly by the end of the year. The persons interested in the finding of natural gas reserves are mindful that the market for its use will be competitive, particularly as regards competition from oil. Until the committee has reported and the report has been closely examined, anything else I might say could give a false impression, and I would not desire that to happen. I did not visit Gidgealpa, and I have not received any recent reports on it. However, according to the press, the price of shares in the organization operating there has risen recently. Whether or not some developments have occurred there without our knowledge, I

cannot say, but I see no reason at this stage why those shares should be 2s. higher.

#### TELEVISION NEWS SERVICE.

Mr. HEASLIP: My question concerns the time at which the news service is given over the National television channel. I appreciate that this is a Commonwealth matter, but I understand that the matter has been raised in this House. Some time ago the Australian Broadcasting Commission's television channels 1 and 2 changed their news time from 7 p.m. to 6.30 p.m., and as all the commercial channels give their news at this latter time people cannot now see and hear the news at any other time. I understand that the reply given earlier was that the A.B.C.'s time was for a trial period only and that the matter would be reconsidered later. Will the Premier ascertain the result of that trial, and see whether there is any suggestion to revert to 7 p.m.?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: From memory, I believe that the member for Victoria asked this question, and the reply from the Commonwealth Government was that the matter was still being considered. However, because of this question, I will try to obtain further information.

#### MILANG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Milang water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has forwarded the following report from the Engineer for Water Supply concerning the request of the Milang residents to be supplied with water from Lake Alexandrina:

Departmental records, supported by recent analyses, show that Angas River water is of an acceptable quality for township reticulation and is suitable for garden use. It has been used in Strathalbyn for many years without complaint and the many flourishing gardens in that township bear witness that the water is not injurious to flower and vegetable gardens. It is economically sound to supply water to the whole of the Strathalbyn scheme which now incorporates the township of Milang, by gravity from Strathalbyn reservoir during winter months when a plentiful supply of good quality water is available in the River Angas. However, the consumption of water in Milang during this period is comparatively small and no great cost would be involved in supplying the township with lake water. When the new pumps, which are at present being installed, are in operation, consideration will be given to the modification of the pipework at the elevated tanks to enable Milang to receive a continuous supply of lake water.

## PISTOL LICENCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the weekend a priest who lives in my district got in touch with me. He was extremely irate at that time as a result of a visit to a police station to renew his pistol licence. He had received the normal application form for renewal of a pistol licence, had filled it in, and had presented it, together with his 2s. 6d., for the renewal of the licence. At the police station he was told that it would not be accepted but that he should return after December 1 to get his licence, which would then cost him £1. That was bad enough, but with the renewal form he had received the following notification:

Notice to holders of pistol licences: The enclosed application for renewal of your pistol licence should be completed, signed and lodged together with the fee of 2s. 6d. at the police station nearest your usual place of abode on or before December 31, 1965. Failure to renew your licence on time may cause you the inconvenience of applying for a new licence. The official receipt issued for the fee should be retained and affixed to the licence which will be forwarded to you after approval.

It can be seen that nothing on the notification that went with the renewal form indicated that the fee would be raised or that it could not be paid before December 1. In fact, the implication is rather to the contrary. I know there is a Bill on file, the effect of which is to raise the fee, and I assume that this is why this procedure has been followed. Can the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether that is the reason and, if it is, whether this action has been taken with the Government's blessing? If it has not, will the Government consider this matter so that people will not be caused the trouble of two visits to renew their licences in the circumstances I have outlined?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will consult the Chief Secretary about this matter.

## RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Nearly two years ago the Commonwealth Government made available a sum for the survey of the railway line from Port Pirie to Adelaide to bring the standard gauge into the city. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, say whether the survey has been completed and what subsequent action may be expected?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will consult with my colleague and present a report soon.

Mr. CASEY: I refer to the standardization of the route between Broken Hill and Port

Pirie. I understand that the Commonwealth Government has now accepted the route that was surveyed by the South Australian Government between Cockburn and Broken Hill. Has the Premier been notified whether the route that follows the road from Cockburn to Broken Hill through the Thackeringa Ranges constitutes the new route, or whether the route will follow the existing railway line between Cockburn and Broken Hill *via* Silverton?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not received any advice to indicate that the route has been altered, but I shall obtain a report from my colleague and inform the honourable member.

## FRANCES SILOS.

Mr. RODDA: Much congestion is occurring at the Frances grain silo. Waiting trucks have to queue on the main road to gain access to a weighbridge that is in an isolated part of the railway station, and a problem is caused by a chute into a cattle yard. A request has been made for a series of gates to be placed in the cattle yard which will not affect the use of the yard but will give direct access to the wheat silo from the weighbridge. A request has also been made for an additional opening in the railway fence to give trucks additional access to the oat silo, as the trucks queue on the main road, drive into the railway yard, and then have to return to the main highway to gain access to the silo. Will the Premier discuss these problems with the Minister of Transport to see whether they can be solved?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will discuss this matter with my colleague and inform the honourable member when a report is available.

## MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the progress of the Morgan-Whyalla main duplication, particularly regarding the crossing at the head of Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received a report from the Assistant Director, Engineering Services, which states:

To date, 131 miles of pipeline have been laid out of a total of 175 miles. The section of main from the Hanson storage to Mount Mambray on the eastern side of Spencer Gulf is completed, and work is currently in progress on the rising main between Morgan and Hanson, on the seven-mile submarine section and on the line from the western side of the gulf to Whyalla. The whole of the pipeline

is expected to be completed by the end of 1966. The contractor for the seven-mile submarine section is engaged in dredging the channel into which the pipeline will be laid, but the work is somewhat behind schedule. The contractor has brought a second and larger dredge on to the job. It is expected that the pipeline, which has been assembled into half-mile long strings at Mount Mambray, will be launched across the gulf about the middle of 1966. The construction of a pressure-reducing tank is in hand at Baroota and the building of additional storages at Whyalla, Hanson and at the pumping stations, will be commenced in the 1966-67 financial year.

#### MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. CURREN: On Thursday, November 11, I introduced to the Minister of Irrigation a deputation representing settlers from Cooltong who told the Minister of the seriousness of the salt content in their irrigation water. Can the Minister say what action has been taken to alleviate this situation, which could become critical during the summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The statement by the honourable member about the situation is correct. The urgency of this matter is recognized by the department, whose officers are at present in the area and are, in fact, collating information obtained from tests in the area. There have been two suggestions to relieve the situation, but these would only be temporary measures. The first is to provide a sunken caisson in the Ral Ral Creek around the pump; the other is to improve the existing weir. However, until the engineer returns on Thursday I cannot obtain a report or recommendation from him.

#### AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In reply to a question concerning the Agincourt Bore school asked in another place, the Minister has said that the cost of the project may exceed £100,000, and it may therefore come before the Public Works Committee. This may create delay. Can the Minister of Education say when this project is likely to be referred to the committee?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot give the honourable member an exact answer, but I will endeavour to obtain information for him. In discussing the question of the urgency of school projects being dealt with by the Public Works Committee, I have received an assurance from the Chairman of the committee that, if at any time the committee can expedite

the work involved, it will be only too happy to do so.

#### ADELAIDE GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LAWN: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department intends to re-locate the Adelaide Girls High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have considered this matter during the last two or three months, but no definite conclusion has been reached. However, when I have concrete advice I shall be pleased to let the honourable member know.

#### MILEAGE ALLOWANCES.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that dissension exists among officers of the Public Service because of the Government's practice of paying them rates lower than those applying to vehicles of 15 h.p. irrespective of the horsepower of the vehicles of these officers who use their private cars to undertake Government business, and who travel within and beyond a 50-mile radius of Adelaide. Following an unsuccessful approach to the Public Service Commissioner, officers of the Department of Labour and Industry have withdrawn the availability of their cars until their claims are met, and I understand that similar action is being considered by officers of other departments. In view of the impact that this stand may have on the finances of Government departments, will the Premier explain the Government's policy on this matter, and say whether action is being taken to resolve the situation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cabinet has considered this matter, and I point out that a public announcement has been made on behalf of about 50 departmental officers to the effect that they would refuse to use their own cars. They are receiving an allowance to do much of their work in the metropolitan area by means of public transport. The Government is following the policy of its predecessors in this matter, particularly in regard to the use in the metropolitan area of cars of low horsepower. For instance, a four-cylinder car has a more economic running cost than has the more popular six-cylinder car. These officers are assigned to do certain work for the Government and perhaps they will lock away their six-cylinder cars, if they have them, and use public transport. I have no objection to that at all, provided they do their work, as this may save the Government a considerable sum. I assure the honourable member the matter has not been finalized but I will look into it further and ascertain the position.

## LOXTON BLOCK.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of last week concerning the transfer of a war service settlement block at Loxton to another person under a Crown lease?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The block of land referred to by the honourable member in the Loxton irrigation area reverted to the Crown on cancellation of the lease. This property was advertised for sale as being outside the war service land settlement scheme. In respect of the purchase of improvements on the land, the terms and conditions were laid down by the Commonwealth authorities. The tenure under which the land could be allotted to an approved applicant and the rental to apply were fixed by the State. The disposal of other war service land settlement leases which revert to the Crown and which are not re-allotted under war service land settlement scheme conditions will follow the same lines. That is, the department will fix the tenure and rental whilst Commonwealth authorities will decide the price, terms and conditions for the purchase of improvements. Commonwealth policy in regard to the sale of war service leases by settlers after the lease has been held 10 years is that, first, favourable consideration will be given to the transfer of the Crown mortgage to the transferee if such transferee is an ex-serviceman eligible and classified for war service land settlement who does not already hold land under the war service land settlement scheme. The transfer of the mortgage may also be permitted in very special circumstances, such as the transfer to the settler's widow or son on the death of the settler. Secondly, in other circumstances the transfer of the Crown mortgage will not be consented to and the transferee and transferor would need to make their own financial arrangements.

## SHEEP DRENCHES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question concerns sheep drenches. Three years ago I asked the then Minister of Agriculture a question regarding extravagant claims being made by one drug company on the virtues of its sheep drench, which it claimed to be effective against gastro-intestinal worms. The result of the question was that I had the satisfaction of finding that the drug company concerned changed its form of advertising within four or five days of the question being asked. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department has conducted tests of these

drenches or whether it plans to do so in the future?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will get a reply for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

## PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A statement appears in this month's issue of the *Public Service* showing that certain salary claims have been acceded to and that the clerical range within the Public Service is to receive a substantial increase over and above the 1½ per cent increase anticipated in the Budget. Will the Premier ascertain how many officers are concerned in the automatic range adjustment? I understand that this does not include, by any means, all those in the Public Service. Can the Premier say what additional cost is expected as a result of the increase?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have a reply to another question but it may not answer the honourable member's question. I can give this information to the House if it is of value to the honourable member.

Mr. Nankivell: I am concerned with automatic grade clerks.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The figure concerning the increase to automatic-grade clerks is £25,000. The estimated additional cost for survey draftsmen is £10,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is this under an arbitration award?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This increase has been approved by the Public Service Board and ratified by the Government.

## URRBRAE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On Friday evening I attended the annual speech night of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. I think I saw the honourable member for Unley in the crowd, so he will probably back up what I say on this matter. The Deputy Chairman of the council, who was in charge of proceedings, complained several times during the evening about the fact that the new school buildings, which were promised for the school, and the funds for which, in fact, appeared on the Loan Estimates this year, were not being built, and it appears that they will not be built this financial year. This is a great disappointment to those connected with the school because the buildings were promised, and there has been much agitation for them over the years. Can the Minister of Education say whether there is not some chance of the buildings being commenced this year in view of

the promises made over a long time? If there is not such a chance, can the Minister give a definite undertaking that the buildings can be completed in the next financial year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have to inquire into the details to give the honourable member a proper answer to the question. In reply to an earlier question by the Leader of the Opposition, I said that money had been made available for the project. However, I cannot say offhand when the work will be started or completed.

#### DIESEL FUMES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Those of us who travel on the roads (even on the city roads) are conscious of the dense fumes that sometimes emanate from diesel buses and trucks. In the *Advertiser* of November 12 appeared a small article stating that in Great Britain there was a deodorant which could be added to fuel and which was not only a deodorant but also a smoke suppressant. I notice that one commercial firm advertises such a deodorant. Will the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, about the advisability or otherwise of looking into this matter further to see whether it could be a means of overcoming this nuisance? Will he ask his colleague also whether consideration has already been given, or could be given, to making it compulsory that exhausts of all diesel-motivated buses and trucks be pointing upwards (as many already are) rather than having them pointing towards the ground? This would dissipate the smoke and overcome much of the nuisance that is occurring.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

#### CORNSACKS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the price of cornsacks?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cornsacks are manufactured in Pakistan and in India, and while auction prices are related to those of jute they do not necessarily move in conjunction with one another. Jute prices between May and September, 1964, averaged £114 a ton sterling, while for the same period this year the average was £128 a ton sterling. The current quote is £122 sterling a ton. Adelaide cornsack merchants normally buy on the overseas market between May and September. In that period in 1964 Calcutta quotes for cornsacks averaged 27s. 3d. sterling a dozen as compared with 34s. 10d. sterling this year. The new season's price ex store Adelaide

recently rose by 8s. 9d. to 48s. a dozen. The increase in the cornsack price this season only reflects the increase in the buying costs to merchants and is not considered to be excessive.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Previously the price of cornsacks in South Australia has been examined, I think, by the Prices Commissioner. Will the Premier ascertain whether the cost of sacks held by people who purchased cornsacks last year will be considered in fixing this year's price of cornsacks, as the stocks held over from last year were purchased at a lower price?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall inquire and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

#### MAITLAND AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning the calling of tenders for the new Maitland Area School and the availability of funds to commence the building of this school. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has advised that tenders were called for the new Maitland Area School on October 14, 1965, with a closing date of November 23. Funds have been provided to enable the construction to proceed following the letting of a contract.

#### SUPERPHOSPHATE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the discussion on superphosphate prices last Thursday I asked whether the production of pyrites at Nairne could be increased for the purpose of overcoming some of the increased costs that appeared to be likely as a result of brimstone importation. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Regarding the need to increase the output of pyrites from Nairne, I have obtained the following report from the Prices Commissioner:

Sulphuric Acid Ltd. operated at peak capacity in the 1964-65 season and output this year will be on a similar scale. As this is the only works designed to handle pyrites concentrates no benefit would be gained from any increased production by Nairne Pyrites Ltd., unless Sulphuric Acid Ltd.'s plant was enlarged. Such a move would require a large capital outlay and may not be economically desirable. Costs of producing acid from pyrites have risen substantially because of a reduction in the Commonwealth bounty payable to Nairne Pyrites Ltd. This bounty is linked to the price of sulphur and varies, inversely, with the rise or fall in sulphur prices. Due to the £4 10s. a ton increase in sulphur prices, bounty payable to Nairne



Pyrites Ltd. for the year 1965-66 is expected to fall by an average of £4 13s. 4d. a ton of concentrate produced. This amounts to an estimated loss of bounty for the season of £182,000.

#### REFERENDUM COSTS.

Mrs. STEELE: Last week I addressed a question to the Premier regarding the estimated costs of Saturday's lotteries referendum. Apparently my question was addressed to the wrong Minister, for I have now been advised that the Attorney-General has a reply to my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The estimated cost of conducting the referendum, according to the Estimates, was as follows: on line 4, estimate of fees for elections, £29,456; line 10, estimated cost of contingencies and forms, £9,262; making a total estimate of £38,718. The figure shown in line 8 does not include the cost of House of Assembly main roll and House of Assembly supplemental roll. That share is a half cost with the Commonwealth Government, and is estimated to cost the State £13,300. The main roll would have been printed in any case on the order of the Commonwealth Minister for the Interior, as, subject to the agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments, he has similarly ordered reprints in the other joint roll States. That had already been done. Line 4 also contains provision for debiting fees for eight districts on general elections. Accounts for these districts were not complete at June 30, 1965. Line 10 also includes provision for debiting contingencies for eight districts about general elections, and line 8 includes provision for half cost of printing cards, maps, etc. The original estimate made by the department has not been inaccurate, and the estimate has not been revised.

#### MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the design and construction of the Morphett Street and Victoria bridges leading over the Torrens River into my electoral district?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, reports that in accordance with section 4 of the Morphett Street Bridge Act, 1964, plans and specifications have been submitted by the City Council and have been examined by the Highways Department engineers. On October 8, 1965, the Town Clerk was advised by letter that the Minister of Local Government

approved of the council proceeding with the relocation and reconstruction of Montefiore Road from War Memorial Drive to Jeffcott Street and for the construction of sheet piling in the Torrens Lake adjacent to Victoria bridge. In addition, approval was given on the same date for the City Council to call tenders for the construction of Morphett Street and Victoria bridges.

#### BALAKLAVA SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning finance for the Balaklava swimming pool?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: According to the information available at the office of the Director of the Tourist Bureau, the proposal to build a swimming pool at Balaklava is still in the planning stages. The President of the Balaklava Swimming Committee called at the Tourist Bureau as recently as November 10, 1965, when an appointment was made for him to see an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to get advice regarding pool construction and a water treatment plant. At the same time an application form was given to the President. During the past several years the Director has endeavoured to encourage local government authorities to submit their applications for subsidy by mid-June each year so they can be taken into account in the preparation of financial estimates submitted to the Treasury for the following year. In the Estimates submitted for the year 1965-66 there was a reduced demand for swimming pool subsidies and an increased demand for tourist resort subsidies, and it was not practicable to keep spare provisions available for swimming pool subsidies that might arise.

In these circumstances the Director felt it necessary to inform the Balaklava committee that it was unlikely that a subsidy could be made available this financial year. However, since that advice was given by the Director one town has withdrawn its application for a subsidy for a swimming pool, and there is now an amount of £902 available. Before the Director can submit a recommendation to me regarding a subsidy it will be necessary for a formal application to be lodged, together with details about the area planned, size and design of the pool and water treatment plant, the estimated cost and the method of financing.

#### PENDRIL.

Mr. McANANEY: Occasionally, a company fails and no funds are available to the creditors, in consequence of which no liquidator

is appointed and no-one takes any interest in defaulting directors or in the shareholders who lost money. A company called Pendril came into the Strathalbyn district to drill an oil well and asked notable citizens to support it. However, the local member of Parliament was not asked, although I do not say that that is why it failed. Many small shopkeepers, thinking this was a large company that would produce great wealth, advanced considerable sums, but they are now left holding the baby. Perhaps they took a business risk and now they have to stand up to it. This company has no funds nor has it a liquidator appointed, and no doubt its affairs should be investigated. Has the Attorney-General inquired about the possibility of investigating this company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I have not, but I shall inquire. As to the question of no funds being immediately available in the company to cover the cost of a liquidator, or of inquiries, or of funds in the hands of a defaulting director, a suggestion has been made by the Employers Federation and the Institute of Credit Management that a special fund be set up to cover these cases. This matter has been listed for discussion at the next meeting of the Standing Committee of the Attorneys-General in January to see whether we can get uniform agreement between States under which each State would set up such a fund.

#### HOME FOR INCURABLES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the weekend I read in a newspaper that certain members of Cabinet intended to visit the Home for Incurables, in my district, this morning, and I assume that the visit took place.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You will see it on television tonight.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity people will not see me, but there it is. An amount of £475,000 has been provided on the Estimates to be paid to the Home for Incurables as a capital grant. Can the Premier assure me (especially after what must have been an impressive visit this morning) that all of that money will be made available in the current financial year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I was unable to accept the invitation for the visit and I notified the people concerned. How successful the visit was I cannot say, but if the work to be carried out at the Home for Incurables costs the amount set out on the Estimates, then it will be spent. However, I shall obtain a further report on what may occur in this regard.

#### STATE LOTTERIES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that in yesterday's newspaper the Premier stated, concerning the lotteries referendum, that he intended to visit other States. That would seem to indicate that the Premier or the Government has no specific plan yet on the type of lottery to be introduced. In a television programme the Premier referred to Minda Home and said that profits from a lottery would assist that type of charitable institution. Does the Premier intend to visit Tattersalls during his Eastern States trip? That organization is undoubtedly an outstanding success in every way, and it could be reasonably expected that Tattersalls, because of its large promotion programme, would continue to sell its tickets in this State: it would not wish to see a decrease in the demand for its tickets here. Does the Premier intend to discuss the matter with this company to the advantage of this State, and secondly, because of his reference to Minda Home can he say what percentage of the lottery receipts is to be set aside to assist such charities?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I should have thought that the honourable member would be more concerned with the original aim of my visit, to ascertain whether a totalizator agency system of off-course betting could operate successfully in this State, because I announced publicly before the referendum was held that I intended to go to Melbourne to obtain information on that important question. Parliament has determined that the Government should introduce a T.A.B. system. Following the result of the referendum held last Saturday, I intend personally to visit Victoria in connection with both matters, and also to examine the working of the Government-run lottery in Western Australia. Being the Minister responsible for the introduction of the relevant legislation, I shall have to examine how the lottery will function. It will probably also be necessary to seek other assistance, possibly from a Treasury official, perhaps even the Under Treasurer.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you taking the Minister of Works or the Minister of Agriculture?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I assure the House that I will not take the member for Mitcham. In reply to the member for Ridley, I can only say that, in introducing the relevant legislation, the matters raised by him will be considered and made known to the House. Even though a measure was introduced relating only to the holding of a referendum, the House should have been conversant with all associated

matters. I intend to make a complete investigation concerning legislation resulting from the recent referendum, as well as legislation to establish T.A.B. in this State.

#### PARA HILLS SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question concerning the building of the Para Hills Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that tender documents for this new school building are nearing completion and it is planned that tenders will be called during next month. With the letting of a contract early in the new year, it is estimated that the school should be completed in time for the school opening in 1967.

#### LAND SUBDIVISION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On the day the Attorney-General took silk (and he will vividly remember the date) I asked him a question about the subdivision of land at Hawthornedene owned by Mr. H. G. Curtis. Has the Attorney-General a reply to that question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An application to create one allotment in part section 886, hundred of Adelaide, was submitted under section 15 of the Town Planning Act on July 12, 1965. The Director, Engineering and Water Supply Department, states that the land is in an area where sewerage could not be provided for many years, and in an area which the department does not propose to provide with a water supply for residential purposes. The locality is shown on the Town Planning Committee's Development Plan 1962 as hills face zone. The Town Planner's policy is to request all plans of re-subdivision situated within that portion of the hills face zone which lies within the metropolitan area as defined in the Town Planning Act, to be submitted as plans of subdivision under section 17.

If, on receipt of the application, the Director, Engineering and Water Supply Department, does not certify that the land can be advantageously and economically sewered and reticulated with water in terms of section 12a (2) of the Act, then the application has to be referred to the Minister for a decision under that section.

Messrs. Mosel and Associates, agents for Mr. Curtis, stated by letter dated August 12, 1965, that Mr. Curtis does not agree to submit his proposal as a plan of subdivision, and that is where the matter stands at the moment.

#### MINISTRY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice): What is the order of precedence in the present Ministry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Hon. F. H. Walsh, M.P., Premier, the Hon. A. J. Shard, M.L.C., Chief Secretary; the Hon. C. D. Hutchens, M.P., Minister of Works; the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., LL.B., M.P., Attorney-General; the Hon. R. R. Loveday, M.P., Minister of Education; the Hon. S. C. Bevan, M.L.C., Minister of Local Government; the Hon. A. F. Kneebone, M.L.C., Minister of Labour and Industry; the Hon. G. A. Bywaters, M.P., Minister of Agriculture; and the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, M.P., Minister of Lands.

This order of precedence is merely an expression for protocol, and does not reflect in any way the relative importance of any Minister.

#### FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When does the Government expect to be able to consider the question of the fluoridation of the water supply of this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some time in the future.

#### HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING CONTROL BOARD).

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

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

I have had a confidential talk with the Chairman of the Betting Control Board (Mr. Cleland), and he would like to have discussions with me from time to time regarding the activities of the board. The object of the Bill, therefore, is to bring the Betting Control Board under Ministerial control. Clause 3 amends section 34 of the principal Act so as to provide that in the performance of its duties and exercise of its powers it shall be subject to the directions of the Treasurer. Clause 4 inserts a

new section 34a in the principal Act providing that in the exercise of its powers, functions, authorities and duties under the Act the board shall be subject to the direction and control of the Treasurer. It is not required necessarily that the Minister be the controlling authority, but rather that he shall be able to advise on the administration of the board's affairs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1963. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

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

It makes four amendments of substance to the principal Act. In the first place it will provide for compensation for injuries arising out of or in the course of employment; secondly, it provides cover on journeys between residence and place of employment; thirdly, it provides for payment of compensation at current rates; and, fourthly, it increases the maximum amount of compensation to £6,000. I deal with these amendments in order.

The principal clause relating to the first two matters is clause 3 which will strike out the words "by accident" in section 4 (1) of the principal Act and will also strike out the word "and" and insert "or". Subsection (1) now provides a liability to pay compensation in respect of "personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment". As amended, this will read "personal injury arising out of or in the course of the employment". The necessary amendments in this respect are made by paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (i) and (j) of clause 3.

Provisions for cover on journeys between residence and place of employment are made by paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (h) and (k) of clause 3, and by clause 4. Section 4 (2) of the principal Act relates to journeys. Paragraph (a) provides for compensation while a workman in the course of a daily or other periodical journey between residence and place of employment (whether to or from work) is being conveyed by a means of transport provided by or by arrangement with the employer. This is amended by paragraphs

(e) and (f) of clause 3 to provide for compensation while a workman is in the course of a daily or other periodical journey between residence and place of employment whether the journey is to or from work, but the limitation as to means of transport is removed by paragraph (g) of clause 3.

Paragraph (h) of that clause relates to section 4 (2) (e) which covers a workman while he is travelling between his residence or place of employment and any other place for the purposes of medical attention. The new provision will substitute for the words "while the workman is travelling" the words "on a journey taken by the workman". There could be some argument whether a man was actually travelling, for example, where an injury was sustained while he was not actually in motion on a journey. Paragraph (k) of clause 3 will remove from section 4 (3), relating to apprentices on journeys between residence and trade school, the requirement that they must be travelling in accordance with arrangements made with the employer.

Clause 4 provides that no compensation shall be payable for an injury occurring on a journey between residence and place of employment or trade school or a journey in connection with medical attention if it occurs during or after any unconnected substantial interruption or deviation or other break made during the journey. This provision is substantially in line with similar provisions in New South Wales and Victoria. Clauses 5, 6b and 7 raise the maximum amount of compensation payable to £6,000. The existing maxima are £3,250 for death and £3,500 for incapacity and table injuries.

Clause 8 provides for payment of compensation at rates currently in force at the time of death or incapacity. There are cases where a workman suffers a recurrence of injury attributable to the same accident but if the case occurred before a change in rates he obtains only the amounts which were current at the time of the first injury. This can operate somewhat harshly. The remaining amendments in the Bill and, in particular, those effected by clause 9 and the schedule are consequential and relate mainly to the removal of the word "accident" and the substitution of "or" for "and" in various parts of the principal Act.

Mr. CUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMEND-  
MENT BILL (RATES).

In Committee.

(Continued from November 18. Page 2944.)

New clause 2a—"Arrangement."

2a. Section 3 of the principal Act is amended by inserting therein after the passage "Part IVB.—Rebate of Duty in Respect of land used for Primary Production" the following passage:

"Part IVC.—Rebate of Duty in Respect of Dwelling-houses."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader has asked a question on the effect of new section 55i (9) on the new clause 2a. He has suggested that this seems to take something away from the primary producer and that it penalizes him when considered in relation to concessions under Form U, but that is not the case. The rebate in respect of land used for primary production applies to succession duties under will or intestacy, and does not apply to those other dispositions that may be recorded on Form U. In other words, the primary-producing land rebate applies specifically and only to successions recorded on Form A. Further, a house on primary-producing land necessarily forms part of the value of such land, and the Commissioner of Succession Duties has always accepted this to be the case, so that the matrimonial home on a farm passing to a widow qualifies as an integral part of the land for the "primary-producing land" rebate of up to £5,000. The only intention and only effect of subsection (9) is that, if the widow or widower should be entitled to a rebate of up to £5,000, under the "primary-producing land" provision, for a succession that includes the matrimonial home as part of that land, he or she should not also be entitled to a further £3,000 rebate for the same succession to the same matrimonial home under the dwelling-house provision. To provide otherwise would be to provide for double counting. In any case, the "primary-producing land" rebate is the greater one and it is in no way reduced by the provision of subsection (9), and the rebate for primary-producing land remains at £5,000 for all values of estates, whilst that for a dwelling reduces fairly rapidly so as to disappear with the succession of £15,000 to a widow and £6,000 to a widower. In most cases the widow or widower succeeding to primary-producing land, including a dwelling-house, will be at a considerable advantage in having the house treated for rebate purposes as part of the primary-producing land, rather

than having it treated separately under the dwelling-house rebate provisions. The purpose of the amendments now on the file is really to improve the position, following the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the Committee to accept them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I am not sure what the amendments actually mean. I have been advised that they are in conflict with other provisions of the Act. It is provided that the rebates will apply to a certain section, but this appears to be completely at variance with other provisions that say that something else shall apply. In any case, it does not alter the fact that in respect of the matrimonial home most people are going to be much worse off. With the virtual elimination of Form U deductions, it means that the £6,000 which we were promised at the election time ceases to be £6,000. In many instances the person concerned will be much worse off under the alleged concession.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Give us some instances.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Onkaparinga gave some direct instances, and they have not been contradicted.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not in relation to this.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They were estates that were real. This amendment makes most of those people worse off, as it does not overcome aggregation. Form U benefits will no longer apply and, rather than being a concession for the primary producer, it does not cover the cost of a modern house let alone a house on a rural living area. Although the Treasurer says that these amendments are satisfactory to him, they do not make the Bill satisfactory to the Opposition, or overcome its objections. The Bill aims to increase exemptions to widows and dependent children but altering the circumstances of succession duties takes away these exemptions in most cases.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Absolute nonsense, deliberate baloney.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many estates are dutiable for Form U benefits under these provisions, in which case the Government is giving with one hand but with the other is substantially taking away. This Bill was introduced with the object of giving relief.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It gives much relief, and you know it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It increases the cost of succession duties. Why has so much opposition been aroused if it is giving relief? How does it increase succession duties by an estimated £750,000 a year if it is giving relief?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Because your rich pals will be paying what they should have paid previously.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that Government members have peculiar financial ideas, but no relief exists where people are charged more tax. I do not understand the full implications of this amendment because the benefit is limited to this part, and I am informed that this does not override other parts of the Act. The aggregation clauses in this legislation were not forecast by Government members prior to the election.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know that much publicity has been given to this matter, but I am satisfied that much of it is not as accurate as it should be. The greatest objection to the Bill by the Opposition is the aggregation, but it is time that major consideration was given to this. Our views and those of the Opposition are as far apart as the north and south poles. The law provides that certain matters may be included in Form U, but Form A is a straightout issue of what is provided normally by the will. At least 90 per cent of estates in recent years would not be affected in any way by these proposals.

Mr. Shannon: That is good; that is a useful figure.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Estates that are involved have been included in the legislation. There is a provision for primary-producing land. We expect that on a living area there will be a dwellinghouse. Supposing that a dwellinghouse is on the land and the widow is left another house that is not on the land. How can a concession be granted with respect to the house not on the living area? Under these provisions there will be no succession duties for a dwellinghouse on primary-producing land. Normally, the widow desires to keep the family unit together and to continue living on the property. These people are granted a concession, and it is not being reduced. This Bill provides an exemption on a £12,000 unit in a joint ownership that is not on primary-producing land. Because of joint ownership, £6,000 will be duty free. In respect of primary-producing land, the dwellinghouse is automatically recognized as being on that land, for the purpose of granting this exemption.

Mr. HALL: I have never been more confused. If a farm that is left to a widow or child under 21 years of age has a house on it, does the property carry a total rebate of £5,000—or the £11,000 referred to in the second reading explanation?

Mr. Hudson: £11,000!

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer said that a house would be regarded as an integral part of the property.

Mr. Hudson: For the purpose of the primary producer's concession!

Mr. HALL: We have not received this explanation, and mere interjections will not suffice. If a primary-producing property is to receive a rebate of £5,000, and a city property one of £6,000, it means that the concession for a primary producer is £1,000 less. What is the maximum rebate allowed on a house left to a widow or child under 21? I take it that the value of the matrimonial home on a primary-producing property is an integral part of that property's valuation. The report read out by the Treasurer a few minutes ago says that, this being so, it would not be counted twice, so that the total rebate is inescapably £5,000.

Mr. Hudson: Plus £6,000! Don't be ridiculous.

Mr. HALL: We must assume that the total is £5,000.

Mr. SHANNON: In every instance of sample values of estates that have been produced, it has been disclosed that there would be an increased impact of succession duties on those estates. To say that 90 per cent of the estates will not be affected is wishful thinking. There is an absolute lack of understanding of this legislation. Estates of £6,000 and £7,000 are certainly not large, and more succession duty will be payable under the Bill than is payable now. The examples I gave were worked out by practical people, and they believe that 90 per cent of estates will be affected by the Bill. I cannot support this legislation.

Mr. HUDSON: The Opposition is still trying to perpetrate the fraud commenced in the *Advertiser* and followed in Parliament in the debate on this legislation—that the ordinary person will be affected. However, that is the exact opposite of the truth. The Commonwealth Taxation Commissioner's report shows that the number of estates in any one year greater than £20,000 is about 270; that the number of estates greater than £15,000 in any one year is about 450; and that the number of estates of £10,000 in any one year is

about 720. The number of deaths in 1963-64 in South Australia (from memory) was 8,500. Of the people who died, 8 per cent left estates greater than £10,000, and the percentage of successions greater than £10,000 would have been even less. Of the people who died in 1963-64, 5 per cent left estates greater than £15,000 and 3 per cent left estates greater than £20,000. The examples given by the member for Onkaparinga were all based on Form U and on aggregation. They do not apply to people who left their property purely by will, and there are many cases of that. His examples applied to the categories I mentioned—to the 3 per cent, 5 per cent or 8 per cent categories—and not to the 92 per cent of the people who died and left either nothing at all or an amount less than £10,000. Just who are the member for Onkaparinga and the Opposition trying to protect? I think they are trying to protect the large estates.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are trying to hoodwink the poor.

Mr. HUDSON: They are trying to hoodwink the public of South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: In some cases the people who have contacted me have, because of the propaganda—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You are deliberately trying to mislead the people.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, we are not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: Because of the propaganda presented in the press, and because of the overtones associated with it, some of these contacts were rather abusive. However, I queried the person concerned in each case as to the amount involved and it was clear that under our proposals those people would pay either no duty or a negligible amount. Members opposite have tried to suggest that the provision for the rebate for primary-producing land detracts from the general exemption for the widow, whereas it does nothing of the sort.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will take his seat. Some members of the Opposition are ignoring the call to order. I ask them to restrain themselves. There is no need to become heated. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: New section 55i (9) provides that this provision in relation to the dwelling-house does not apply to primary-producing land. A previous Part of the Act applies to

primary-producing land and gives a general rebate of £5,000. Such rebate does not reduce for the higher-value successions. Part IVc of the Act, which applies to primary-producing land, does not detract from the general exemption of £6,000 granted for the widow. It is additive, and the Treasurer did not say it was not additive. He has said that this amendment, which provides an additional exemption over and above the £6,000 where the marital home is involved, does not provide an additional amount for the primary-producing land, but that does not mean to say that the total exemption for primary-producing land does not remain at £11,000. There is a £6,000 general exemption for a widow and children under 21, plus a further £5,000 for primary-producing land. The Treasurer pointed out that this amendment dealing with this section does not apply to primary-producing land. That does not mean that the previous Parts of the Act which are not in this amendment (the general exemption of £6,000 plus a further exemption for primary-producing land) do not apply. What is more, they apply to each succession.

Mr. Hall: They don't.

Mr. HUDSON: With a property of £33,000 divided between three children under 21, the total amount of duty paid, if the value of the primary-producing land contained in that estate was £15,000 or more, would be nil. With three successions each of £11,000, and each succession having the exemption applied to it of £11,000, that is so. This amendment is designed to apply to the marital home, to provide an additional exemption over and above the £6,000 exemption which already applies for the widow and children under 21. It means that, if a widow obtains a succession that includes half the value of a house worth £9,000, that is, £4,500, plus an additional amount of £4,500 so that the total succession to that widow is £9,000, she will pay no duty under this amendment. Up to the sum of £10,000 received by a widow from an estate, the widow concerned would pay either no duty at all or a negligible amount. I pointed out that 92 per cent of the people that die leave an estate of either no value at all or an amount less than £10,000.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And that is the total estate.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and not successions.

Mr. Hall: You can halve that for a start.

Mr. HUDSON: Let me explain the position to the member for Gouger: The total number of personal estates above £10,000 subject to duty as a percentage of the people who die

in any year is 8 per cent. The total number of successions as a percentage of the number of people who die is likely to be less than 8 per cent, because some of these estates greater than £10,000 would be broken up into a number of successions less than £10,000. As I further pointed out regarding the widow, up to the level of £10,000, taking into account the effect of this amendment, the widow will pay either no duty at all or a negligible amount.

The Opposition has introduced into this whole debate (and as it has had the co-operation of the press) a smokescreen designed to protect the large estates. It has tried to convince the people that the ordinary average person would be adversely affected by this Bill. This is a sheer smokescreen, and the worst kind of political fraud I have had to observe since I have been in Parliament. I hope we have heard the last of this sort of argument. The Government is sticking to what it says: it is concerned to see that the extra revenue necessary for Governmental purposes (as admitted by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Onkaparinga) is made available to the State by those who can afford to pay it. That is what we are doing in this legislation. We are being fair, we are not removing incentives to save, and we are not doing the sort of things that the letter writers in the *Advertiser* say we have been planning to do.

Mr. Hall: You have had a lot of second thoughts on this Bill. Why did you do that?

Mr. HUDSON: We wanted to make it quite explicit.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you introduce it in a proper form?

Mr. HUDSON: Will the honourable member agree that it is in a proper form now? Honourable members opposite see some merit in this amendment. If the Opposition does not vote for the amendment it will be telling the people of South Australia that it does not wish to provide extra exemptions for widows. I hope the amendment will receive the full support of all members, and that we will hear no more of the kind of argument that we have heard during the last two weeks.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think the figures quoted by the member for Glenelg of the percentages of the size of the estates that fall into administration in any one year would have any bearing, unless he had given the number of estates of £6,000 or less so that we would know the exact percentage of those who would

benefit under this legislation. I quoted cases, the lowest being of an estate of £7,517. Under the existing law, permitting the use of Form U, the duty was £187 10s. This modest estate of £7,517 would pay £226 10s. under the Bill, a percentage increase of roughly 20 per cent. I understand the Government wants more money and I do not blame it for that, but I do charge it with not understanding where the impact of this Bill will have the most effect, and that is on the people the Government is trying to protect.

Mr. McANANEY: I object strongly to the member for Glenelg saying that certain frauds must be stopped. I was in Parliament when this legislation was amended previously, and the then Opposition raised no objection to the use of Form U. The Attorney-General knows that to make use of a law that is available is perfectly legal. The Treasurer, when Leader of the Opposition, said that he would help widows and that is where the fraud is, because in many cases they will obviously be worse off. That statement could be named as a fraud because there is no legal backing for it. In his policy speech the Treasurer said that a living area would be allowed in respect of a primary producer, but there is less exemption now than under the old law. The Bill is vaguely worded and the Attorney-General gives his interpretation that the £5,000 exemption applies to every succession. If he can make that out of the Bill he is a smarter lawyer than I think he is. There was to be a living area valued at £5,000, which is a ridiculous amount for a farm. Apparently the Government meant that the living area was the house in which the person lived and not the primary-producing land. My son has built a house for £7,000 and the member for Glenelg is saying that he should not have it. Apparently the member for Semaphore is saying that the rest of the community helped him build it. It is ridiculous that the present Government should introduce a Bill that is so badly worded that it is almost impossible to understand it. If the Treasurer were to suggest a sum of £10,000 he would be nearer to honouring the promise he made at the last election.

Mr. HALL: In many instances concessions under these proposals will be far less than they are under the Act. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer stated that a widow succeeding to a primary-producing property of a net value of £11,000 would pay no duty, the inference being that that would be the general rule. What happens when two sons, both over the age of 21 years, succeed to a property?



From reading the tables, I understand they would each receive the normal concession of £3,000, and then half the £5,000, making a total concession of £5,500. It would not be difficult to prove that that was below the 30 per cent rebate provided in most instances under the present legislation. In the case of those two sons, they could be left a property valued at, say, £18,000 for each. I defy the Attorney-General to go to the Upper South-East or to the Mid-North and to see a property worth £18,000 that would support him.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you suggesting that under the old Act they would have inherited it as a Form U benefit?

Mr. HALL: Surely we can consider this on the basis that they are not joint owners, and were perhaps working on their father's property when he died suddenly. If those two sons receive a property valued at £18,000 (which is less than they will need to live on), they will each pay tax on £12,500 at the appropriate rate, which would be more than it would be in the present circumstances. We must consider the average case. The promise made at the election is simply not being honoured.

New clause inserted.

New clause 30a—"Rebate of duty on dwellinghouses passing to widow or widower."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved to insert the following new clause:

30a. The following Part is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after Part IVB. thereof:—

#### PART IVC.

#### REBATE OF DUTY IN RESPECT OF DWELLINGHOUSES.

55i. (1) In this section—

"dwellinghouse", in relation to the widow or widower of a deceased person, means a house which was the principal place of residence of the widow or widower at the time of the death of the deceased person.

(2) Subject to this section and upon the application of the administrator, a rebate of duty shall be allowed where any interest in a dwellinghouse is derived by the widow or widower of a deceased person.

(3) In the case of any such interest derived by the widow of a deceased person, the Commissioner shall, for the purposes of this section—

(a) determine an amount which shall be the sum of—

(i) the value of such interest or Four thousand five hundred pounds, whichever is the less; and

(ii) the value of the aggregate amount of all other property so derived by her or Four thousand five hundred pounds, whichever is the less;

(b) subject to subsection (4) of this section, deduct from the value of the aggregate amount of property which the widow so derives an amount which shall be the amount by which the amount determined under paragraph (a) of this subsection exceeds Six thousand pounds; and

(c) assess the duty payable on the resultant amount.

(4) Where the value of the aggregate amount of property so derived by the widow exceeds Nine thousand pounds, one-half of the amount by which such value exceeds Nine thousand pounds shall be deducted from the amount required to be deducted under paragraph (b) of subsection (3) of this section.

(5) In the case of any such interest derived by the widower of a deceased person, the Commissioner shall, for the purposes of this section—

(a) determine an amount which shall be the sum of—

(i) the value of such interest or Two thousand pounds, whichever is the less;

(ii) the value of aggregate amount of all other property so derived by him or Two thousand pounds, whichever is the less;

(b) subject to subsection (5) of this section, deduct from the value of the aggregate amount of property which the widower so derives an amount which shall be the amount by which the amount determined under paragraph (a) of this subsection exceeds Three thousand pounds; and

(c) assess the duty payable on the resultant amount.

(6) Where the value of the aggregate amount of property so derived by the widower exceeds Four thousand pounds, one-half of the amount by which such value exceeds Four thousand pounds, shall be deducted from the amount required to be deducted under paragraph (b) of subsection (5) of this section.

(7) In determining the value of any interest in a dwellinghouse for the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall—

(a) take into account any charge or encumbrance to which the dwellinghouse is subject; and

(b) include the value of any land of an area not exceeding one-half of an acre on which the dwellinghouse is built and the value of any fixtures and fixed improvements on such land,

but shall not include the value of any domestic appliances, furniture or furnishings in the dwellinghouse.

(8) The rebate allowable under this section shall be the amount of duty which, but for the provisions of this Part, would be payable on the aggregate amount of property derived from the deceased person by the widow or widower and the amount of duty assessed under subsection (3) or (5) of this section in relation to such widow or widower.

(9) No rebate shall be allowed under this Part in respect of any dwellinghouse on land in respect of which a rebate is allowable under Part IVB of this Act.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Third reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill does not in any way satisfy the demands of the Opposition, and we intend to oppose the third reading. At the election the Treasurer made a statement involving three separate issues that were to be the policy of his Government (if elected to office) on succession duties. First, the exemption to widows was to be increased to £6,000; secondly, an exemption would be granted to primary producers, so that they would not pay duty on a living area; and thirdly, succession duties would be raised on larger estates. They were the points made by the Treasurer on this matter. He made no reference to the fact that, in future, successions would be aggregated. No reference was made to the fact that certain successions previously allowed under Form U would be wiped out, and that in many instances widows would be infinitely worse off than they were before. No suggestion was made about an alteration affecting primary producers. Many primary producers will be worse off than they were previously under the exemptions granted in the Bill. As none of these matters was mentioned by the Treasurer in his policy speech, the Opposition maintains that the Government has no mandate to make these alterations.

Moreover, as far as we can determine, the Bill has been drawn up without regard to many matters. In the general haste many things that are aggregated should not have been aggregated. I am assured that it is correct that the amount paid into a superannuation fund by a person all his life will, under the Bill, be dutiable on his death. Can any member opposite justify that? The member for Onkaparinga went to great pains to submit cases to show how adversely the new law would affect many people. It gives concessions not to small estates generally but only to some small estates. These concessions are not uniform and many people will be worse off than they were before. The Treasurer did not say in his policy speech that he would introduce legislation of this nature that would affect people,

although I agree that he said he would levy more duty on larger estates. However, the Bill imposes more duty on smaller estates because of aggregation. The Bill is unacceptable to the Opposition, and we will oppose it to the limit. I hope the House will not accept it because, in my opinion, it does not give effect to the proposals outlined in the Treasurer's policy speech, but provides rather for the contrary.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I support the Leader's remarks. The Leader referred to the proposals in the Treasurer's policy speech which, had they been incorporated in the Bill, would not have aroused opposition from members on this side. In his policy speech the Treasurer promised a reasonable approach to succession duties. As the Leader said, the Treasurer mentioned only one aspect in which he intended to reach out for more, and that was in relation to larger estates. The member for Glenelg said that the Opposition had sought so perpetrate a fraud on the public and to mislead them by the information it was giving to them. That statement is obviously untrue because the facts that were presented to the House by Opposition members proved conclusively that these statements were correct. I take the strongest possible exception to the statement read in the House by the Treasurer and repeated in the press. I cannot find the actual words the Treasurer used.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Make sure you repeat my words.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Treasurer said that the Opposition was more concerned about protecting the large estates of rich people. Although the Treasurer read the statement in the House, I have my suspicions about who prepared it. The Attorney-General and the member for Glenelg said the same thing this afternoon. I take strong exception to this. No member on this side, as far as I can recall, has sought, at least over the last nine years, in debates on succession duties to protect rich people and large estates. No member of the Government Party can point to a quotation in *Hansard* to the contrary. I say that the allegations made by the Government concerning this matter were a lie, and that the Attorney-General and the member for Glenelg have, today, repeated that lie. I said in an earlier speech that I was not concerned about rich people or about large estates, and I believe all members on this side have similar feelings on this matter. I hope that this sort of nonsense and libel will not be repeated by the Government

because it is simply not true, and members opposite know it is not true.

The Government has been under extreme pressure on this measure. Because of well authenticated and well documented statements given in the debate, it has obviously been proved to the Government that the contentions that it had put forward were inaccurate and that there was a good case for amendment and reconsideration of the Bill. The Government has moved certain amendments which, it is suggested today, are of real benefit.

Mr. Nankivell: They were not in the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, they were second thoughts arising from pressure inside and outside of the House. Having thrown a net around the whole school, the Government then claimed that it was being magnanimous and helpful to most sections of the community if it let out of the net one little fish. I hope the Government will appreciate that bringing down this sort of dragnet legislation, whether in regard to succession duties or to any other matter, involves it in a hopeless tangle. If the Government sets out by legislation to do certain things, let it approach the legislation from the positive angle; let it put into the legislation precisely what it wants to achieve, and not just throw a net around the whole set of circumstances and then, because of pressures, misunderstandings and second thoughts, begin to make amendments and provide for exemptions. That is a bad approach to legislation. The proper procedure is to design the legislation to do precisely what is required and no more. In this case the Treasurer has served a confidence trick on the public by saying in his policy speech that he is going to do one thing and then doing something entirely different in its effect. When the last clause was put through I heard a member opposite say, "They did not even bother to divide." Well, of course we did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have never wanted to stifle debate in any way. I have allowed the honourable member for Finders to refer at some length to debate that took place in Committee and to reply to debate that took place in Committee, when I think the reply should have come in Committee. This debate is concerned with the Bill as it came from the Committee, and therefore I do not want the honourable member to pursue that line of debate.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate your point, Mr. Speaker. I know that I did somewhat transgress the Standing Orders earlier in my remarks. However, I think you

will appreciate that I had strong reasons for so doing. I do appreciate the latitude that you gave. The reason why we did not pursue this matter further in Committee was not that we were satisfied with the Bill. In fact, the Bill, as it has come to us out of Committee, is entirely unsatisfactory. We have had to work very hard to get the amendments that we have got, and we have to be satisfied at this point. However, this Bill is not finished in Parliament yet, and I do not know what the ultimate result will be. We oppose this Bill at the third reading, and we shall carry our opposition to the point of division. We hope that before this Bill becomes law some other people in some other place will be able to exercise more judgment upon it. I oppose the third reading.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I oppose this Bill as it comes from the Committee. The Bill in its present form has been vaunted and held up as a concession to primary producers.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And widows.

Mr. HALL: Yes. However, on an £18,000 property inherited each by two sons over 21 the extra tax payable under this legislation will be £147. It is nothing but a fraud. How can it be a concession to primary producers? On that point alone, apart from its many other undesirable features, I must oppose the Bill. I say that it deserves the disapproval of this House.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I was charged, unfairly, with speaking on this Bill purely because of the impact it would have on large estates. I have never adopted that attitude, and I say here and now that, if the Government must have more money, succession duties is a proper source from which to get it. If I were in the Government and I wanted more money to carry on the affairs of State, that would be the place I would seek to get it. However, the Bill will have an impact upon certain estates which I do not believe the Government envisages. I could have sat tight when the Bill was introduced and left the Government to muddle through and get into a mess. However, it has never been my principle to avoid helping a person in trouble, so I did an honest job of trying to bring out what I thought were the inequities and injustices to people who can ill afford to pay even a modest increase, especially when we have been telling them they are going to get a concession.

I cannot imagine that the criticism I heard came from anybody who knows me well. I cannot visualize how anybody could accuse

me of being out to protect the big estates. If I remember rightly, the whole Playford Government was criticized by some of our own people for seeking additional revenue from just that source. I can say that we took care never to do anything that would hit the small man. It is because of the very provisions of the existing law that these small estates were protected. I am not opposing the Government's raising revenue, but I am opposing this Bill because I think the impact is an unfair one.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I oppose the third reading. Throughout the whole debate we have been hammering the fact that the smaller and moderate estates will be hit. When I refer to the moderate estates I mean those estates in which a certain amount of capital is required. It is in the State's interest to ensure that those estates are not deprived of that capital. At no time have I decried the fact that rates were to be raised on the higher estates. In fact, in the second reading debate I said that if I had £50,000 I would give some of it away to a hospital and would not necessarily leave it all to my children, because I think all that is required is sufficient capital to carry on and for full protection to be given to the widow and the children under 21. We have spoken so strongly on this subject because in many instances the widow and children will be worse off than under the existing legislation.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I oppose the third reading of this Bill as it came from the Committee, and I oppose it from the first clause to the last because I am opposed to succession duties. Of all the vicious forms of taxation this could possibly be the worst. Apparently everyone agrees that we should sock the rich. The Attorney-General interjected and said it should be obtained from our rich supporters. Of what crime are these people guilty? The member for Glenelg said that £750,000 would be raised from 8 per cent of the estates. Of what crimes are the great pastoral properties of South Australia guilty? These people have done more to build the resources of this State than possibly anyone else, but they are classed as the iniquitous rich and the people who, under the old Labor Party style of distributing the wealth, have to be taxed. I support these people who by sheer industry and application to their jobs have acquired wealth, as in doing that they committed no evil. Why should the tax be raised from them? They are amongst the most worthy people in this State, but because they happen to be rich they

are branded with the mark of Cain. I will never agree to that. I have never supported succession duties except when they have been reduced, and I will never support any increase in this taxation from whatever grade of wealth it is extracted. This is a degrading and vicious form of taxation and denies many people any benefits, therefore, I oppose the third reading.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I oppose the third reading of the Bill as it has come from the Committee. The Opposition has been accused of not voting against the second reading, so that when we are accused of not opposing it, the only thing to do is to speak against it. I am not opposed to succession duties, as all countries have them and we have to raise revenue, but I strongly oppose the vicious succession duties envisaged in this Bill. The Bill is bad and will destroy the idea of saving so that people will spend money rather than save it. People receiving social service benefits have had the same opportunity as most people, but instead of saving their money they wasted it, and now those that have it have to look after them. If the stage comes when everyone has to be looked after, who pays then? I do not believe the statement that £750,000 is to come from 8 per cent of the people. If it is true, it is so much worse that this money is being taken from them by succession duties. I know that more than 8 per cent of the people in this State can afford to pay succession duties. It is not right that the 8 per cent should pay, as the wealth of the State is more evenly distributed than that. I am sure that even the Attorney-General cannot understand this Bill, so how can anyone understand it? The member for Onkaparinga has had advice from experts in these matters, but they are not sure what it means. If they do not know, how can a layman understand it? The Bill is bad and, if it is necessary, it should be re-introduced after being redrafted.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.  
Noes—Messrs. Brookman and Teusner.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

#### HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2723.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I rise to support the Bill. I believe it would be strange for this session of Parliament to pass without our witnessing the introduction of a Bill to extend the application of the Prices Act. Of course, similar Bills have always been supported by honourable members opposite and, indeed, that support is in line with a plank of the Labor Party's platform. I, too, have supported similar Bills right from the time when I first entered the House. One of the subjects to which I first decided to devote some interest was price control, which decision aroused some interest on the part of those who wondered why I should speak about and support such controversial legislation in those days. I believe that I was well able to speak on the matter in those days, because I had come fresh from bringing up a family and budgeting in the home, believing that I knew something of the impact of price control on most items required by a family.

Since then, I have always supported legislation to continue price control. I am perhaps not so able to speak now with authority about the matter, because I do not have the same family responsibilities, or the same household to run, that I had when I first came into the House. Earlier today when I was discussing this matter with my friend the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) he said that I had committed myself too early to the support of price control, and had placed myself in the position of not being able to retract my earlier remarks. However, I have never desired to retract those remarks, and I reiterate today that I think price control in South Australia has generally been of service to the community. When I secured the adjournment of this debate I thought I should make myself conversant with those items still under price control in South Australia. Many of us may know that in recent years the control on many items has been lifted. I also desired to know

the services that were still subject to the supervision of the Prices Commissioner and, by telephone, I obtained particulars of the various categories still subject to price control in this State.

Because of the effluxion of time, and because many items (including services) have been decontrolled, I shall give the House a list of items that remain under price control for the benefit of the public. These are items which I am informed by an officer of the Prices Department, are still under control. The first item concerns groceries and foodstuffs, such as breakfast foods, bread, milk (and all the commodities used for the nourishment of a family), soap, sauces, infants' foods, and flour. The second item is clothing (not including fashion garments but articles that pertain to the ordinary work-a-day world of men, women and children) including overalls, working garments, and apparel. Thirdly, we have nursery squares—

Mr. Millhouse: We call them nappies.

Mrs. STEELE: —infants' and babies' shawls and footwear; fourthly, household equipment and appliances (including ordinary utensils used in the kitchen). The fifth category includes glass for glasshouses, windows and panes of glass for houses. Then, the sixth item includes commodities required, in the main, in the building industry, by which control the prices of houses built in this State have been kept many hundreds of pounds below those in other States. The building materials listed include bricks and blocks, builders' hardware, caneite and masonite, cast iron, porcelain, enamel ware, earthenware and stoneware pipes, and fittings. Item 7 is fibrous plaster for walls and ceilings; item 8 is fittings used in connection with drainage, sewerage and water installations; item 9 is joinery; item 10 is tiles of all kinds such as roof, wall and floor tiles; item 11 refers to metals such as galvanized iron for roofing purposes, zinc and annealed sheets, and plain and corrugated iron; item 12 is galvanized steel pipes and fittings; item 13 is hides, leather and fibre, such as leather for shoe repairs; item 14 is tyres and tubes; item 15 is paper and stationery and includes school requisites such as pencils, chalk, erasers, note books, exercise books, and text books for primary and secondary students; item 16 keeps under control drugs, chemicals and acids, such as sulphuric acid, which is essential in connection with the manufacture of superphosphate; item 17 is listed as manures and fertilizers; item 18 is poisons, drenches and sprays; item 19 is oils, paints, varnishes and

so on (although paint has now been removed from control), kerosene, lubricating oil, petroleum and shale products other than aviation fuels. We all know that in relation to petroleum South Australia has set the pattern that other States have been pleased to follow. Therefore, there has been a common price of petrol throughout Australia, although we know this varies in certain parts.

Mr. Millhouse: I wonder whether that is accurate.

Mrs. STEELE: I queried this with the Prices Department and was told that the standard set for the price of petrol in South Australia, with relation to all the particular facts that come into the assessment of the price, is followed by the other States. We provide a basis, at least, for fixing the price of petrol. Item 20 is resins, thinners, turps and articles used for painting. Item 21 is sand, gravel and stone, and the products of quarries. I point out that out of the 21 separate items, nine items under control are associated with the building industry.

In addition to goods under control, there are many services over which the Prices Department exerts a measure of control. These again form a considerable list. This list includes prices in connection with milling and machining of timber, any process in the manufacturing of clothing, and boot and shoe repairs. Also included is bricklaying, which includes cement blocks. Then there is the building of dwellings as such, building repairs, alterations and renovations; carpentering; cartage, haulage and delivery charges; electrical work and repairs and the installation of electrical wiring in houses; footwear manufacturing; funeral, cemetery and crematorium services; and men's and boys' hairdressers. I queried whether women's hairdressing did not come under this control. I was told that it did not because of the vagaries of fashion which meant that it was impossible to fix a price owing to the individual styling. That is one of the penalties women have to pay for being fashion-conscious and for trying to keep themselves beautiful for their lords and masters.

In the list are included the manufacture of bricks and blocks (cement or concrete); meat pies and pasties; paper and paper hanging; plastering; plumbing and repairs; tiling and floor laying; and termite and white ant treatment services. Out of the 19 services I have listed, 14 are associated with the house-building industry in South Australia. Another item I have overlooked is non-intoxicating drinks, aerated waters, mineral waters, fruit juice

cordials and extracts, and ice cream. When one reflects on all the items and services that I have given, one sees that effective control is exerted on these lines in South Australia, and that this has a big influence on the day-to-day living of the people.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that this compares with other States?

Mrs. STEELE: When visiting other States I have made a comparison. When men have their shoes repaired at least they get value from the amount of rubber put on their heels. I am afraid women pay through the nose, as it were, for heel repairs they may have to have done. I know that when I have had my shoes repaired in other States I have been appalled at how much more I have had to pay than I pay in South Australia. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer referred to house-building, and those of us who have taken the trouble to compare prices of building in South Australia and in other States (and it does not matter whether it is a house built in brick or in any other kind of building material) have seen that the price in South Australia is always hundreds of pounds cheaper.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you seriously put that down to price control?

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, I do. I shall probably be taken to task for some of the things I have said, but I sincerely believe they are the result of careful price control. I think that South Australia has a record for house-building, and the lower cost of house-building has been contributed to largely by the control not only of all the goods associated with house-building but also of the services necessary to erect a house. In addition to the normal run of things which the Prices Department examines (sometimes at the request of people who have complained about high charges), it also undertakes investigations for the Government into many different matters. It has made investigations into hire-purchase trading and into the price of wine grapes. As I have already said, it has also set a pattern in the pricing of petrol that is followed by other States. I think we owe the Prices Department much. I pay a tribute to the Commissioner who recently resigned from his post. Over the years I think he was a very good public servant for South Australia, not only for his work as the Prices Commissioner but for the detailed investigation he undertook into extraneous matters outside his department. Invariably his findings were acceptable to the people who were concerned with the inquiries he was undertaking. I think

this Parliament, the Government, and the people of South Australia owe him something for the services he gave during the time he was Prices Commissioner.

The Government has intimated, through the second reading explanation of this Bill, that this legislation is being extended for several reasons. One reason given, apart from the fact that it was extending price control, was that the present Prices Act contained provisions relating to unfair trading practices. I think the inference from that is that the Government thought that there was virtue in the sections that were added to the Act to control unfair and restrictive trade practices. It is the intention of the Government, we are told, to introduce separate legislation on this matter, and this will be done some time in the new year. Whether or not it is to be done in this session of Parliament, we do not know, but it is the Government's intention to introduce special legislation for this purpose. Apart from the fact that the Commonwealth Government expects to bring down legislation for this purpose, the State still thinks it desirable to initiate legislation of its own, and in this it is following the practice of the previous Government.

Another reason given in the second reading explanation was that this legislation was being continued because with the introduction of decimal currency it was thought that some unscrupulous traders might take advantage of the change-over to exploit the public. I think this was the main import of what the Premier had to say. I point out (and I think this is the right place and the right time to do it) that when the Municipal Tramways Trust increased its fares recently the excuse for the very steep increase was that this was to bring it into line with decimal currency when it was introduced.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think the M.T.T. had its increases vetted by the Prices Commissioner?

Mrs. STEELE: I do not imagine so, because we all made a song and dance about the increases at the time. As I say, one reason given by the Government for the extension of this legislation was that it was thought that unscrupulous traders might take advantage of the change-over to decimal currency. We found at the time that the increases in fares were steep; they were graded in denominations of 6d., because it was thought this would more readily coincide with decimal currency when it was introduced next February. I pointed out then (and I point it out again now) that when fares were increased in New South Wales

recently this same reason was given, but their increases went up in increments of 2c and not 5c, which was suggested here as the most convenient for the trust to adopt. Therefore, I think it is rather naive of the Government to make this suggestion as a reason for extending the Act when this is actually what it sanctioned for M.T.T. fare increases.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, it was the reason given by the previous Government last year, too.

Mrs. STEELE: I will leave the honourable member for Mitcham to deal with that point when he gets to his feet; he can justify it himself then. One of the other points the Bill makes is that the maximum prices on the introduction of decimal currency should be those that existed one month before February 14, and that this will protect the public. That seems to me to be a very good thing, because in the change-over to decimal currency there will not be any opportunity to increase the prices and they must be kept at the same level as they were a month before the introduction of decimal currency. I think the main point is that extending the operations of the Act beyond the end of this year is primarily to ensure that the public gets a fair deal and that it is treated correctly in prices of goods and services. It is not only the city people, of course, who benefit from the price control that we have in South Australia. The primary producer, too, is helped immeasurably to keep his costs down by the control of items that relate to the rural industries and to primary production. While he is also benefiting from the fact that he gets the overall benefit of all the other items that I mentioned earlier, he does, of course, get special benefit from the items that are particularly related to working his property.

Reverting once more to the price of house building, I point out that the price of timber in South Australia has been decontrolled for some considerable time. However, it is one of those things on which a close watch is kept by the Prices Department, because there is some difference of opinion between what the people in the industry consider a fair price and what the Commissioner thinks from the point of view of the consumer is a fair price. I think the greatest tribute that can be paid to the Prices Department is that when prices have to be fixed the parties are brought together in the Commissioner's office, where discussion takes place; a price is then suggested, allowing a fair margin for profit, and this is usually

accepted with good grace by both parties; and that price is thereupon established as being the fair and proper price for that particular item or service.

Mr. Millhouse: I think someone has been telling you fairy tales.

Mr. McAnaney: So do I.

Mrs. STEELE: I know the members for Mitcham and Stirling are going to oppose this legislation. I am not just quoting this as a result of having a talk to the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Millhouse: You have been to the happy, happy merchants under control, perhaps?

Mrs. STEELE: I have had (and I am sure other members of this House have too) many people tell me that they had not been justly treated regarding services people have rendered to them in respect of work carried out around their houses. In most instances when I have taken up a complaint with the Prices Commissioner's office the matter has been investigated, after which a discussion has taken place and the price has been considerably reduced. It is interesting to know, because of the Electrical Contractors and Workers Licensing Bill currently before the House, that there has been considerable difficulty in keeping within reasonable control prices charged for electrical installations. I do not know what will happen when the Bill becomes law, but if electrical workers and contractors are to make up for the special expenses they incur in reaching a higher status, what will they charge in future? This aspect may provide much work for the Prices Commissioner. Another service that has needed investigation is the cost of plumbing and plumbing services. I have had several jobs done at my house and the price I have paid does not seem reasonable when compared with the service provided.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know many wealthy plumbers, and I don't know what you expect plumbers to live on.

Mrs. STEELE: I have paid them and had not complained, but I considered that the jobs were expensive and I did not get much work for what I paid. The Prices Commissioner has investigated the price of houses and the difficulties that house owners have experienced in building, particularly in respect of houses built on the doubtful soils around Adelaide. Unless a strong foundation is used these houses are susceptible to cracking, and many people have brought to the notice of the Prices Commissioner instances where they have paid money in good faith for houses that soon show signs of deterioration. These matters have

been investigated by the Prices Commissioner, and although these problems have not been resolved to the complete satisfaction of everyone, investigations have been useful to the building trade in overcoming problems inherent in building of houses on some of the difficult soil areas around Adelaide. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The member for Burnside may be able to guess what I am going to say, but she grieves me. She is a girl who is hard working, intelligent and usually right on the ball, but on this occasion, as on other occasions when this matter has been debated, she is far from realistic. It grieves me that the representative of a good district like Burnside (almost as good as the district of Mitcham) should speak in the way in which she has. It is a great pity that the member for Burnside, when speaking for the first time in this House, chose this topic, and thus committed herself for all time as a supporter of price control. Admittedly she said today that she does not use her shopping basket as much as she did because of her duties as a member of this House. That was the thing that made her first espouse the cause of price control.

Mrs. Steele: Practical realism!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Taking around her capacious shopping basket and doing the family shopping. Now she is engaged as a member of Parliament she does not do that quite so often, and one does not so often see her carrying the family goods. It is a pity she does not feel able to temper the views she first expressed with a little commonsense. This year South Australia has seen a new Government and we have had many changes, most of them for the worse. However, I regret that there has been no change in the established pattern of price control. Any change in this matter would have been one for the better. I am not surprised that there has been no change in the outlook of the Labor Government about price control. The Australian Labor Party has, over the years, supported price control, even though as time has passed it has become more and more obvious that it is completely useless. The support of the Labor Party for price control has been based on two factors. The first is the same as that which motivates the member for Burnside, and that is sheer pride and an unwillingness to admit a mistake. The second is that the Labor Party is a Socialist party and restrictions of all sorts are dear to the hearts of the members of that Party. Price control does impose restrictions



on some members of the community, therefore on doctrinaire grounds the Labor Party favours price control.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Are you in favour of the Law Society?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Since I have been here the Leader has been fond of dragging that red herring across the trail, but it is not accurate. There is no price control imposed by the Law Society.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that before dinner I dealt with the remarks of the member for Burnside and, so as not to hurt her feelings, I shall not say any more about her. I am opposed to price control for the same reasons on this occasion as I have been in the other sessions when a similar Bill has come before the House. I do not intend to go over all those reasons, but I do not believe that any of them has ever been answered by any other member in this House.

I hold to all the reasons I have given over the years in my opposition to price control. As I say, I do not believe that any of those reasons has ever been shown to be wrong. On this occasion I am fortified in my opposition to price control by what has been happening in the United Kingdom in the last 12 months or so. As you know, Mr. Speaker, a Labor Government was elected by the narrowest of margins in the United Kingdom in, I think, October of last year. One problem which it has faced (and which was faced by its predecessor) is the problem of rising prices. There has been much debate about this in the U.K. Parliament and throughout the English community generally, but it is noteworthy that, of all of the remedies for rising prices that have been proposed in that country, never has it been suggested that price control of the sort that we have in South Australia should be imposed. I have here the white paper entitled, "Prices and Incomes Policy", which was presented to Parliament by Mr. George Brown, the First Secretary of State and Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in Parliament this year. No-one, I think, could accuse Mr. George Brown of being anything but a Socialist (and a convinced Socialist at that), and a person who one would think, as he is of the same persuasion as members of the Government, would favour price control. However, what did he say in the white paper that he presented on this subject? Dealing with considerations affecting prices, he said:

The development of an effective policy for keeping the general level of prices stable will

call for considerable efforts on the part of management generally to increase efficiency, avoid cost increases and, wherever possible, to stabilize or reduce prices.

So he is thinking of the same thing as we are thinking of in this debate. He continues:

The rate of change of the average level of prices over any period of time is determined by differing movements of a very large number of individual prices.

With that, I suggest, nobody can argue. The white paper continues:

Even when the average level of prices is rising there are many prices which fall.

It is the next sentence to which I particularly ask honourable members to listen:

It would be impossible to lay down detailed rules which would cover all the circumstances which individual enterprises faced when deciding prices to ask for their products.

That is the very thing we try to do by virtue of price control. We set up an outside authority (the Prices Commissioner), responsible to the Minister concerned, to fix a maximum price for things, and yet that is what Mr. George Brown said about the matter. It is just too complicated to do it.

Mr. Lawn: We do it with wages.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the whole vice of price control. It is a pity the member for Burnside did not think about these things.

Mr. Lawn: The two are related.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course they are.

Mr. Lawn: They don't fix wages in England with an outside tribunal as we do in Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the member for Adelaide would care to look at this paper, because it is entitled, "Prices and Incomes Policy". He would see that both these facets were discussed in it. This paper was obtained for me by our Parliamentary Library from the Public Library, and it would do the member for Adelaide more good reading this than interjecting along the lines on which he is trying to interject just now. Let me read the sentence again, so that it will sink in:

It would be impossible to lay down detailed rules which would cover all the circumstances which individual enterprises faced when deciding prices to ask for their products.

And yet, that is the very thing we asked an outside authority to do in South Australia. More significant, in all the discussions about assisting price stabilization in Great Britain, there is never any suggestion of the imposition of price control, because it is accepted by everyone in Great Britain that price control just does not work. It never has worked, and it never will work to keep prices down. Our own experience in this State shows that that

is the fact. The explanation used by the new Premier when introducing this Bill contained a number of reasons (six, I think). In years gone by I have chided the former Premier for changing the reasons every year. That sank into somebody, because the reasons given this time are almost precisely in the same words as the reasons given to support the Bill in 1964.

Mr. Lawn: They were successful then; why wouldn't they be successful now?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The weight of numbers was successful, but the reasons are not more valid now than they were then. The first reason given (and the member for Burnside spent some time on this) is the changeover to decimal currency. It was suggested last year that people would cheat (and that is the implication of the speech) if there were not some watch dog to make sure they did not do the wrong thing. Why on earth the merchants and manufacturers (or some of them) in this State are regarded as more likely to cheat and to do the wrong thing than are their counterparts in other States, I do not know. I do not know why, every time this Bill is introduced into the House, the merchants and the commercial community in this State are insulted in that way, but that is, in fact, what happens.

Mrs. Steele: If the cap fits wear it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Burnside apparently believes this. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

First, the introduction of decimal currency in February, 1966. Unless watched carefully, some traders could use the advent of decimal currency to their own advantage.

All that means is that they are likely to cheat about it. I do not believe this is justification for it and it certainly has not been a justification in the past. Although we are going to have decimal currency in the next 12 months, I do not believe this is a worthy reason to put forward at all. The only different provision in this Bill, except for the change of date, is the one dealing with the conversion to decimal currency. This is mere camouflage because it could as easily have been inserted in that celebrated Bill we passed recently—the Decimal Currency Bill. If members look at that they will see it contained changes to many Acts of Parliament to provide for decimal currency. However, it was decided to bolster up the reasons in this case by including this provision in the Bill. The ghost writer for the Premier had the good sense to say that it was purely a machinery amendment.

Other reasons were given for the Bill, such as the reference to certain trading practices.

In the Bill are provisions relating to restrictive trade practices. On this I agree with the Government. I agree with restrictive trade practice legislation and I believe it should be permanent. However, I do not believe it should be continued, as it has been in this particular Bill, in order that it should be used as an excuse for the continuation of this Act. This is different from restrictive trade practice legislation because it affects only some of the merchants and manufacturers, whereas restrictive trade practice legislation covers the whole field and treats everybody alike. That is why I support one and oppose the other. The member for Burnside spent some time giving the items still under control. I am grateful to her for doing that. Usually I ask a question on notice and get this information in *Hansard* in a less painful way than by giving it in the House, and I use this information to illustrate that only a few items are under the control of the State. Are the people who manufacture and sell these things less moral than those who sell and manufacture other things? Why should some be penalized and not others? This is one of the basic unfairnesses of the matter. If everybody were under control at least everybody would be on the same footing and suffer from the same disabilities. Why should we pick out some things and not others? The member for Burnside talked about the housing industry. She was correct there because those trades and practices connected with building are singled out under this legislation (purely for political purposes) for control. Why should not the member for Torrens be under control as he is an engineer in competition?

Mr. Coumbe: I am uncontrollable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is uncontrolled.

Mr. Heaslip: He has free competition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: These things apply as much to other trades as they do to the building trade. This is one of the most unfair things about price control, and I am disappointed in the member for Burnside in that she ignores these matters when she gives her blessing to the Bill. A vague phrase was used in the Premier's second reading explanation that internal pressures in the economy are increasing and are already evidenced by an upward trend in some prices. Nothing could be vaguer than that, and nothing could be more specious than to say that and use it as an excuse for price control. I am sorry that the member for Burnside did not deal with this matter in her speech. In this morning's

*Advertiser* appeared an article under the heading "Plea for Boost to Industries", which states:

The Australian manufacturing industry was showing increasing signs of a general slowing down, the president of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures said today.

That is the very opposite of the reasons put up by the Premier in supporting price control. He said:

The internal pressures in the economy are increasing and are already evidenced by an upward trend in some prices.

No examples are given and there is nothing but that vague assertion backed up by nothing at all, yet it is absolutely contrary to the facts of economic life in Australia at present. There are other reasons, much the same, set out in the Premier's second reading explanation. Most of them are the same, word for word, as was set out by the former Premier last year. In some cases the very words are the same. It is obvious what happens and that is that the precedent of the speech for the previous year is used and the gaps are simply filled in.

Mr. Jennings: So everybody is out of step but you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think that is correct even in this Chamber, but if it is correct in this Chamber then I am certainly in step with the vast majority of people outside it. I hope I can show that now as I have shown it in years gone by. The second reading explanation has already begun as follows:

In asking the House to agree to an extension of the Prices Act for another 12 months the Government is satisfied, etc.

It will be interesting to see if the same sentence appears next year if this iniquitous legislation is continued again. If members like to compare the reasons for last year and for this year all they have to do is look at the speech for this year and then go back to page 564 of last year's *Hansard* and see there just the same reasons which were just as inapplicable last year and just as unjust as they are this year.

Mr. Hudson: They were better spoken this year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the joke of the century. The effect is the same but I suggest, even though I opposed it last year as I do this year, that I enjoyed listening to it being read by the former Premier more than I enjoyed listening to it this time.

I have already referred to the white paper. Perhaps I should make it clear for the benefit of members on both sides of the House that

this paper was prepared in co-operation with representatives of the Trade Unions Congress and employers' organizations in Great Britain, and was presented by George Brown so that, in fact, it is a pretty fair representation of thought on economic matters in the United Kingdom. I hope that I have said enough already to show that the Bill is unfair to some sections of the community. The member for Burnside prefers (as she always does on this matter), to think only of the consumer. She does not give two thoughts for the merchant or manufacturer and the burden he bears in this matter. She thinks only of the advantages to the consumer. Naturally, all of us would like to have everything for nothing, or certainly much more cheaply than we pay for it now; that is only human. However, it does not add up to an argument in favour of the control of prices. The other great reason which I advance against price control as we know it is that we are vesting considerable arbitrary powers in one man or in one department. May I remind honourable members (as I have done before) of the terms of section 8 and 9 of the Prices Act. Those are sections which, alas, despite my efforts in past years, have remained unchanged in the Act since it was enacted in 1948. Perhaps the member for Burnside will listen to this because I remind her that in other Bills before this House we have opposed less sweeping and drastic measures than this. That sections states:

For the purposes of this Act, an authorized officer may require any person—

- (a) to furnish him with any information which he requires or
- (b) to answer any questions put to him, or
- (c) to produce at a time and place indicated by the authorized officer any books, papers and documents, including balance sheets and accounts, relating to any goods or services whether declared or not, or to any land or any other matter arising out of this Act.

Sir, that is a most sweeping and arbitrary power to vest in any one man, yet year after year we are prepared to vest the Prices Commissioner with this power.

Mrs. Steele: The investigations are done with great discretion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When the member for Burnside says that, I know she is talking tongue in cheek, for even she cannot believe that that is the case. Section 8 goes on in similar vein. As I say, it is a most arbitrary provision. Section 9, of course, gives a right of entry and investigation to any authorized officer. It states:

For the purposes of this Act an authorized officer may enter upon, inspect and search any premises and inspect any documents books and papers, and may inspect and take samples of any stocks of declared goods or any other goods.

Subsection (2) says that he has to be authorized by the Commissioner. However, that is all that is required. This is a most sweeping power, and it is one that I suggest should not exist in a democracy such as we have now. During this session we have had arguments on matters less serious than this, and I venture to say, from some of the Bills on the Notice Paper, that we will have arguments on other matters less serious than this before this session is out. Yet gaily, year after year, we complacently extend these arbitrary powers. I should like some honourable member on either side of the House to get up and defend these powers if he can. I am dashed if I can see how they can be defended. What is the result of them? Let us not talk only in theory about this. Very often the facts of a fixation are never brought to the light of day, and we never know them. Parliament itself can never get at the facts that have led to the fixation of a maximum price. If one tries, one is met with the oath of secrecy that is imposed by section 7 and told that these things are private and cannot be divulged. In other words, Parliament is not the master in this case, and that is a very bad thing. There is another Bill before this House now about which there has been much complaint, but it does not go nearly as far as this in the secrecy it imposes. No-one is ever able to decide whether or not the fair thing has been done. We hear one story from one side and another story from the other side, and one is never in possession of the full facts to enable one to make up one's own mind.

Mr. Hall: You would not say the Commonwealth income tax authorities should make all its investigations public.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are not talking about income tax now, and there is no relevance in the honourable member's remarks. Let me just for a moment remind members that in the last week we have had a very good example of a difference of opinion on a price fixation. I refer to the vexed question of the price of superphosphate in this State, a matter that is controlled by the operations of the Prices Commissioner. Questions were asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and, I think, by the Leader himself, as to why an increase had been given in this matter. On November 16, the member for Flinders asked a question

and put it in the form of a complaint that there had been a rise in the price of superphosphate. In reply to the question, the Premier, as the Minister in charge of prices, said:

A further increase was proposed, but the Prices Commissioner made suggestions to assist this industry in its future expansion. My information discloses that because of the previous Government's actions in grinding down all the time we were left to a certain extent with the proposed increases.

Now, the language is not entirely clear and not entirely felicitous, but what it means, pretty obviously, is that the previous Government depressed the maximum price of superphosphate unduly so that it was necessary for this Government to give a pretty hefty increase.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you believe that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to buy into that argument one way or the other. It is a pity the member for Flinders was not here at the beginning of my speech. For his benefit, I repeat that I use this simply as an illustration of the fact that opinions differ on what is a fair price and that what one Government thinks the other Government does not think; yet, because the facts are kept private, we are unable to make up our minds. Sir, this is a very grave and a very unjust thing in our community, and it is one of the other things I wish the member for Burnside had touched on in her speech.

I do not intend to say much more about this. I have already, I hope, emphasized that I believe that in this Act we give too great and too arbitrary power to one man. I do not intend to go over the experience which the Government has had and which we have had regarding that man in the last 12 months, but I suggest that it illustrates the danger of giving such arbitrary powers to be exercised by an individual, virtually untrammelled. This is a very serious thing, and it is a most unfortunate experience that we have had. The last point I make, as I have made before, is this: why, if price control has so many advantages; why, if it has the advantages that are set out in this speech; and why, if it has the advantages that were told to us before dinner by the member for Burnside, does it not appeal to any other State in the Commonwealth of Australia? Why has every other State substantially abandoned price control and only South Australia continued with it, if the advantages are so obvious? If we are so much better off with price control than is any other State, one would have thought that

one of the other five States, be they Labor or Liberal, would have reintroduced price control to get some benefits that we in South Australia are getting from it.

Mr. Hall: Why are building costs lower here?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe that is because of price control. If it were, why do other States not jump on the band waggon and have lower prices for buildings by reintroducing price control on the lines on which we have it in this State. Sir, there are many reasons. The British white paper underlined the fact that these things are so complex and complicated that it is impossible to make an arbitrary decision and give arbitrary reasons for particular changes. It cannot be done. Figures show that price control has not kept down prices in this State. I have an extract from the *Industrial Information Bulletin* of August, 1965, which sets out the basic wages in the various States. I refer to that merely to show that there is no significant difference between South Australia and the other States. The basic wage in Adelaide is £15 3s.; in Sydney, £15 15s.; in Melbourne, £15 7s.; in Perth-Fremantle, £15 8s.; and in Brisbane, where, in 1957, a long reign of Labor came to an end, a Country-Liberal Government came to power, and price control was promptly abandoned, the basic wage is £14 10s. Apparently prices did not rise there to the extent that they have risen elsewhere.

I quote the figures to show that our level is not significantly different from the level anywhere else. What about the consumer price index that measures changes in price levels in various places? This may interest the member for Burnside because she relies on her experience in other States to show how much better off we are here than are people in the other States. The base year for the consumer price index is 1952-53, and that is taken as 100 in every State. For the year ended June, 1965, Adelaide's figure was 128.6. At the same time the weighted average of the six State capital cities was 130.4 or 1.8 above the figure of this State. In Sydney the figure was 128.8; in Perth 127.6; and in Canberra (one of the fastest-growing cities in Australia) 128.1. Surely these figures show that price control has made no significant difference to our level of prices, because it has been the experience through history that price control does not keep prices down. South Australia is no exception to the general economic laws. Why should it be? Our experience has been the general experience throughout history. So price control

does not work, does not keep prices down, but does grave injustice to some sections of the community. It vests great and arbitrary powers most undesirably in one individual. It is for these reasons that I oppose price control, and for these reasons that I intend to vote against the second reading.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill, and wish to reply to some remarks of the member for Mitcham. We recently had questions asked about the price of superphosphate, and I suggest to the honourable member that had there been no price control here the present price would not be the price paid by the farmers of this State for superphosphate. Over the years I listened attentively to the then Premier's statement when explaining this Bill, and more than once he told members the sum saved by consumers because of the operation of this Act, and showed the price asked for by the seller and the price ultimately fixed by the Prices Commissioner. It was claimed by the previous Government that building costs were lower in South Australia than elsewhere, and it has been claimed that prices fixed in South Australia for oil and petrol are those accepted in other States. No-one can convince me that price control has not been a success here. When other States follow the prices fixed in this State, it is obvious they use price control without facing up to their responsibility of introducing it. For years the member for Mitcham has approached the previous Prices Commissioner with complaints on behalf of his constituents, and even during the controversy between the member for Mitcham and the Prices Commissioner, the Prices Commissioner stated publicly that the honourable member used to go to the Prices Department and discuss prices with him on behalf of his constituents.

Mr. McKee: The honourable member never mentioned that.

Mr. LAWN: No. I remind the honourable member that a person can speak on a certain subject and act in another way.

Mr. McKee: Why do they control wages?

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham said that it was impossible to arbitrarily control prices, and that opinions differed as to what was a fair price. Opinions differ as to a fair price to a person selling goods or labour. I suppose the opinions of 100 people working in industry would differ as to what they considered was the value of their labour. I suppose if 100 persons were selling the same commodity there would be many differences of opinion as to what the price should be. I

concede that. However, the honourable member would agree to control all wages, although tonight he said that he did not believe in setting up an outside tribunal on prices.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not say that. You have gone too far.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member spoke of an outside tribunal and in his speech objected to the setting up of one. If he objects to that regarding prices, why should he advocate in 1958 that it should apply to members here with relation to another matter. He believes in an outside authority being set up to control employees' wages and salaries and that the employees should observe the wages fixed by that outside tribunal. Opinions differ as to what the wages and salaries should be, and that tribunal hears the arguments for and against and gives an impartial judgment. If this is done in regard to wages and salaries, why cannot it be done in regard to prices?

Mr. Ryan: Of course, prices are fixed only on the maximum that can be charged, aren't they?

Mr. LAWN: Of course. I think the member for Mitcham was looking at it from the point of view of the maximum's not being high enough, and not from the point of view of its being too high.

Mr. Ryan: He believes in unlimited power for the seller.

Mr. LAWN: I think he believes in the right of free enterprise in respect of anyone selling goods, or selling labour if it concerns the legal or medical profession, but the honourable member believes the wage earner should not be free to demand his own price.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't this why the Commonwealth Government now has to bring in restrictive trade practices legislation?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know about that, or about how sincere the Commonwealth Government is, but it is alleged that, because of those things, the Commonwealth Government is forced to legislate for control. The honourable member referred to cheating. We do have cheats in South Australia—people who indulge in rackets. Although I support the Bill as far as it goes, I am not sure that it goes far enough. I draw the attention of the honourable member to something that is thought to need price control, and I challenge him to deny it. Recently I asked a question of the Attorney-General in the House in regard to the Evergreen Memorial Park Trust.

Mr. Ryan: Unfortunately, that isn't under price control.

Mr. LAWN: No, it is under an Act, and that organization is using that Act. As a result of my question, some of that organization's salesmen have resigned, because the question and reply caused discussion in the community. The matter was raised even by some of the people connected with the salesmen, who read the press report and subsequently searched *Hansard* (because the Attorney-General said the matter had been investigated previously). Some of the salesmen concerned, after referring to the previous *Hansard* report, have resigned.

Mr. McKee: Why?

Mr. LAWN: Because they say it is a racket. Just prior to my raising the matter in the House some salesmen sold plots for over £200, and then, having realized what had been happening, they found they could have sold similar plots at Centennial Park for only £21. They have come to me and given me all the paraphernalia supplied to them by the management, portion of which I shall read and then hand on to the Attorney-General. It shows the organized pressure that these people will apply to the unsuspecting public: in the main, pensioners who do not have much to live on and who, so they will not be a burden on their relatives and friends, fall for buying these expensive plots at the Evergreen Memorial Park.

The salesmen are given several documents, one referring to the various steps of their approach when calling on the householder. Step 1 states "Locate prospects . . . one hour daily in front of a lot of nice people." Step 2 states "Favourable attention", and the salesmen spends two to four minutes with the prospect. Step 3 is "Interest", and 15 to 17 minutes is to be spent romancing about the property. Also in this step the salesman is told, "Tell—don't sell." Step 4 states "Desire", on which the salesman is to spend 15 to 17 minutes, and he is also told "Make 'em want it; make 'em see it; make 'em feel it." Step 5 states "Action—15 to 20 minutes—always a sale made here." The next document is headed, "Think it over," and states:

What could motivate a prospect to "think it over", after you have given your presentation and attempted to close?

The answers are as follows:

- (1) They are not clear on the programme;
- (2) He doesn't know what his wife thinks, or she doesn't know what her husband thinks;
- (3) They do not see why they should act tonight;
- (4) They cannot decide how many;
- (5) Procrastination;
- (6) They want to investigate;
- (7) They do not want to buy at all, neither of them want to buy at all; —

Even when people frankly say they do not want the plots, the pressure is still there to continue to a set programme of five steps to make sure of a result. The final answers are as follows:

(8) They are broke; (9) They are illogical.

The document continues:

When a prospect says, "Think it over", it is very possible that he is actually in one of the above frames of mind. Usually the prospect will be in a frame of mind where he wants to purchase in Evergreen Memorial Park but hesitates because of one of the above reasons listed from, say, No. (1) to No. (6). It is obvious that if the reason he is saying, "Think it over" is because he doesn't want to buy (7) or he is broke (8) or he is illogical and superstitious (9), if this is the situation then there is very little we can do about it. However, if it is No. (1) to No. (6) then there are things that we can do. If we can look into each one of these situations, we cannot help but come up with the fact that these mental attitudes represent problems in the mind of the prospect. If we can eliminate this problem that is in the mind of the prospect, then obviously we remove the reasons that the prospect fails to act tonight.

We have listed the above states of mind in their logical order according to the frequency in which they occur. Most people for instance will hesitate merely because they are not clear on all points of the presentation. Secondly, usually a couple will hesitate because they might not realize how the other feels about the situation, and on down the list. Listed below are the most effective ways in which to eliminate from the prospect's mind the problem represented. We have listed the solution to each problem in very brief form. If you will listen to the tape on "Think it over", you will find it goes into full detail on exactly what is to be said in order to eliminate each problem in the mind of the prospect:

1. Summarize.
2. Find out what the wife is thinking, then find out what the husband is thinking.
3. —

and that point is missed in the document, but the next one states:

4. Find out what is the maximum that they are thinking, and the minimum they must have.

5. Help the man and woman to make a decision. Show them how our proposition is both right and good for their family.

6. Show them how solid Evergreen Memorial Park is:—Operating for 20 years—nearly 4,000 burials—recapitulate the trust makeup—the men behind the company—operating under Government supervision—membership in the N.A.C.

Later, the document mentions the names of two Government representatives, and the minister of religion on the trust is mentioned. The document continues:

7. If this is the way they both feel there is no solution. If they both do not want to buy after a full and thorough presentation, then you have struck out.

8. If they are actually broke this will come out in the open by going through the first six possibilities.

9. If the people are illogical, superstitious or neurotic, there is little that can be done for such people.

As "Think it over" is the most numerous objection that we get in this business, it is to be highly recommended that the above answers to this situation be thoroughly learned and put into operation. It will assist you very greatly if you will listen to the tape—

This base sheet is to be used in conjunction with a tape, which I do not have.

Mr. Hall: Is this price control or a swindle?

Mr. LAWN: It is something that should be under price control but unfortunately it is not. The document continues:

—that we have on "Answers to Think it Over" and repeatedly go over these procedures until they are a permanent part of your presentation. After answering each situation, it is extremely important that a definite attempt to "Close" be made. You will find that once you have made these procedures a permanent part of your closing technique, it will add tremendously to your selling power.

I do not wish to go through all of this. Another documents states:

A little history of the park, Mr. and Mrs. Brown, "As I said a moment ago, the Park Trust was created in 1944 under Act of Parliament—The Enfield General Cemetery Act. The care and preservation of the Park is in accordance with the Act under control of a trust comprising seven men, all appointed by Statute.

They go around to the poor, unsuspecting people in the community, particularly the aged. It is a disgrace that these people should be able to act in the name of Parliament. They give two names of persons representing the Government and two names of persons representing the Enfield council. They mention also the names of two reverend gentlemen representing two religious denominations. The names of another member representing local government and of another representing a religious denomination are used. These are the people allegedly controlling this trust in accordance with the Statute.

Mr. Ryan: Aren't these high-pressure salesmen employed by a company selling rights from the cemetery itself?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know sufficient about it. All I know is that it is crooked and that the whole thing should be investigated by the Attorney-General and legislation brought down to correct the position. I shall now quote—

The SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member must link his remarks to the Prices Act Amendment Bill. There is a limit to discussion of what should be, but is not, in the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I do not dispute your ruling, Sir, but my point is that, if funerals are under price control and have been investigated by the Prices Commissioner, the burial ground should be under the control of the Prices Commissioner.

The SPEAKER: That is in order.

Mr. LAWN: I have been attempting to point out that this is not under price control, whereas I believe it should be. I am glad you have raised the point, Sir, because I have now been able, as a result of prompting by the member for Port Adelaide, to say that funerals have been investigated by the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Ryan: And the Commissioner said that certain costs should be included in the undertaker's charge.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, all charges including the funeral director's charges, and even charges for press notices he does not insert, and charges for the services of a minister of religion that he does not pay. I refer to another document which is entitled "Favourable Attention". Directions are given on the way a salesman should conduct himself. This is the result of the investigation. The document states:

This step is better known as the warm-up phase of the Sale, or the prelude. This is what we call the "Sale before the Sale" and it is here that you begin to make your prospects like you, understand you, and believe you. Remember, you are on your own in this phase of the sale, and the kit is not to be opened until you are sure that you have won FAVOURABLE ATTENTION. The first thing upon entering is to set down your kit. You are awkwardly disposed and at a disadvantage if you stand with kit in hand. Remember, as long as you are standing it is easy for the client to dismiss you. Probably, the most important thing to remember in this F.A. step is to get your clients seated correctly so that you are seated directly across from them, and they are seated side by side.

After you have gained FAVOURABLE ATTENTION, and if everything appears to be right for the presentation, the opening remarks may go something like this: Mr. and Mrs. Brown, may I ask you, do you know of Evergreen Memorial Park or have you read any of the many reports in the newspapers? Memorial Parks have a limited number of ways to advertise. We cannot and would not resort to the blaring methods mainly used by most advertisers. For instance, we cannot effectively use radio, television, newspapers, or billboards, for if we did we could be criticized for capitalizing on

other people's misfortunes. This is because people don't understand, and therefore we have to be careful in the methods we use to acquaint the public with our services. Hence, at Evergreen Memorial Park, we find that the best way to do this is to simply bring the Memorial Park right into the home, and with your permission this is what I now intend to do.

I have many other documents here that show many matters including the way to handle a person according to the make-up of the individual concerned. I do not intend to go any further, except to say that it is scandalous that in a country like Australia, which we claim to be a democracy, in the year 1965 a state of affairs such as this should still exist. I do not blame the previous Government. All I demand is that this Government take this matter from me and investigate it thoroughly. If it is necessary to alter the Act then that should be done. If there is any thought that Parliament having granted rights to certain businesses, it should not revoke them, I will disagree with that if it is proved that a situation such as I have described has arisen. I believe it is the duty of Parliament to revoke any Statute where people have been allowed to act as these people have acted.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Unless I am convinced in this debate that price control is a good thing I will undoubtedly vote against the second reading. I suppose it is a good thing really that somebody of the age of the member for Burnside should still believe in Father Christmas as, I believe, do some other members of the House. I can just imagine the member for Burnside going around with a basket in Burnside and thinking that the Prices Commissioner was saving her from being exploited, and that she was getting things more cheaply. Taking the index figure for food, in 1965 this has risen to 141, compared with the Australian average of 133. During the previous 10 years the increase in food prices was as great if not greater than in most of the States that did not have price control. This can be followed right through. As I say, we think we are accomplishing something, but when we get down to hard facts we find that no-one can prove a case that price control in South Australia has kept prices down.

In explaining the Bill, the Premier referred to decimal currency and said that he had to save us from any adjustments that might be effected in the change-over to decimal currency. I think perhaps he should have set an example in this matter when he made certain adjustments to Government charges; he should have taken advantage of the change-over to



adjust charges the other way, rather than impose the increases that he has done. I think normal competition would have prevented increases from taking place. I do not believe in restrictive trade practices and that type of thing, but I maintain that where firms are competing against each other there should not be price control and that they should not have to go to the Prices Commissioner to put their cases.

The Premier, in support of his argument, referred to the increase in retail sales in South Australia. He said that price control must be good because there had been a greater percentage increase in retail sales in South Australia than in the other States. However, when we look at the overall increase in retail sales over the 10 years we see that retail sales per capita in South Australia are slightly lower than the per capita figure over the whole of Australia. We can also point out that if our prices are higher it inflates these retail sales figures, so I cannot see how he is making his point there. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) got up and said he had a closed mind on this, that he would support price control whatever facts and figures were placed before him. He said that as wages were controlled prices should also be controlled. However, with prices it is only the maximum price that is fixed, and there is no guarantee that the quality of the article is what it should be. On the other hand, wages are a guaranteed minimum sum, and in most industries there is nothing to prevent the paying and receiving of a greater wage. We have reached the stage now of full employment, and there is sufficient money kept available to clear our warehouses and so keep full employment. I do not think the Arbitration Court can actually achieve very much more in the way of additional wages or increased living standards for the worker. I think the farm labourers are probably the only people that do not have a basic wage, yet I can prove that in this State today the farm worker, without an award, is more highly paid comparatively than any unionist in Australia. If there were any crime in paying higher wages than those fixed by the Arbitration Court, I would be in trouble because to get labour in the country one has to pay considerably more than what a man would get under his union award.

As I said, I have definite views on this and I will hold those views unless I am convinced to the contrary. I have read through the speeches made in the debates on this legislation over the last two years. I think most

members complacently believe that this legislation is going to be passed and that, with the support of the Labor Party, it will go through. Certain people have tried to prove a case in favour of price control, but I do not think they have made any point at all. I first became strongly opposed to price control way back during the time when the Labor Party was still in charge in Canberra. We then had very rigid price control on essential goods but no control on goods that were not so essential. In those days we were handicapped, not only on the land but in every other walk of life, because we could not get the essential goods. I remember spending a morning going around Adelaide trying to get wire and galvanized iron. I had to personally import galvanized iron from overseas at a price considerably higher than the fixed Australian price to enable me to get on with some essential things. In the afternoon I went down Rundle Street and I saw rows and rows of shops full of the unessential things of life, things that we could do without. Those goods were there because they were not under price control and people could get a higher profit margin on them.

I think that fact, as much as its effort to nationalize banking, caused the defeat of the Commonwealth Labor Party. The Commonwealth Liberal Party, which does not believe in these restrictive policies, then formed the Government, and it has been more acceptable to the people, particularly the younger people. I do not think the young people today like restrictions; they are better educated, and they realize that we can get a decent economy without all these restrictive controls; they read about what happens overseas, where the countries that have restrictions and controls are more backward than those who have a free economy. I do not refer to a *laissez faire* economy, but one that has a certain indirect control, where there is a balanced economy and where the demand for goods is equal to the capacity to produce; they are the countries that have gone ahead with rising living standards. They are not frightened that these restrictive controls will be imposed, and they have enough faith in the future and in their own ability to protect themselves. I think the younger people are going to demand these things in the future, and it will be the members of Parliament that advocate something like that who will get their support. We must not forget that they are the majority that vote for us now.

Mr. Casey: What countries are you referring to that do not have restrictions?

Mr. McANANEY: I think West Germany has gone ahead probably more than any other country, and probably the people there have had the least restrictions of any economy in the world.

Mr. McKee: What part of Germany are you referring to?

Mr. McANANEY: Even in that part of the country run by the Communists or the fellow Socialists of the honourable member they are getting around to the fact that they have to lift their restrictions, that people will not produce the goods unless they have some incentive. I think that ultimately, with the way some people are advocating restrictions, we will be meeting such countries halfway, unless we have enough sense to get away from these restrictions. We have certain restrictions in Australia, but are we going ahead on an artificial economy? How far down the list of natural growth is this country? I belong to a Party in which we have freedom about what we say and to select our policy on these things. Recently, a debate was to be held at the university on electoral reform as introduced by the Government and a Liberal member was to present our policy. A Labor representative was to put his side of the question, but Labor Caucus stepped in and said that he could not do it.

Mr. McKee: What has this got to do with price control?

Mr. McANANEY: We have freedom to speak and express our views, although members of the Labor Party have to do what they are told. As a Parliament we have to arrive at a decision about whether we believe in price control or not. I do not know how the Prices Commissioner arrives at the margins or what system he uses to fix prices, and yet we say that he will look after everyone. How do we know whether he is doing it fairly? I understand that if he wanted to know the price of meat he has rung the General Manager of the Metropolitan Meat Company, who said that he could tell the Prices Commissioner anything.

Mr. McKee: Meat today is too dear.

Mr. McANANEY: Handling costs, yes, but mutton has never been cheaper; when it reaches the butcher's shop it is dear.

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member opposite may be interested to know that the late Leader of the Opposition said that he did not know or care what items were under control.

Mr. McANANEY: Most of the Prices Commissioner's staff are unqualified, and probably

could not assess a balance sheet. Some companies revalue their assets and issue bonus shares, but other companies do not do this. This can be done in many ways, so that it must be difficult for an unqualified man to be able to read a balance sheet properly. During the last two years various members have slated traders who sell goods, but they are an ordinary cross-section of the community. There is always someone exploiting other people, and perhaps some sections of the community do not play the game. However, that does not mean that the remaining people should be restricted. Why pick on one section to be policed severely when other things are not controlled? Recently I tried to buy leasehold land from the Government but the price was ridiculous and fictitious, and that was a case I should have taken to the Prices Commissioner for him to consider. The Harbors Board was paying  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest on borrowed money and making  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent profit, but now it has increased the charges to provide further revenue. The board is going beyond what should be a reasonable price to be charged. The evil of price fixing is that a maximum price is fixed for a certain industry and that becomes the price. People do not become efficient and try to get below that price, so that prices tend to become inflated because of lack of competition.

Recently the *Government Gazette* contained many pages of regulations relating to plumbers. I am an accountant, but I could not cope with what the plumber has to do with his cost accounting, and that is why plumbing costs are increasing. The plumber has to add many charges to his normal cost because of the filling in of returns and other things. The price fixed by the Prices Commissioner becomes the price for all plumbing jobs and there is no chance for a plumber to reduce that price by becoming more efficient. It has been stated that primary producers have been saved much by the control on petrol prices. I am opposed to petrol companies' secretly fixing their own prices, and to people generally getting together and attempting to exploit the public. I have experienced a greater reduction in the price of petrol than I experienced when competition existed. I endeavoured to have a petrol company install a tank on my property, but when two new companies recently commenced to function, creating local competition, I suddenly found I had four tanks, and could not even get into my garage when returning home the other night. I obtain the petrol much more cheaply than I obtained it previously. Was I

the only one obtaining fuel cheaply? I spoke to the local carrier the other day, who told me that he was busy carting petrol to people who had ordered it before the price was increased.

Mr. Ryan: Live cheaply with Labor!

Mr. Jennings: You're supporting the Bill in other words!

Mr. McANANEY: I believe that tyres are still under price control; if they are not, a racket exists that should be stopped, for the quality of tyres at present is absolutely terrible. Of a set of tyres on my wife's car, four out of five came up in air bubbles, although I am pleased to say the company was prepared to meet a proportion of the extra cost involved. One of my tractor tyres went down within the first two days of use, right at seeding time, causing three days' work to be lost. The tyre was defective on the inside, a hole having been rubbed in the casing; within a year it was useless, but I received nothing from the tyre company. By keeping the price of tyres down through price control, defective tyres may well be coming on to the market. What is the history of the superphosphate companies, originally operated by Fertilizer Sales? That company started off with a monopoly, when the farmer was unable to ask specifically for Cresco or Wallaroo-Mount Lyell superphosphate. All he could ask for was superphosphate—and poor quality superphosphate, at that. No competition existed at that stage. When President of the Primary Producers Union, I spent days in listening to complaints of farmers of the poor quality of superphosphate that weighed 187 lb. when it came off the truck and only 140 lb. after a month had passed.

Mr. Casey: How long ago was that?

Mr. McANANEY: It was certainly in my lifetime. The equipment in the superphosphate companies was so poor then that I have seen a man come along with a handful of bolts and nuts out of a piece of machinery.

Mr. Casey: Was that to make up the weight?

Mr. McANANEY: It would have helped. Have the superphosphate companies in South Australia made more profits than the average of those of a similar company anywhere else in Australia? I believe they have. The Tariff Board allows a margin of about 9 per cent, although we do not know what the Prices Commissioner allows. When the price of cool drinks was recently increased by 1d. a bottle, I noticed that a certain cool drink company made a loss, although it may have camouflaged the figures in some way. If it did, the Companies Act will certainly catch up with it. It has been

suggested that superphosphate companies desired to set aside profits as reserves so that they could install new machinery and erect storage sheds. We may think that it is not fair that the farmers should pay for that, but that practice is apparent in many other companies, and the article concerned can often be produced more efficiently, quickly and cheaply, as a result.

I now come to housing. I have worked out that the average cost of a house in South Australia is £4,500, and that the Australian average cost is £5,500. Is price control contributing towards this? The labour factor in building a house is considerable. Also, the basic wage in South Australia is a shade lower than the Australian average and this would contribute a little. The cost for the components used in house-building are as high in South Australia as in the other States. Therefore, where is the real difference in price? Are our houses not up to the standard of those in other States or is the reason the general efficiency in house-building? As a great believer in private enterprise and in incentive I believe it is largely because of subcontracting. Recently I noticed how subcontracting worked when I observed the building of a new wing of a hospital. Never have I seen such good work. The men were skilled workers and the subcontracting provided good and cheap work. Where there is no incentive that is where costs begin to rise.

A few years ago I visited Port Adelaide when there was trouble on the wharves. I had always read about hefty wharf labourers but the lack of organization in loading the ships was terrible. Until private enterprise is attracted to this field there will be high costs because of the muddling around. If boats were loaded on a contract basis ships would turn around very quickly. I noticed in the *Groceries Review* that there was a two to one increase to decrease ratio. In the items mentioned two were affected by price control and both prices went up. I believe in the control of restrictive trade practices. I believe in private enterprise and free competition but, if people band together, the advantage of competition is lost, and something should be done to see that those practices are curbed. Much trouble occurs in contracts and hire-purchase agreements which are far too complicated. A contract should be of not more than 500 to 600 words and the print should be twice the size of normal newspaper print so that it can be read. Also, two copies should be provided to the purchaser.

Although I believe in freedom—I would restrict salesmen who go around from door to door. This would protect the freedom of the householder although it would restrict the freedom of the door-to-door salesman. A certain period of waiting should apply to all goods sold by high pressure door-to-door salesmen. Many of my friends in Denmark will be surprised at my opposing price control. I am against manufacturers getting together and fixing prices. I do not belittle in any way the efforts of the Prices Commissioner in the past. He did much good for the wine grapegrowing industry.

Mr. Ryan: You would abolish the Prices Department, though.

Mr. McANANEY: I thought I made that clear.

Mr. Ryan: Just a minute ago you were praising up the job it does in this State.

Mr. McANANEY: I said that in this case it performed a useful function. However, prior to that I told the honourable member a better way to do it. I have had a fair amount of experience.

Mr. Ryan: And you are inflicting it upon us.

Mr. McANANEY: I have had a fair bit of experience with a buying service. I admit that this buying service does by-pass the local dealer. The reason I went into it is because if one has plenty of time and can go in and argue about prices one gets a reduction, but if one receives a bill and pays promptly in cash one always pays the full amount. I got fed up with that, so I went into a buying service, and I find that I can get goods 10 per cent more cheaply. I think members of the Public Service have such a buying service. I think it would be much better if there was one price—and it could be a lower price—for everybody who went into the shop. A person should get some concession when he pays cash. John Martins are allowing people to buy in November and to make payments extending right up to the end of next March, and that sort of thing adds to the price structure.

Mr. Ryan: The Commissioner does not fix a minimum price: he only fixes a maximum price.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is not following my argument.

Mr. Ryan: We are not magicians, and it is impossible to follow your argument.

Mr. McANANEY: When the Commissioner fixes a maximum price it becomes the price, and that is where the inefficiency of price control comes in. It results in higher prices. One

of the reasons we can keep prices down through a buying service is that we do not have any bad debts. Bad debts have contributed substantially to the increase in prices all over Australia today. I know that some people get things and deliberately avoid paying for them, and such action has had more effect on prices than anything the Prices Commissioner in South Australia has done. Some people today get into the habit of not paying their bills, and that is a costly thing, because they have to get credit and pay interest on it. Incidentally, there is no law in South Australia that compels a person to pay his debts; it is illegal to charge such a person interest, and it is the devil's own job to get some people to pay. That person is robbing people of credit and adding to the cost of all goods bought in Australia. Indeed, the buying service of which I have been a member has suffered through this. Before a buying service or even a retailer can buy goods of a certain type it or he has to be voted on to the selling list. I think this position should be corrected. Why should a group of manufacturers have a vote to say whether or not one can buy goods? We get this fixation of prices, such as with baling twine. The manufacturers of that threaten to cut off supplies if you do not sell it at a fixed price. They did away with that sort of thing in England, and prices there went down substantially, much more than they possibly could through any action of a Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Ryan: You are putting up the best case I can imagine for price control.

Mr. McANANEY: I am opposed to price control, for it restricts trade.

Mr. Ryan: Well, what are you supporting?

Mr. McANANEY: I will let the honourable member have a half-hour tutorial tomorrow morning if he wants it. I think I have made the point that the younger people today do not like restrictions and, with their greater education, they will be able to cope with this situation. I think we can run our own price control to a certain extent. I have been accused by the Minister of Agriculture of being a capitalist, but I never give more than 2s. a lb. for bananas, and that is my price control on that. Recently I was in a shop in a poorer area when a lady came in and asked for two sweet melons. The shopkeeper told her that they were very dear (and possibly she already owed him money) and tried to talk her out of it. Even though those melons were 4s. each, she still insisted that she wanted them. That is where a person can introduce his own price control, for a bit of self-discipline is

all that is needed. A person wanted to charge me £9 for bolt cutters. I did not go to the Prices Commissioner about it, but I wrote to the person concerned and pointed out that he was charging at the rate of £9,000 a ton for these bolt cutters. Some time later an amended account came in with a charge of £3 less. A person should be able to look after himself in these matters. The member for Port Adelaide has told me that I have said more than he can digest tonight, so perhaps I will keep the rest of my comments for another occasion. Summing up, I think I have proved the case.

Mr. Ryan: What case?

Mr. McANANEY: I have quoted figures regarding the comparative consumer index in the various States. The only item that is lower in South Australia is household supplies and equipment. Whether or not that is in the long list the member for Burnside read out, I do not know. Many items have clearly had as many increases in this State as they have in the other States. Perhaps "Miscellaneous" is a little bit lower.

Mr. Ryan: What about petrol?

Mr. McANANEY: I have travelled pretty extensively, and often I have found that petrol is cheaper in the other States than it is here. I must admit that that is probably because the places at which I have bought petrol have had a larger installation. People have often told me that the price of petrol in South Australia is cheaper than elsewhere, but I say deliberately that that is not so. Clothing is an item that is 1 per cent below the Australian average. In many of these things, Hobart weights it up. Because of the additional freight to Hobart, the costs there are considerably higher than the Australian average, so when South Australia is just a small percentage below the Australian average, the position here is obviously not as good as it looks. I think a maximum price invariably becomes the real price, and that this leads to inefficiency and greater costs. I think it has been proved overseas that the less restrictions that are imposed the better things are, for there is a period of internal readjustment and you get greater efficiency. I am not advocating *laissez faire*: that has been left behind years ago, but we then went into the restrictive age when Socialism seemed to be the answer. However, it is obvious that you cannot get a higher standard of living with Socialism and all its restrictions. We must aim for a controlling body so that we have a

balanced economy where the demand for goods is equal to the capacity to produce.

Mr. Casey: Would you favour the quarterly adjustment of wages?

Mr. McANANEY: I am not getting into that argument. Those without adjustments are those getting the high wages, and with a balanced economy and a demand for goods with no unemployment, people will get the highest price for their labour so that labour will produce the goods to sell and no price adjustment need be considered. The workers will get the highest wage it is possible for industry to pay in reality and practice rather than a fictitious amount decided by legal arguments. We have the knowledge to run this country efficiently, and adjustments should not be made at the top. There should be an overall balanced economy so that each individual adjusts his business to the supply and demand and the variation of prices. With a balanced economy goods are produced according to the needs of the people. We do not want a return to an inefficient system with a lower standard of living. With a lower efficiency comes higher costs, whether price control exists or not. If anyone can convince me that price control is necessary and give practical and not theoretical examples, I will favour price control, but until that happens I will vote against the second reading. The additional clauses should not have been added to the Prices Act but should have been introduced in another Bill. One clause refers to discounts. Tom the Cheap works on three months' credit which means he does not have to have capital as his expenses are low. The person receiving one month's discount is at a disadvantage. Where one section of the community suffers, freedom is abused, but we should not restrict progress as this Act does.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I have heard the speech of the member for Burnside supporting this legislation, and one from the member for Mitcham opposing it. I did not hear the member for Adelaide but I should think he would support it. Now I have heard the member for Stirling and, if I assess his speech properly, he opposed it. He was not firm in his convictions and said that if anyone could convince him otherwise he would change his mind. I am not speaking about theory. The member for Stirling said he had been in the House for two years, and spoke about his experiences. He is entitled to his views. I have had experience of price control since 1948, the date referred to by the member for Mitcham. My experience then was sad and sorry, and I

opposed it. In those days it was profit control: if you were efficient the price was reduced. Because of efficiency you had to accept a lower price: that is not price control, it is a penalty for efficiency, and because of that I opposed price control. Since then there have been distinct changes in price control as we understand it. This legislation is introduced each year, and in these 12-month periods price control has played an important part in the economy of South Australia. If there is no competition it is necessary for someone to ask whether people are playing the game. That is what price control has done in the last six years as it has been a watchdog to see that, without competition, someone is not taking advantage of the situation.

I support price control generally, although I do not think prices should be fixed for no reason. One of this State's superphosphate companies (under price control) has a counterpart in Western Australia which is not subject to price control. Being a shareholder in both companies, I have received no bonus issue from the South Australian company, but one from the Western Australian organization. However, the South Australian company has paid a regular and substantial dividend, and has supplied goods at a reasonable price to the primary producer. Under price control, it has progressed to the stage where an offer of £4,000,000 has been made to take it over. Under price control, phosphate companies in South Australia have paid a sound dividend, and primary producers have been able to obtain the commodity much more cheaply here. Despite what the Premier said the other day, the South Australian company concerned has not been ground into the earth. Price control benefits investors as well as consumers.

Mr. Freebairn: How does the price of superphosphate here compare with the price in Victoria?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is cheaper here.

Mr. Shannon: You are wrong there. I suggest you go to the South-East and see if that is so.

Mr. HEASLIP: The South-East is just over the Victorian border.

Mr. Shannon: What about preferential freights?

Mr. HEASLIP: That still would not matter. The freight charges at Port Adelaide (being the closest port, in this case, to the South-East) would be far greater than those paid by Pivot (in Victoria) for freight in respect of the South-East. Pivot's prices are

cheap and provide good competition, so South Australia has to keep its prices down to compete with that organization. However, where no competition exists we must employ a watch dog to do exactly what price control in South Australia has been doing over the last six years. Although I was opposed to the profit control that we saw in 1948-49, the system has since changed completely, and now endeavours to establish a fair price for everybody concerned. I am prepared to support the extension of the Act for a further 12 months. I disagree with the statements emanating from the Chamber of Manufactures this morning, which were cited by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), and which were merely crying wolf.

If we desire to have a depression that is certainly the way to go about it. We should at least be optimistic about the future, for we shall be more successful if we are optimistic. I believe that psychology plays an important part in the economy of a country. South Australia enjoys full employment; most of its companies have been prosperous (despite a falling off in some industries, which has been taken up, anyway, in other industries). Why panic? Let us be practical. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) had something to say about things that happened, I think, in the war years, when shortages existed and when things were obtained under the counter; it was not so much a case of what one knew but of whom one knew. However, that has nothing to do with price control. The Bill deals essentially with the conversion from sterling into decimal currency, and re-enacts the existing legislation for a further 12 months, which I support.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I, too, support the Bill, knowing that it is a measure that will be before Parliament again in 12 months. Then we will have an opportunity to review the legislation. This will be necessary because it is now being administered by a Socialist Government. We have seen many examples of the restrictive policies of the Government. Restrictions have been applied to both citizens and businesses of the State. The Government should realize that not only by restriction will it achieve growth in the community. If it pins all its faith in restrictive measures we will see a great dropping off in development in South Australia. In the past the Liberal and Country League Government introduced incentives to accompany such measures as this, and I hope this will be continued. It is interesting to see where we are going with

price control. We are reaching a stage where something more is needed and that something is hard to define. What we need is something between price control and unfair trade practices, something that will protect citizens who cannot protect themselves. This end will never be properly achieved.

Mr. McKee: You commenced your speech by saying you were opposed to restriction.

Mr. HALL: If it is not matched by incentives. The previous Government's legislation was not restrictive. If this legislation is loaded on to all the other restrictions brought forward by the Government it could lead to a calamity by destroying incentive in the South Australian community. I do not have to enumerate the great many restrictive Bills brought forward by the Government. As I said, it appears that something a little more is needed to establish honest trade practices. People are operating within the law and it appears to be impossible to bring them within an honest sphere of operations.

Recently a man came to me and told me that he had purchased and installed a swimming pool. He and his wife had purchased a home on a first mortgage and were paying £5 a week in repayments. The house was fully furnished and they were in a comfortable financial position. They read advertisements for swimming pools and telephoned a man on a Sunday morning. He visited them on the Sunday afternoon and told them that they did not have to worry about money because, with only a first mortgage, the bank would assuredly advance them a second mortgage. They agreed and work was commenced on the pool on the following Thursday. The pool was completed without any reference by the purchasers to any financial institution to see whether they could get the money. The upshot is that they have been forced into obtaining finance for something they cannot shift and sell, and instead of paying £1,350 for the pool they are paying £2,300 for 10 years at £5 a week in addition to the £5 they are paying on their house.

Mr. Shannon: They were at fault.

Mr. HALL: They were absolutely at fault, but they did not have a copy of the contract. I agree that they were silly in the handling of their affairs, but something is needed to bring that company into line because it is continually dealing with people in this manner. The book purchasers legislation, with which I have been involved, has been fairly successful. How far can we go in restricting activities in an attempt to protect those who cannot handle their own

affairs? I support price control because of its desirable effects and because it will come up for review in 12 months' time.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): The member for Gouger gave the Bill half-hearted support. He supports it only because it comes up again in 12 months' time, and he has been doing that for I don't know how long. South Australia is the only State left with this type of legislation. I believe the proposed legislation of the Commonwealth Government dealing with restrictive trade practices is the correct approach to this problem, if there be a problem, and that legislation is having a rather rocky inception. It may be like a thalidomide baby, left without arms and legs by the time it is born, because bits are being lopped off here and there as it progresses. It is no closer than it was in the time of Sir Garfield Barwick, who was the progenitor of the legislation. If there is a reason for strait-lacing trade practices then the legislation should be on a Commonwealth and not on a State basis. It has been alleged that our Prices Department has provided the basis for other States to adopt, but I do not know how that has been done. I do not really think that is a valid approach to this problem. It has been suggested that that has been done. I was a bit worried when our ex Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) threw in his hand and decided he was no longer interested in the control of the Prices Department. It worried me a little, because I did not know where we were heading in this field of price control.

Much discussion has ensued in this Chamber regarding the price of superphosphate. At the moment the company concerned is receiving bids of up to 90s. for their £1 shares, which is not a bad sort of price. I do not know any other stocks on the Stock Exchange that are more highly priced. For instance, such blue chips as Broken Hill Proprietary, Commonwealth Sugar Refining, and Imperial Chemical Industries are not in the same field at the moment as the Cresco shares, and in fact are pounds from it. I do not know whether or not all the good things that are alleged to have happened in South Australia as a result of price control have, in fact, happened as a result of price control. The member for Mitcham will be pleased with me tonight, because I have come back to the fold. I have done so because I believe that in this field the only effective method of dealing with unfair practices that might occur in industry or commerce is on a Commonwealth basis. The State law here does, in my view, make

invidious distinctions as between one type of industry or commerce and another type. Let us take, for example (I have been right in the middle of this, and it has been a bit of a nightmare) the almost astronomical fluctuations of the dear old common potato, a fundamental of our diet. The prices have fluctuated by as much as £10 or £20 a ton over a weekend, and we have not lifted a finger to do anything about it. As members know, we have a Potato Board that is charged with the duty of seeing that a fair thing is done to the grower and the consumer. Well, if the board can justify the fluctuations that have taken place in our potato market over the last 12 months, then I say no price control is any good at all, for it has no force or effect. The potato is one of the foodstuffs of the people, and it is one of the C series index items that has a fairly decent sort of bearing on our cost of living. Therefore, by and large I consider that we could discard this legislation. I should like to see it discarded for a year or two and then see what happens. I should like to test (as other States have done) what really will happen if we discard this artificial method of trying to control our prices in South Australia. Other States have tried it, and we have not had any information about it other than that given by the member for Rocky River.

Incidentally, the honourable member was entirely off the rails. However, I will not tear him to pieces quite as badly as the member for Mitcham tore to pieces the honourable member for Burnside. The member for Rocky River was entirely wrong when he tried to discuss the interstate price of superphosphate. My very good friend, the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson), will know that Pivot superphosphate has been sold in large quantities on Yorke Peninsula, which happens to be centrally sited in South Australia fairly close to the Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Fertilizer Company at the top of Yorke Peninsula. He spoke of the protection we get through the distance from the manufacturer to the consumer, but quite obviously that does not apply. Therefore, I have some reservations about whether or not this legislation is justifiable. I should like to see a hiatus in this field for a year or two to enable us to see whether or not the ills we are trying to cure are really there. There is such a thing as competition, and that is the surest way of providing a fair deal for the average consumer. Price control operates in the superphosphate industry in South Australia, and a fairly steep

increase is being awarded by the Prices Department, despite the fact that we now know that this is an extremely profitable industry. Are we to assume that the Prices Department arrived at its decision based on the information tendered to it by various people? I suppose that is the position, for the department has all sorts of rights under the Act. No doubt the member for Mitcham will agree with me that seeing the books and understanding the books are two entirely different things. The Commissioner could be convinced that everything was in order, but he does not know and cannot assess whether some of the charges that are made against an industry are reasonable or whether they are exorbitant. He cannot assess that unless he is in the industry himself, for he has no way of assessing or measuring it.

It seems to me that there is a possibility that our Prices Department is in fact boosting up prices rather than keeping them down. For instance, some industries today are not as efficient as they should be. Such industries may go to the Prices Department and establish to the department's satisfaction that their industry is suffering by virtue of the prices at which they have to sell their goods. Despite the fact that they are inefficient, it seems to me that they are likely to get a margin of profit based on their own inefficient workings. If I could be assured that that would not happen, that the inefficient would not be bolstered up by price control, then I should be pleased to hear it. My own view is that some inefficient industries can be and probably are being bolstered up. The inefficient can only be dealt with effectively by competition. If his competitor in the field can produce the same article at a lower cost and sell to the public at a lower cost, that will bring the inefficient producer up to scratch, otherwise he will have to go out of business. With all respect to what is obviously going to be a vote in favour of this legislation, I shall, on this occasion, vote for its discontinuance in order to see whether we are reaping the rewards that it is alleged we are.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I find it necessary to reply to matters raised by members and, in particular, I am concerned with references made to the price of superphosphate. The price increase approved for this season provides for the recovery of cost increases incurred since last season only. It makes no provision for any improvement in the profit margin which was reduced last year, or any expansion costs, or



the loss of profit on the sale of 60,000 tons delivered this season at last year's price prior to the increase being announced. This amounts to 2s. a ton over the total annual tonnage. The increased output was taken into account when investigating costs. Costs submitted were based on an estimated industry production of 622,000 tons compared with costs last year based on the production of 584,000 tons. If, because of seasonal conditions, sales do not reach 622,000 tons, costs will be higher than the estimate. It has never been the policy to make provision in the price of superphosphate to cover increased dividends to shareholders. Comparative increases for the last two years between the main superphosphate-manufacturing States are as follows:

In South Australia, 17s. 6d. in bulk, and in new cornsacks 30s.; in Victoria, 18s. in bulk, and 35s. in new cornsacks; in New South Wales, 19s. in bulk, and 28s. 6d. in new cornsacks; in Western Australia, 22s. in bulk, and 36s. in new cornsacks.

Prior to the 1963-64 season when prices were reduced by 12s. to 13s. a ton and were also reduced by the Commonwealth bounty of £3 a ton, prices had remained unaltered for five years. For the two-year period 1964-66 it will be seen that the average increase in this State is lower than the other States, although other States each produced more superphosphate than South Australia. The important factor is that it is not the question of whether the companies manufacturing superphosphate are being helped to make profits because of price control. The Prices Commissioner has done a good job in this matter. It seems that certain trade practices have occurred and will continue to occur because people are not responsible for their actions. I do not know any way to protect people from their folly. It is almost unbelievable how people can become involved in matters that are their own responsibility. We know that high-pressure salesmanship has been indulged in from time to time, and that there should be some control of it. To some extent it has been eliminated but there are signs that it is increasing again. People will not take sufficient interest in their domestic affairs and do not appreciate the need to test these matters, so they fall victim to the high-pressure salesman.

This legislation is being extended for another 12 months, and that is in the interests of the people. I have received deputations from time to time asking that certain commodities, mainly clothing and footwear, should be released from price control, but I am satisfied that these controls should continue for the sake of the

community. People are receiving a reasonable deal as a result of price control. The member for Mitcham criticized price control, but he should consider what his predecessor had to say on this matter. The former member for the district was capable of voicing his views, which were linked up with those of the member for Rocky River when he referred to profit control rather than price control. The former member for Mitcham was consistent and able to place before this House his views and reasonings more capably than can the present member for Mitcham. I ask the House to support the second reading knowing that this legislation has been supported by members opposite, and I see no reason why I should answer all the criticisms.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think you can.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I consider that this legislation will work in the interests of the State.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (32).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Coreoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Ryan, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Walsh (teller).

Noes (3).—Messrs. McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), and Shannon.

Majority of 29 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Honourable members will see that this clause deals with the change-over to decimal currency. As Minister in charge of prices, will the Premier say why it was decided to insert this provision in the Bill and not, along with amendments to other Acts, in the Decimal Currency Bill considered by members some weeks ago?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The fact that this Bill re-enacts existing legislation was sufficient to justify the inclusion of the decimal currency provisions as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONERS'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2741.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Although the Bill is short, it is very much to the point. After a long term as practically an autonomous part of the State, the Railways Commissioner is now to leave that position and he will become subject entirely to the will of the Minister. This is done very nicely and is a gracious way of asking the Railways Commissioner to fade out. It is done by asking the Commissioner to make certain propositions to the Minister, who may not necessarily approve of them. In turn, the Minister submits his own proposition and his will shall prevail. If there are any losses consequential on the Minister's idea, the Government is responsible for those losses. These are the losses for which the Government is now responsible, for each year it pays £3,000,000 to £4,000,000 to make up the Railways Department's deficit. Under the Bill, it will still make up the deficit but the loss will be consequential on the Minister's idea of running things. The Government will condescend to make up these losses.

Mr. Jennings: The Commissioner will still advise the Minister.

Mr. QUIRKE: This reminds me of the provision regarding the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Treasurer, where the wording is the same. In fact, this could have been an adaptation of that provision. In that case, the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank has an idea and presents it to the Treasurer. If the Treasurer does not agree, the Act provides that where there is a disagreement the Treasurer's will shall prevail.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: In that case a report has to be made to Parliament of what happened.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and there is no evidence of a report having to be made in this case. The Bill means simply that, instead of the Railways Commissioner being autonomous, the Minister has the responsibility and makes up the losses. He need not necessarily report to Parliament for so doing.

Mr. Jennings: The Minister is answerable to Parliament.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. I shall deal with the losses on the railways. An amount of £67,000,000 is employed by the Railways Department and the deficit for the year ended June 30, 1965, was £3,564,000. The contribution from Consolidated Revenue was £4,000,000.

The Auditor-General's Report states that the Railways Department had a surplus of £436,000, and that is true after the £4,000,000 contributed from Consolidated Revenue is taken into account. The Railways Department made a deficit of £3,564,000 but the debt charges alone were £2,595,000. Therefore, the deficit was mainly incurred in trying to make up interest charges on Loan money, some of it 80 years old. I believe that the Railways Department wrote off some of the debt in about 1928.

Today the department is under the disability of having to pay interest on sums for debts incurred 50 or 60 years ago, and this places a tremendous burden on it. Let us not forget that the real deficit between working costs and income was only about £750,000. In practice, the main deficit of the department is the cost of this interest which is a heavy burden and a debt that has been incurred over many years. Railway lines were built in South Australia in order to open up the country. It was never expected, when a line was put through to Pinnaroo, that that line would pay or, when the narrow gauge line was built on the West Coast, that it would pay.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That was the best proposition the Railways Department ever had.

Mr. Casey: I think that honour could be claimed by the line in my area.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: On reflection, I would bow to the honourable member.

Mr. QUIRKE: The point is that after all these years there is a difference now in actual working of only about £800,000; the rest is made up of interest. I have never agreed (and I have mentioned this here before) that the whole of that interest should be charged to the Railways Department, for it was a developmental project over 75 years or more. Of course, the income can necessarily only be derived in the main from one section of the community. A little more than half of the £14,000,000 or thereabouts that is received by the Railways Department as freights comes from the country, and another big slice comes from the operation of the interstate railways. The whole of the burden of that interest is not borne by the whole of the population as it should be. If we put money from Consolidated Revenue into the fund, then that does happen. However, I do not see why that should be landed on the department to bring about what we have today, when we are going to boost the railways.

We have to hammer the transport industry in South Australia in order to put goods on to the railways to increase receipts by

£1,000,000, and this will merely pay the interest on a capital debt that has accumulated over three-quarters of a century. Surely the fairest way to do that is to put that debt as a charge to the total State, and in that way obviate the necessity for the brutal attack that will have to be made on road transport in order to force traffic on to the railways. We are trying to destroy a very effective transport system in South Australia or to place it in jeopardy in order to find money to pay interest on a capital cost. Those charges in the main will be borne by a section of the community; they certainly will not be borne down here, because the transport will be free. They will be borne over every country district in order to pay the interest on a debt that was incurred towards the benefit of the whole of the State, and therefore the whole State can justifiably bear these interest charges. Those charges should be lifted off the Railways Department altogether and made a part of the debt of South Australia to which everybody can contribute. It is not right, in my opinion, to prolong a debt that is merely interest on something that no longer exists. The enormous sum that has been expended on materials and other items for the railways is still a debt, even though those items have been written off long ago. The only thing that has not been written off is the debt itself, which remains there in perpetuity. The Government will still accept the responsibility for any debt, a fact that is clearly indicated in the clause which provides that, if the operation takes place at a loss, the Government will stand it.

I have said repeatedly (and I repeat it again now) that the railways are an essential part of our transport system. However, I think they are a run-down part of our transport system. We have only to see the type of vehicle that will be sent into the country on special trips. The Lord alone knows where they pick that stuff up; it must be somewhere down at Islington or at Mile End ready for assembly. The railway line between Riverton and Clare is unusable for passenger transport. When the rails were put down in 1918 they were secondhand, having been rolled in England in about 1860. They were turned around so that the unworn side was opposed to the wheels, and they are now completely worn out. It would not be possible to run a fast railcar on them without the risk of its being thrown over an embankment. Those rails were only

60 lb. rails when they were new, and a good bit of their weight has gone now.

Mr. Casey: What do you term "fast" in that country?

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not reply to that question. However, I say that if it were an effective line and it had an effective vehicle on it, the journey could be done in half the time. We have a railway line running from Riverton to Spalding, and a road bus, run by the Railways Department through a private contractor, takes the passengers from Riverton to Jamestown. It runs alongside the railway. The only thing the railway line can be used for is the caterpillar action of a linked-up train of trucks. It is only with that slow motion traffic of goods trains that it can operate on that track. If one stands some distance away and watches the train going from Taillem Bend to Loxton, it looks for all the world like a caterpillar, for one can see humps over the length of the train. I know that that is difficult to believe, but I have seen it. We are asking the primary producers, the people in the country, and the people who use the interstate railways to bolster up that sort of thing, not by paying for new rails and new rolling stock and things like that but by meeting this wretched interest charge, which simply means that the railway system as a whole will not necessarily benefit. If capital expenditure is increased that debt charge is increased. I think that debt charge should be lifted off the Railways Department and made a charge against the whole of the people; it should not be put onto the department year after year as so much from Consolidated Revenue. It does aid, but it does not do any good: it does not give more rolling stock, and it does not improve the rails.

I was promised years ago that the only way we could get a new railway line from Riverton to Spalding would be through the conversion of the Broken Hill track to standard gauge. I was told that there were good rails on that line and that, when those rails were taken up, the Riverton-Spalding line would be rebuilt. I do not know how many rails have yet been taken up, but I am living in hopes that we can start again with another secondhand track. However, I think they will be heavier rails. I think probably they are more like 90 lb. rails on the Broken Hill line, and such rails, when worn out on one side and turned around with the new side opposed to the wheels, would probably last for another 30 years. In the meantime, we are without, and

that is a reflection on the Railways Department although we will bolster it up by doing this. The present Railway Commissioner is one of the most able administrators I have ever met, but probably the worst salesman I have ever known. He cannot sell the railway system to the public and I do not think he tried to. All he did was to administer the Railways Department and at that he was good. Compared with what one sees about railway systems in other countries we want to spend much money on our railway system if it is to be effective, as those overseas. A large sum is required to bring the railway system to a good working standard. It works efficiently but does not work fast, and many tracks in South Australia are not speed tracks. Washed out and worn out, it is time they were renewed. This will cost a tremendous sum and no doubt another Bill will be introduced later on which I shall address myself more forcibly than I am speaking now.

I approve of the Bill, which takes away the full standing from the Commissioner. I believe one should be able to approach a Minister who is directly in command of a department, but we have not been able to do that with the Railways Department. I should like to compliment the Commissioner on his capable administration. I understand he retires soon and will not lose his power until then. His successor will not have the power that the present Commissioner has, and I agree with that, because one difficulty associated with the Railways Department is that it has been a sort of ivory tower into which members of Parliament hesitated to intrude. One was received well, but I never knew anyone who could refuse what one asked as could the present Commissioner. That does not detract from his ability. That is how he saw his job and he was prepared to do his job as he saw it. Although I have been affronted on occasions, I have much admiration for the man and his attempts to do what he thought was right. The Bill provides:

The Minister may at any time in writing request the Commissioner to propose in writing a scheme for effecting an increase of income or a decrease of expenditure, or for carrying out any matter of general policy specified by the Minister, and if the Minister approves of the same he may direct the Commissioner to take all necessary steps to carry out the same. If the Minister does not approve of any scheme proposed by the Commissioner, he may himself transmit to the Commissioner any proposition for effecting and carrying out such increase decrease or matter of policy, and thereupon the Commissioner shall take all necessary steps to give effect to such proposition.

Where any direction or proposition given or transmitted in pursuance of subsection (1) of this section adversely affects the accounts of the railways, the Commissioner shall notify the Minister thereof from time to time, and the amount of any loss occasioned by the direction or proposition shall, if certified by the Auditor-General, be paid to the Commissioner out of moneys to be provided by Parliament.

That is practically the same as we have today.

Mr. Shannon: No, it is entirely different.

Mr. QUIRKE: We provide the money.

Mr. Shannon: The Minister will be the deciding factor.

Mr. QUIRKE: Of course, Parliament will be the final authority and can agree or disagree, and Parliament always can do that. In this case the Minister is responsible for the railways, and there is no doubt about that. The Bill further provides:

The Governor may make regulations fixing the amount of fares for the conveyance of passengers and the charges for the carriage of animals, goods and parcels and the circumstances and conditions in which the Commissioner will make special rates for the carriage of goods.

These charges will be recommended and approved, but the Government will make regulations for fares and freight charges so that they will have to be submitted by the Commissioner to the Minister, and the Governor will make the regulations accordingly if the Minister agrees. The same applies to by-laws.

Mr. Shannon: It does not say that at all.

Mr. QUIRKE: These are regulations, and in the actual administration the Minister will call for a report from the Commissioner and that will be supplied, but there is a Ministerial condition whereby he can disapprove and raise the rate.

Mr. Shannon: Or reduce it?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, by regulation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They can be disallowed by Parliament.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Bill further provides:

The by-laws which were made by the Commissioner before the commencement of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act Amendment Act, 1965, fixing the amount of fares for the conveyance of passengers and the charges for the carriage of animals, goods and parcels and which were in force immediately before such commencement shall, upon such commencement, continue to be of full force and effect, but may be altered or repealed by regulations made pursuant to section 131a of this Act.

That means that present conditions will continue until they are altered by regulations. There is an amendment whereby the value of animals transported increases, but one item I cannot understand.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should not be dealing with the amendment now.

Mr. QUIRKE: I suppose I should not. It must be recognized that this Bill removes power from the Railways Commissioner, who hands it over to the Minister *holus bolus*. The Minister will be responsible for running of railways; he will make all the regulations and fix the fares and other charges. He will be responsible for running the whole organization. I do not know why he wants this responsibility at this stage, because it certainly is a responsibility since the railway system today, with the very best that can be said for it, is run down. The attitude towards the public is not the best. I often think of the railways refreshment rooms. There has been no deviation from the case-hardened pie, the bulk-made coffee and tea and the idea that it is good for a person always to eat his meals standing up, surrounded by a crowd. That sort of thing has not progressed in the last 60 years; it is still the same as ever. If anything, as the pies are usually mass-produced they are a little more solid on the outside. In one or two moments of indiscretion I would essay to eat them, but sometimes one needs to carry a band-saw to take portions off them. Occasionally there are good ones, but it is the general approach to the public that concerns me. We still have the railway sandwich (two thick slices of bread and one thin slice of meat), the bulk-made tea or coffee, and the pie that one eats like a horse with a nosebag on. The Minister will have to alter that. When he is in charge, I will take a trip around the railway system and come back and tell him all the disabilities. Many other members will, too.

There has been no effort to sell the railway system to the travelling public. I raise another point. I say this with considerable regret, but some of the railway staff has not yet learnt ordinary courtesy to the travelling public. I do not think I can be taken to task for saying that. Reports have reached me about this, and on one occasion I actually saw what was done by an officer in the interstate ticket office to a passenger: it would have earned him instant dismissal in any private organization. I do not like criticizing employees; I certainly would not criticize the ordinary rank and file on the lines working against insuperable odds to keep decrepit lines like the one to Spalding in action. They have to be at it night and day, and they have done a great job to keep that line in action.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I have heard no complaints about the men in the cars.

Mr. QUIRKE: No; it is not general among railway employees but there are some to whom attention might be given. There is plenty of evidence of that. It will cost a colossal sum to modernize the railway system. I am glad that the Minister is taking on this responsibility, because I should not like to see it thrust on to a new Commissioner. Let the Minister see what he can do to rejuvenate our railway system.

We are merely bolstering up, piecemeal, a decrepit organization, and we shall certainly not achieve much. Indeed, it should not be done in this way. The department is past earning the interest on a capital debt that has existed for three-quarters of a century, many of its assets having long since disappeared. I was interested to read portion of the Vernon Report drawing attention to similar matters and suggesting that it was time that the whole of Australia's financial structure was reviewed. I thoroughly agree with that suggestion, because that structure is daily breaking down in every direction and a greater burden is being thrust on the public. We have had a far greater series of collapses in high places today than we may realize, and this is a reflection on our present systems. For instance, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is in exactly the same position—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. QUIRKE: Very well; I shall be good, Mr. Speaker. I emphasize that the Railways Department cannot carry such a heavy burden of interest and at the same time rebuild its system to be able to compete with road transport. People (including me) have, in sheer disgust, forsaken the railways for road transport, which is highly efficient. I support the proposal that the Minister shall have charge of the Railways Department, because the easiest way for a member to have his ideas and criticisms recognized is to be able to bring them before the House. Private members have always been diffident about criticizing public officers. When the Commissioner was in charge, any reflection on the system was, of course, a reflection on him. For that reason alone, I support the Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): This is one of the few occasions on which I agree with the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke). I, too, support the Bill. I agree wholeheartedly with what he has said about the colossal debt hanging over the Railways Department in South Australia, that debt having been incurred over the years because of development of the State. It is a pity that we cannot wipe off the debt so that

the department can get off to a fresh start and the system can be built up into something that will benefit the State. South Australia is in the invidious position of having most of its best lines operated by the Commonwealth Railways system. Railway transportation, not only in South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth, has been killed by breaks of gauge. Honourable members need only read the Clapp Report that was furnished to the Commonwealth Government to see the sorry state in Australia because of the different rail gauges. South Australia has three gauges—3ft. 6in., 4ft. 8½in. and 5ft. 3in. This necessitates the continual transfer of goods from trains operating on one gauge to trains operating on another. Although this is not so bad in the South-East, where the 5ft. 3in. gauge goes through to Victoria, in the North goods must be transferred at Port Pirie and Terowie.

I believe the Government will realize that the only way to improve the railway system throughout the Commonwealth in general and in South Australia in particular is to standardize gauges. Recently I have asked questions in the House about the economics of converting the line through Terowie and Peterborough to Broken Hill to a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. Such a move would greatly enhance the whole South Australian railway system. As the member for Burra has said, the South Australian railway system is completely run down. I was rather surprised to hear that from a member of the previous Government because, during the last 30-odd years, when the Liberal Government was in power in South Australia it did nothing to lift the railway system out of the doldrums. In 1936 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into a suburban electrification scheme. I believe that the Public Works Committee sanctioned this scheme, but dieselization was implemented instead. That might have been the right thing to do at that time. However, throughout the world and in other States, particularly Victoria and New South Wales, railways are electrified, and perhaps we would be better off if we had suburban railway electrification. Time will tell whether that is so.

Mr. Quirke: Electricity is needed for that.

Mr. CASEY: Of course, but that brings in another matter.

Mr. Coumbe: I think the diesels have proved themselves, haven't they?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has referred to them on occasions as "red hens" and, apparently, they do not give the service required in some instances. I understand that, in the operation

of the "red hens", one unit can be run singly, but that the next grouping must be three, because two units cannot operate linked. That is uneconomic, and it does not happen with electrification. The Bill before us is essential, and its provisions should have been given effect to years ago.

The fares charged on a country line were mentioned recently and, in such cases, it would have been better if the honourable member had obtained the information he desired from the Railways Commissioner, because there has been no real representation of the department in Parliament. However, Parliament should be answerable not only to members themselves but also to the people in general. I think the introduction of this measure is a progressive step. The Commissioner will be the top authority in the Railways Department and will administer that department as he has been doing. I think the new Commissioner will do a good job. He is a young man who has travelled. However, on policy matters the Government of the day should be responsible and answerable to Parliament. Any honourable member should be able to inquire through the Minister in Parliament regarding the particular railway matter in which he is interested, as is the case with other departments, such as Works, Lands, Agriculture, and so on.

If criticism has been levelled at the department (and there has been some over the years I have been here), the answer given has always been that the matter will be referred to the Commissioner for report. The matter could not be taken any further than that, and there was no redress to the Minister. I do not know why the previous Government called the particular Minister the Minister of Railways, because he was so in name only. He had no authority whatsoever regarding the policy of the Railways Department, this being determined by the Commissioner. However, under this Bill, the Commissioner will be responsible to the Minister and the Minister will be responsible to Parliament. Formerly, the Minister of Railways was not responsible to Parliament. To every question I asked about the railways I received the same reply, "This matter will be referred to the Commissioner," and the reply I got back *via* the Minister was always from the Commissioner.

Mr. Nankivell: The honourable member will get the same thing now.

Mr. CASEY: No, it will be signed by the Minister, but a member may always go back.

Mr. Nankivell: It will not mean any more.

Mr. CASEY: It will. The same principle will apply as when a question is asked of the Minister of Works, or any other Minister.

Mr. Nankivell: The Director writes a report.

Mr. CASEY: I know, but the honourable member can always voice his opinion as to that, and that is the point I am trying to make. The whole railway system, as the member for Burra pointed out, has been declining over the years, and that is no feather in the cap of the past Government. I hope that the present Government will be able to do something to bring the railways back into the public eye, create an image, and get people to patronize them. The railways are essential and competitive; there is no question about that. As I travel on the railways probably more than all other members, except the member for Mount Gambier, I know that some of our railway refreshment rooms are back in the dark ages, and many go back to the days of the wild west. What staggers me is that all railway refreshment rooms run at a loss, and a big loss at that. The inefficiency of the railways can be observed from the following procedure. Travelling from Port Pirie to Adelaide, after coming down on the Ghan from Alice Springs and linking up with the train that reaches Adelaide at about 9 p.m., I have often used the buffet car provided. That car is open until the train gets to within a short distance of Bowmans when, for some reason or other, the car closes and the Bowmans refreshment rooms open. All the people on the train have been able to use the facilities of the buffet car up to that point, and yet for some reason that car is closed so that the same people can patronize Bowmans refreshment rooms.

I do not see any sense in that at all: it is poor administration. In this House members have often said that our interstate booking office at the Adelaide Station is slow in giving attention to prospective travellers. A person takes his place in a queue, takes a ticket from a small pad, and waits until his name is called; he may have to wait for 20 minutes in a busy period. Yet that person can go across the street to the offices of T.A.A. or Ansett-A.N.A. and obtain a ticket almost immediately.

Mr. Nankivell: That's free enterprise for you!

Mr. CASEY: That was the administration under the previous Government. We have been in Government only a short time, and I hope that the administration of the Railways

Department will improve. If it does not, the member for Albert may rise and expound the philosophy of private enterprise as it would apply to the railways, which are Government controlled, and show the Government what can be done. I have no qualms about private enterprise, and I believe in it entirely. I think this Bill will do much for the railways in South Australia. I believe the policy of the railways is a matter for the Government of the day, whether it be Labor or Liberal, and that the Minister should be answerable to Parliament. I consider that the policy laid down by the Government of the day and conveyed to the Railways Commissioner will result in improved relationships between the Government, the Railways Department and the public. I think there will come a time when a rail link between Whyalla and Port Augusta will be necessary, and that it should be the policy of this Government to ensure that the South Australian Railways Department operates that line.

Mr. Heaslip: This Bill won't affect that.

Mr. CASEY: Well, it could, because it defines the policy of the Railways Department.

Mr. Shannon: It does not empower the department to build a new line.

Mr. CASEY: That is so. However, I think that at the appropriate time this Government could bring a scheme into operation to link these two big cities in the north of the State. In fact, it is vital for a city like Whyalla to be connected with a railway system. The Commonwealth line between Port Augusta and Port Pirie could be used, although under the agreement with the Commonwealth Government we would have to pay for the use of that line.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Apparently we have a bottomless purse somewhere that we have not yet discovered. The member for Burra wants to write off the railways debt. I do not know how we can do that unless we convert it to our national debt and pay it over 50-odd years. The member for Frome wants to standardize all our railway lines and build a few new ones as well. These are matters that I fear will not encourage the Government very much when it comes to look at the financial impact on railway revenue. In fact, it will have the opposite effect. We would have to get the Commonwealth Government to play ball with us and come in on the same basis as it did on the Cockburn to Port Pirie line. Has the member for Frome even an obscure clue as to what State finances would be involved in meeting our three-tenths share?

If he has not, I ask him to see how much this State can afford toward standardizing our railway system.

The honourable member said that our Railways Department had made no progress over a number of years, that it was still in the doldrums, and that it had done nothing to improve efficiency. Let me tell the honourable member that that is entirely wrong. The introduction during the term of office of the present Commissioner of diesel-electric prime movers has improved our financial return by some hundreds of thousands of pounds a year. One effort did that. Regarding the proposal submitted to the Public Works Committee (before I was Chairman) for the electrification of the suburban railway system, that wisely was not proceeded with by the Government of the day or by any succeeding Government.

Mr. Casey: It is not too late.

Mr. SHANNON: No, but it will not be done for a valid reason. The diesel-electric cars are much more mobile without fixed overhead transmission lines for power. Traffic can be varied with the needs of the shifting population, without undue cost. These factors apply in a transport system, and these are reasons why road transport can compete successfully with the railway system. The Railways Department is the biggest single enterprise owned by the State: it is the largest employer of labour and the largest spender of State funds.

Mr. Hall: It is not as big as the Electricity Trust.

Mr. SHANNON: That is in a different category and is not a straightout owned system. The railway system is a much larger employer of labour. Several factors have been overlooked by the members for Burra and Frome, who both failed to notice that we are dealing with a complex undertaking. The Railways Department is a common carrier. The only way a railwayman can become efficient is to come up through the ranks, and the Railways Department is administered in this State mostly by men who have done that. They have learned the hard way by doing the menial tasks and then rising through the Traffic Branch, to the administrative section. I cannot understand how the member for Burra can expect to have a more efficient management of the railway system by a tyro who has done nothing in the railway system and has had no experience in it, and this applies to the Minister. I cannot understand how one can expect to get a more efficient operation from a tyro than from a man who has been trained almost from boyhood

to handle these problems. We are told that we must have improvements, although I do not know whether we shall have more elaborate eating houses at railway stations. Apparently we are losing money at present, and we will probably lose more. It is the present Government's policy to obtain another £1,000,000 of revenue, not to spend it, but what I have heard about from the members for Burra and Frome are spending propositions, not saving propositions.

Mr. McKee: We must have new rolling stock.

Mr. SHANNON: If the member for Port Pirie thinks we can buy traffic, that is not the way to do it. It is efficient handling of the business that will attract the customers. Some of the rolling stock that the South Australian Railways has built is equal to anything I have seen in Australia. If honourable members want to criticize the Railways Department for its inefficiency, please do not criticize it on that score. If it is to be criticized on its permanent way, well and good, but whose fault is that? That is the fault of the parsimonious Parliament that has not given it sufficient money.

Mr. Jennings: Who has been in control of the Treasury?

Mr. SHANNON: That is all right. If the member for Enfield wants to pass it on to me, I am prepared to accept it. The permanent way on Eyre Peninsula and in the Murray areas has been allowed to deteriorate. That is a pity, because the line is expensive to restore. I could not believe my ears when I heard the member for Burra read from new section 95a as follows:

The Minister may at any time in writing request the Commissioner to propose in writing a scheme for effecting an increase of income or a decrease of expenditure, or for carrying out any matter of general policy specified by the Minister.

That rocked me. If we are to appoint any person (I do not care how able the Minister may be) to deal with our Railways Department and he does not know the first thing about railway operation, heaven help us! This Bill does not meet with my approval. I see no good in it but, on the contrary, many headaches for the Government. The member for Frome visualizes our being able to come straight to the Minister with all our problems. If that happens, the Minister will wish before long that he hadn't been born and could hide away. This is not the sort of undertaking where we should install any form of control not highly skilled. The present Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fargher) has been criticized, but I should like to say



a few words in his favour. Like all administrators of big undertakings, he has, of necessity, had to say "No" every now and again. If the Commissioner had not had the courage to say "No", I do not know what would have happened to our railway system. An examination of the Railways Department's accounts will show that Mr. Fargher's administration will bear comparison with that of any of his predecessors. I also know and respect Mr. Fitch, who has had the right sort of training. He was not trained in this State but, I think, came from the Commonwealth Railways. His should certainly be a successful appointment.

Mr. Coumbe: He is an engineer.

Mr. SHANNON: He is but that may not be an essential qualification. After all, the chief of staff of this undertaking must have, as well as his ordinary training in railway operations, a commonsense approach to administration and business practice. The Railways Department is an extremely complex organization in which the Commissioner plays a vital part, for example, in effecting savings. From the Government's legislative programme, it is obvious that it desires money, but let us not allow our railway system to suffer tremendous losses. Even though a Minister may be willing and able, it cannot be expected that his directions will necessarily benefit the State.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause to amend section 98 of the principal Act.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

New clause 4a—"Special conditions, if just and reasonable, may be made."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move to insert the following new clause:

4a. Subsection (1) of section 98 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out the word "twenty" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "forty"; and

(b) by striking out the passage "one pound for any sheep, pig or other small animal" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "ten pounds for any pig, or four pounds for any sheep or one pound for any other small animal".

The new clause raises the rate of damages recoverable from the Railways Commissioner for loss or injury in respect of livestock. The present limits are £50 for any horse, £20 a head of cattle, and £1 for any sheep, pig or

other small animal. The Government has been approached by the South Australian Stock Salesmen's Association and asked to fix a more realistic maximum, since the present rates have operated for many years. The Government agrees that the amounts fixed are too low, and the new clause raises them to £40 a head of cattle, £10 a pig and £4 for any sheep.

Mr. Hall: Does the amount for a horse remain the same?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: We are not increasing the amount of £50 for any horse.

Mr. McANANEY: When stock is injured on the railway system, responsibility is not accepted by the Railways Department unless there is something wrong with a truck or stock has been left too long. In other cases the department always points out that an extra fee must be paid to cover such things. Not many producers are aware of this until their stock is killed, and then they are told that they should have paid the extra fee. This fact should be pointed out to people so that they will know what the position is.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### EXCESSIVE RENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 11. Page 2786.)

Clause 7—"Applications by purchasers of substandard houses"—which the Hon. D. N. Brookman had moved to amend by inserting after "writing" the words "made on or after 2nd November, 1965."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): As the reason for retrospectivity has been given by the Attorney-General, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Alexandra moved the amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2740.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): This short Bill amends the Fauna Conservation Act of 1964. I strongly believe that the Act is a sound one, but it has proved

advisable to make several comparatively small alterations with all of which I agree. One alteration provides that police officers do not have to carry permits. Another alteration is to enable the Minister to give authority to bird-banding organizations and others to band birds inside fauna sanctuaries where they can be more properly examined than if they were on other types of land outside sanctuaries. Often better research can be carried out within a sanctuary and, as it has turned out, the Minister has not had adequate power to give authority to band birds in those areas. I have a small amendment on honourable members' files to enable landowners to give authority to destroy pests, but I will describe that later in the Committee stages. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause to amend section 33 of the principal Act.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

New clause 3a—"Dogs, cats and pests in prohibited areas, reserves and sanctuaries."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. Section 33 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "land" where it first occurs in subsection (1) thereof the passage "(or any person authorized by such inspector, or owner or occupier of any land)".

The provisions of the comparatively new Fauna Conservation Act are strengthened by the fact that private owners of land who use such land for farming and other grazing purposes may apply to have their properties to be declared sanctuaries. If this amendment is accepted, these sanctuaries will still have the full protection under the Act. Very often the wild life does not interfere in any way with farming operations and can be left completely undisturbed. The legislation has been quite successful, and many owners have applied for land to be so declared. I think the legislation is a significant step forward in conservation in this State. However, it is slightly restricted by section 33 (1), which states:

Subject to subsection (2) of this section, an inspector, or an owner or occupier of any land which is the whole or a part of a prohibited area, fauna reserve, fauna sanctuary or game reserve may destroy any of the following animals or birds on that land, namely:

- (a) any dog or cat;
- (b) any animal or bird of a controlled species;
- (c) any animal or bird of a prohibited species;
- (d) any vermin within the meaning of the Vermin Act, 1931-1962.

My amendment will slightly widen the provision and give the owner or occupier a little more scope in the destruction of animals or birds that are not protected. It does not in any way alter the fact that if the owner himself has applied for his property to be declared a sanctuary he may not destroy native birds or protected birds or animals; it merely gives him that extra scope regarding other animals.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I have no objection to the amendment, and I recommend that the Committee accept it.

New clause inserted.

Titled passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 2812.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): One or two questions need to be asked in connection with this Bill. The Minister when explaining the Bill said:

In consequence of proposals put forward to the former Minister of Lands by a deputation on behalf of the settlers in the Eight Mile Creek settlement, the Government has agreed to introduce this Bill to amend the basis of valuation for the purposes of assessing the drainage maintenance rates in the settlement so as to provide that the valuation is to be based on the unimproved value of each holding rather than on its market value as now applying.

Do I understand from that statement that the deputation represented all settlers on Eight Mile Creek? Obviously some settlers, because of the change in the method of rating, will get a lower rate and some will get a higher rate. I cannot believe that this deputation was unanimous and, if it was not, the reasons for altering the basis from an improved value to an unimproved value should be made clear. These blocks were allotted not as unimproved land but as improved land. If they had been allotted as unimproved land they would be unimproved as they were under water and in their natural state, and had been a quagmire before the Government took up the land, drained

it, put houses on it, did what was necessary to settle it, and then made the allocation under the war service land settlement scheme. It will be difficult for the Land Board to fix an unimproved value as between area and area, and I do not know how the board will do it. It was under 3ft. of water and probably would have remained there except that a large sum was available from the Commonwealth Government for its settlement.

Although this alteration will relieve some settlers of rates which they have paid under the agreement by which they were settled, it alters the agreement on which the various settlers were placed on the blocks. An Act was passed when they were placed on the blocks but this Bill alters the conditions. If this alteration is being made without the consent of all the settlers, it should be inquired into by a Select Committee rather than be passed as a matter of no moment by this House. Are all the settlers prepared to accept this new form of rating, or is it something that has been suggested by a section of the settlers and approved by the Minister as something he thinks should be done? Although I do not intend at this stage to oppose the Bill, I ask the Minister how many settlers were represented on the deputation and whether any action has been taken to get the views of settlers who may be adversely affected by this Bill.

[Midnight.]

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Although I was associated with settlement in the South-East, I was not directly concerned with Eight Mile Creek. I share the concern of the Leader in this matter. From the little I know of Eight Mile Creek, it appears that some blocks were wetter than others and many were under 3ft. of water. I should like to hear the Minister's explanation of the real reasons for the introduction of this Bill, as there is some need to put this matter on an equitable basis for the settlers there.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The deputation that was introduced to the then Minister of Lands resulted from the quinquennial assessment made in May of this year, in accordance with the Act, which meant an increase, in most cases, of the drainage maintenance rate as applied to the Eight Mile Creek settlement. In every case there were appeals against the assessment and a meeting of the settlers was called. They sought legal advice on what could be done about their appeals. The meeting was fully representative of all the settlers in the Eight Mile Creek area,

with the possible exception of the person who owned a cheese factory in that area, who would not be directly affected by the drainage maintenance rate.

This meeting sent a deputation to the Minister. One of its major points was that it did not consider the method of valuing under the improved or market value of land fair and reasonable, because a person who was a good manager and worked hard could be penalized whereas a person who possibly did not work so hard or manage his block so well might not be penalized. The deputation contended that it would prefer the valuation to be made on unimproved values. I point out that it certainly was not my decision, as Minister of Lands, to introduce the Bill. I know the area concerned, as it is in my district, and, as the Bill meets the wishes of the settlers in the area, I am pleased that the Government saw fit to introduce it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Were all the settlers unanimous on the change in the rating system?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The executive of the organizing committee that was formed for this purpose has known for about six weeks that the Bill would be introduced, and knew also of its contents. I have heard no objection from any settler in the Eight Mile Creek area. Nor have I heard of any objection from the executive of the committee. Therefore, so far as I am aware, there are no objections to the Bill.

Mr. Quirke: Is it expected that the same sum will be returned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director is responsible to fix the sum required over the five-year period for the maintenance of the drains, and the rate is then struck accordingly. The Bill seeks to make it a more equitable rate over the whole settlement. Some people will have to pay a higher rate than others.

Mr. Rodda: Some will pay less under this scheme and others will pay more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Having received no objections from an individual or from a group of settlers, I believe that has been accepted.

Mr. Rodda: Some will benefit more than others.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We have to look at the unimproved value of the area.

Mr. Rodda: It will be difficult.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: By ascertaining the market value of a property and the cost of bringing it into production, we can fairly say that the difference is the unimproved

value. In the case of Eight Mile Creek, the drainage referred to by the Leader of the Opposition was provided and paid for by the State and not by individual settlers. Therefore, the drainage outside the boundary of any property would not be considered in the improved value, but in the unimproved value, whereas a drain constructed on a property by the owner, which had a direct effect on that property, would be considered to be improved value and not, therefore, included in the unimproved value. Drainage paid for by the State, to which the settlers have not contributed at all, can fairly be added to the unimproved value of a property. The settlers do, of course, contribute to the maintenance of the drains, about which they do not particularly complain, because they realize that it is essential for the drains to be maintained in first-class order. I do not believe the Leader need have any fear about objections to a change in the Act from settlers within the area concerned.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister said that there had been a fairly long time (I think it was six weeks) for settlers to be informed about this matter. I point out that the Bill was introduced on November 16, only eight days ago. It has certainly not been a public matter for any length of time, and it could easily not have been seen by persons interested. It is obvious from the Minister's statement that it was not a unanimous deputation but a committee that set out to get this done. I doubt whether the majority of the settlers know what is involved in the Bill. This will be a bit of a gamble by settlers with regard to what the unimproved value in the area will be. However, as the Minister is the member for the district and as he says that the settlers approve, I do not intend to make any objection, though I doubt whether the end result will be as satisfactory as we have been told it will be. Obviously, if the settlers have already appealed against their assessments some will appeal against the new assessments because the total amount of the rating will not be altered as it is based upon the necessity for a drain. Therefore, somebody will be disappointed soon.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I am perfectly sure that the deputation was fully representative of the settlers in the area. They were not informed of the actual contents of the Bill, but about five weeks

ago I informed the secretary, appointed by the committee, of the intention of the Bill. I told him that it was intended to change the assessment from market values to unimproved values and so make it more equitable and possibly fairer than the previous valuation. As I said, neither the settlers nor the secretary has been in touch with me since. I agree with the Leader that there will possibly be appeals against the assessment. The settlers appealed in the first instance in 1960, again in 1965, and undoubtedly there will be appeals in 1966 when the new assessment is made on the new basis. This is their right and they exercise it freely, as the member for Burra knows. I say definitely that this deputation was fully representative of the settlers in the area, and I should be surprised indeed if I now received any objections to the measure, because I think ample warning was given to the settlers to raise objections if they so desired.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 2302.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): From the point of view of the effect upon the community, this is probably one of the most important Bills introduced this year and I rather regret that the Premier has seen fit to deal with it after midnight. I should have thought it could be considered by the House at a more suitable time. However, we are now called upon to debate it.

I oppose it on two principal grounds, the first of which is the economic ground. Although we may consider that these things are not important and that this Parliament may disregard them, we must remember that this State is not the one most endowed with natural assets and we must remember that we have to compete with other States of the Commonwealth as far as our factory production is concerned, and with oversea countries as far as our primary products are concerned. Anything that increases the cost of or inconveniences production, or drives industry away from this State, will have serious consequences ultimately.

If I may digress for a moment, in 1933, when I was first elected to this House, we were plagued with transport control, which

affected my own district and particularly an industry that had been established at Mannum. I think I spoke in that Parliament only upon transport control and considered at that time that, if there was one thing that we ought to do, it was to make the King's highway free for the commerce of this country. Today I still consider that that is one of our principal functions. At that time the argument was that the roads and the railways did not compete on equal terms, because the railways had to provide running tracks whereas a transport operator did not provide the road. Of course, that argument broke down completely when the road maintenance tax was introduced so that the transport operator does now, in fact, compete fairly and squarely with the railways after having paid a charge for road maintenance. I point out that the charge has been determined as fair and equitable by no less an authority than the High Court of Australia. Therefore, when the road maintenance tax was introduced the Government at that time took steps to terminate transport control and give freedom to the operator and to the commerce of the country to enable them to use the roads in the manner for which they have been constructed. I believe the Bill is a retrograde step, a step that ultimately will have adverse results as far as this State is concerned, and I am sure that it will put commerce and industry in this State back very much.

I do not pretend to be an industrialist, but I was concerned when I read only last week the remarks of one of the great industrialists in South Australia, and he is also one of the most efficient. I refer to Mr. Schroeder, who was the General Manager and is now, I believe, Chairman of Directors of the Adelaide Cement Company. He pointed out in no uncertain manner how adverse the effects of this legislation would be upon the manufacturing industry of the State. I believe that that is correct, because—

Mr. McKee: Has that been the case in other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will deal fully with that later. I should like to be allowed to make my speech in the way that I consider it should be made, and the honourable member for Port Pirie can later put his views and I will listen to him with courtesy when he deigns to do so. In reply to the reference that the honourable member made, I point out that the circumstances in other States are not the same as those existing in South Australia and that is something we must remember in this Parliament.

Victoria and New South Wales sit upon a home market because the bulk of the population is in those States. They do not have to compete at a distance, using road transport to get their commodities to the different centres. As far as Queensland and Western Australia are concerned, each has vast resources that attract industries and each will progress through those industries, even though there may be some detrimental factor as far as their economy is concerned. However, that does not apply to South Australia because we do not possess those natural advantages and, in fact, we have many natural disadvantages.

If we are to compete with companies in other States and with oversea rural production, the cost of production in this State must be kept down to the lowest possible level. I believe—and I say this not unkindly—that one of the features of the Government's policy at the present time is that it is not cost-conscious at all. We see in every direction costs being put up against industry. I have personal knowledge of how difficult it was to overcome our natural disability which for so many years held this State back. I say without fear of contradiction that anybody who has studied this position will acknowledge that this is a most retrograde step and that it will have the greatest consequences on the future development of this State.

The railways can and do undertake many phases of transport in successful competition with road transport. It is rather interesting to note that when this Parliament passed the law that virtually abolished the operations of the Transport Control Board the rail earnings were not affected. My honourable friends opposite made some dire predictions that the moment there was freedom of the roads the rail earnings would drop, but that did not happen. We had the advantages of the freedom of the roads without the corresponding loss that we were told would take place on the railways. I point out to members opposite, particularly to those who so blithely talk about interstate comparisons, that under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution freedom of the States is assured to us. Therefore, there can be no argument that this transport control will drive business away from South Australia. A carrier at Mount Gambier will be free to go to Melbourne and pay one-third of a penny on 40 per cent of his loaded capacity, plus the tare weight.

Mr. Freebairn: And at Renmark, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He can do that without restriction and without

getting a permit from anybody. The commerce of Mount Gambier and the whole of the South-East can go to Victoria without let or hindrance, and nothing this Parliament can do can stop it. We are deliberately placing an embargo upon Mount Gambier dealing with the rest of this State as a result of this legislation. A short while ago the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) referred to the effect upon other States, but he should surely know that already we have had the problem of the diversion eastward from Broken Hill of, I think, about 3,000 tons of certain products a week.

Mr. Casey: How much is coming down this way?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot give the precise figure, but I believe it is 14,000 or 15,000 tons.

Mr. Casey: It is 20,000 tons at the moment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That may be so, but at one time we had all of it.

Mr. Casey: About 12,000 tons.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A diversion has already taken place. Several times in the last 10 years we have had threats of bigger diversions, and we have met these only by making concessions. This State cannot afford to make arbitrary laws suppressing road transport, and I say without fear of contradiction that the people who have introduced this Bill will be the first to disown it in the future. In certain electoral districts it is bitterly opposed, and it will continue to be bitterly opposed. I had the privilege of introducing the Bill that abolished transport control in this State, and I hope that in future I may be in Parliament to introduce another such Bill. If I am in Parliament and able to do so, I will introduce a Bill to abolish transport control again. I am certain that I shall have the support of present Opposition members. I oppose the Bill not because the Government is introducing it but because I believe it is wrong, and if in the future I can rectify this mistake I will undoubtedly take action, as I have previously done, to free transport control in this State. It is undesirable; it will increase costs; it will inconvenience the community; and it will have a bad effect on the economic growth of this State. Also, it will have a detrimental effect on the establishment of new industries in this State. More than that, I believe it will have a bad effect on future efforts at decentralizing industry.

It is interesting to note that all increased charges are borne by country interests. A ring 25 miles around the metropolitan area is

exempt. It is easy for the member for Port Adelaide to say that is good. However, all these charges are completely borne by country interests. A primary producer sells his commodities at f.o.b. price, and in every case has to pay the cost of getting them to the seaports. A margin is taken off the wheat price for transport charges. If the same primary producer buys a tractor, he buys it at the Adelaide price and has to pay the cost of transporting it to him. The country man has to pay the cost in every case, and that applies to country industries, because all the requirements for establishing and maintaining the industry have to be purchased on the basis of the original cost plus the cost of cartage. When the products are placed on the market, the company has to pay the cost of cartage to the place of sale.

This Bill affects country interests; that has been evidenced by the strong political opposition that is obvious from place to place in the country. I suggest that that in itself is something that can well warrant the attention of this Parliament, as apparently Government members are not listening to these objections at present. The establishment of industry outside the metropolitan area can be forgotten if this Bill is passed.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the honourable member understands these things!

Mr. Ryan: Have another look at the Bill!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The people competent to speak have said that this spells the complete rejection of any decentralization efforts.

Mr. Ryan: It will encourage decentralization.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I see that the Attorney-General has the stomach-ache again but it will get better by tomorrow. When he hears something he does not like, he always assumes a certain countenance, which may please him but which, I assure him, it is not pleasing to look at.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was not intended to be.

Mr. Ryan: Have you looked in the glass yourself?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and I look at the Premier, too. I say to the Premier that, while we may force something on to the Railways Department, we cannot force industries into the country; no-one yet has been able to do that. The only way to do that is to give the industries in the country an opportunity to compete on favourable terms with industries established in the

cities. As I have already pointed out, this Bill imposes the brunt of the Treasurer's financial proposals upon the country dweller. The city is completely exempted for a radius of 25 miles, but the country is not. It will not like this Bill, whether or not honourable members like it. There will be strong country opposition to it—and rightly so. Why do we impose the obligation upon the country of making the Railways Department pay? That is what this Bill amounts to.

Mr. Coumbe: It is sectional.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We can have all the bright ideas we like but it is an undeniable fact that it is not economic to establish industries in the country if they are to be humbugged with transport control of this nature.

I turn now to the Bill itself. Any accuracy in the Premier's second reading explanation of what is contained in the Bill is purely coincidental because, if we read the Premier's explanation of the Bill and then read the Bill itself, we find that the matters mentioned in the Bill are not mentioned in the explanation and the matters mentioned in the explanation are completely absent from the Bill. It is remarkable that one can make a statement embodying so many words without occasionally being right, but the fact is that all the things that the Premier said would happen will happen only if the Minister decides from day to day that they will happen. They are not in the Bill and there is nothing in the Bill to show what they are. For instance, the Premier said that permits would be freely issued, but that does not appear in the Bill. The Premier also said permits would probably be issued by a police officer. If we look at the Bill we see, first, that it re-establishes the Transport Control Board in all its glory, except that it is subject to the control of the Minister. Few of the board's duties have been altered, notwithstanding that the Premier said we would have an open road policy. Controlled routes are re-established; the board can control additional routes, subject to the approval of the Minister. Parliament is not required to examine that matter; no proclamation is required, and the order is not subject to disallowance. Whereas, previously, the Transport Control Board applied only to a person carting for hire or reward, it now applies to everyone and everything.

Ancillary vehicles are brought under the control of the board. The Premier says that the Transport Control Board that was abolished

by my Government is set up again, and all the provisions under the Road and Railway Transport Act are re-enacted, subject to a few minor amendments. They, incidentally, are along two principal lines: the first is to place the Minister in charge, and the second is to increase the powers of the board, again subject to the Minister in charge. The Premier said the maximum fee to be charged would be 2c a ton-mile, and I notice an amendment on the file dealing with that matter. I point out, however, that it is not in the Bill. The Premier also said a certain number of permits would be granted a year, as well as a certain number a month, but that is provided neither in the Bill nor in the amendments. That statement is completely without foundation. Indeed, other statements that have been made with a view to allaying public opposition to the Bill should also be looked at with some reservations. The Bill states that the Transport Control Board can charge what it likes.

Those are the provisions of the Bill irrespective of what the Premier might say about Government policy at this time. I suggest that, when the Premier stated in his policy speech that he was going to force £1,000,000 worth of additional freight on to the railways system (and more in succeeding years), that was the real policy of the Government. If the charges that are set out now are, by any chance, able to be coped with by the efficiency of road transport and it is still able to compete with the railways, then these charges will ultimately be pushed up, because the Government's real policy is to suppress road transport. I can see the member for Frome tapping on the amendment which provides for a charge of 2c. There are, however, other provisions in the Bill, apart from the provision for 2c, that provide that the Transport Control Board can charge whatever it likes for a licence.

The Bill has another feature which I believe is highly undesirable and which honourable members opposite should examine closely for their own good rather than for the good of the Opposition. In the Bill, many discretions are given to the Minister with regard to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill, and the Minister can make concessions to people. Two people might be operating in the same district and carting the same product. The Minister could say to one that his charge would be so much, and to the other that he would not be charged anything. Under the Bill, the Minister has complete power and is

not subject to the Transport Control Board; he over-rides the board. He has power to make any remissions he likes, and to impose additional charges. I believe that the provision to which I have referred is wrong and will undoubtedly lead to what happened in another State, where a similar provision led quickly to a charge of corruption. After a year's hearing the charge was not substantiated but it caused the Government of the day the gravest concern. I believe it is entirely wrong that a Minister can tax or can remit charges, because that will lead to charges of corruption, as it has led to them in other States. Because of that, those features of the legislation in other States were removed immediately. When our legislation was first enacted, why was there set up a tribunal appointed by the Governor, completely beyond political control? In the same way, we established a Land Board to determine who would have an allotment of land and who would be charged for it; we did not have an individual deciding these things.

I am certain that this provision was inserted in the Bill without its consequences having been fully considered. I did not know the present Minister of Transport very well before he assumed his office but I have now had an opportunity of meeting him more often and believe him to be an honourable gentleman and a good Minister, so there is no suggestion of any criticism of him in what I am saying. I have received nothing but courtesy from him and consider him to be completely honourable in his ideas and in giving effect to them.

However, the present Minister is not the only Minister of Transport we shall ever have. There will be many more, and probably another fairly soon, so I would not think only of the present occupant of the portfolio. Anything that puts this power into the hands of an individual is wrong, because frequently it will be subject to misconstruction by many people. This Bill makes the board subject to all the political manipulation that any Minister may care to devise in the future.

Mr. Jennings: It brings it under the control of Parliament.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We hear about its being under the control of Parliament, but how long will there be control by Parliament? To give another example, we have a Minister of Marine, and some harbour control regulations (which are subject to the approval of Parliament) have been tabled in this House, and I intend to move for their disallowance. Although the regulations are

subject to the control of Parliament, the fees provided in the regulations are being charged every day and no-one is able to tell me when I shall be able to proceed with my motion for disallowance.

Parliament will not have an opportunity of considering the regulations until then and, in the meantime, the fees are being charged. The member for Enfield knows that and he also knows that the regulations were not brought in until provision for private members' business was ended. We shall probably debate the regulations about March next. That is how much we shall see of any opportunity of Parliament considering this matter. If we are to have control by Parliament, at least let it be by regulation. It surely is not an unknown practice to make charges subject to regulations?

Mr. Jennings: No, but this is completely irrelevant.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not; it is the whole basis of the Bill. It sets out to tax road transport to the degree that will make it impossible for it to compete with the railways. If the two cents a ton-mile does not do it, it will be done in another way. The powers are already inherent in the Bill to enable the Government to do that. I sum up my comments in this respect by saying that it is a Bill deliberately designed to drive road transport off the road. Anything that the Premier says that there is to be an open road policy is not true. It is not set out in the Bill that anybody can get a permit by paying four dollars. It is not set out that that is the only charge to be made. It is not set out that there will be freedom, nor is it set out that these are the only roads to be controlled. The position is that the Minister can direct the board and the board can control every road in the State tomorrow if it so desires, and it will not come before Parliament. It is no use saying that this is just a little bit of mild control, because it is not. The beautiful word used is "co-ordinate". I say that this Bill is designed to "co-ordinate" road traffic off the road! That is the purpose of the Bill, and the Premier in his policy speech made no bones about it. I will say, if it gives honourable members opposite any satisfaction, that the Premier did say in his policy speech that he was going to force a certain amount of transport off the road and put it on the railways. There is no doubt about that; he said it, but he also said that he was going to liberate Eyre Peninsula from the road maintenance tax, and he said a lot of other things. It is a bit



unfortunate for us that this is the particular item he decided to put into effect. We would have preferred him to put others into effect and leave this one by the roadside for a while.

Be that as it may, I repeat that this Bill is undesirable economically and it will have grave repercussions on the future development of this State. It will, in my opinion, seriously hinder any opportunities for decentralizing industry. I do not believe that under this Bill it will be possible to decentralize industry. I venture to suggest that some of the industries already established in the country will have grave difficulty in maintaining their position.

The Bill will drive trade away from this State. Owing to the implications of section 92 of the Constitution, people can trade with the other States and they can completely disregard this Bill. This State adjoins other States on a long frontier, and I believe that the Bill will drive away from this State some of the extremely valuable marginal trade that is now available to us. I would have thought that no Government would want to impair the valuable trade connection that we have with the South-East. However, this Bill will undoubtedly impair our trade relations with many parts of the State.

The form of the Bill is completely undesirable because it gives to the Minister almost unlimited power in the control of road transport. If any honourable member takes the trouble to examine the sections of the principal Act that are being amended and to see how they are being amended, he will realize that the Minister will now assume complete control over the Transport Control Board in the regulation of road transport. The purpose of the Bill is to force road transport off the road and to force goods on to the railways. Whether or not the railways can economically carry them in competition with the road is, of course, another matter. At present it is obvious that in some instances road transport can compete successfully with the railways, whereas in other instances the railways can successfully hold their own against road transport. This Bill will alter the balance for the first year to the extent of £1,000,000. We have had predictions that after the first year the amount will increase, and I do not doubt that, because I believe this will be a cancer on the economy in regard to road transport and that it will be a malignant growth that will gradually suppress road transport to the detriment of the development of the State.

As I said before, I hope that I have an opportunity again of bringing into this House

a Bill to re-establish freedom on the roads and to free road transport. If a carrier pays the road maintenance tax, his ordinary registration fees, and his fuel tax he has every right, in my opinion, to use the roads without let or hindrance, and that will be my policy in the future if I ever have an opportunity of exercising that policy. I oppose the Bill, and I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to add my support to the Leader in his vigorous opposition to this dastardly piece of socialistic legislation. When the Leader was commenting on the effect of this Bill on South Australia's economy he placed some stress on the effect of the measure on our valuable trade with the South-East of the State. I suggest that the part of the State that will be most affected by this legislation is the River Murray districts. These districts, of course, embrace the District of Chaffey, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that no member of the Government is more terrified of the implications of this measure than is the member for Chaffey.

Mr. Ryan: You should study the Bill again.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I will come back to that matter presently. The immediate reaction to this Bill was one of fear amongst the commercial interests upon whom the economy of the State depends. The Chambers of Commerce in South Australia responded immediately to the measure. I have two Chambers of Commerce in my District, one being at Riverton and the other at Kapunda, and both Chambers communicated with me immediately by telegram expressing their opposition to this Bill. I know that other members have received similar telegrams. I believe the member for Victoria handed one to the Premier, who received it in rather a curious fashion, to say the least. I am sure the member for Victoria will tell us the way in which the Premier received that intimation sent to him by the Naracoorte Chamber of Commerce. The member for Victoria will also tell the House something of the reaction this Bill has created in his district.

On surveying a railway map of my district, I notice that it is covered by a complete network of lines, and I suggest that no other House of Assembly electoral district will be more affected by this measure than the District of Light. The District of Chaffey will be affected too, but my district is covered by a network of railway lines so that no part of the district will be beyond 15 or 20 miles from a railway line. All the merchandise traffic in the district will be affected by this legislation.

Mr. Ryan: Aren't the railway lines used up there now?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Not very much, because road transport can provide a much better service.

Mr. Jennings: How are the rat traps there?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know the member for Enfield has no real interest in this Bill, but he will have some interest when his Party goes to the polls in 1968, or, as the member for Rocky River suggested, some time before that, and when the Government takes its policy to the rural electorates the member for Enfield will realize the effect that this measure will have in South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: Don't you think he has been in rural districts before?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I do not think he has. He has not considered rural districts nor has he much understanding of commerce in this State. The member for Chaffey is worried about this Bill and so is the member for Mount Gambier. It is usually essential when addressing members of the Government to repeat oneself frequently so that the message gets over to them. However, I do not have to repeat myself to get this message over to the member for Chaffey. He knows the implications that this measure will have in his district, and so does the member for Mount Gambier. The member for Frome will also know what implications this Bill will have in his district.

Mr. Curren: What about the member for Wallaroo?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I notice that the township of Morgan in my district is 104½ railway miles from Adelaide. There is not much rail freight on that line at present and I cannot see that this impost of 2c a ton-mile can do much to increase rail traffic on that route; but it will certainly increase the price of merchandise in River Murray districts. Let us look at the railway mileage to the district of Chaffey. I have checked these figures with the Railways Department. The railway distance between Adelaide and Renmark is 213½ miles. At the minimum rate of 2c a ton mile (and, as my Leader stresses, we cannot be sure that it will be the minimum charge) the poor unfortunate folk living at Renmark will pay an impost of \$4.27 a ton. Under this Bill, we do not know that any figure but the maximum will be charged but such is the thinking of this Socialist Government that it will ensure that the maximum rate is levied. People in Chaffey will be interested to know just what contribution the

member for Chaffey will make to this debate, and to read his comments in the *Murray Pioneer* next week to find out what he really thinks about this.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I think the honourable member is being nasty.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: But this is a nasty Bill and people in the Murray River districts do not quite appreciate the serious effect it will have on them. The people of Chaffey will know what it means to be governed by a Socialist Government. I have in front of me a copy of the *Murray Pioneer*, an excellent and responsible publication. It voices its strong protest and alarm at this measure.

Mr. Jennings: It may publish your speech!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope it will, and also that of the member for Chaffey.

Mr. McKee: I have explained this Bill to the people in my district.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If that is so, he is the first Labor member of Parliament to attend a public meeting in his own district to tell his people about this Bill.

Mr. Heaslip: The member for Port Pirie is not a force in the country.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I note what the honourable member says. An extract of the report of a recent Berri Chamber of Commerce meeting states:

Members of the committee were unanimous in their opposition to the legislation, and it was agreed that a letter summarizing the feelings of members be forwarded to the South Australian Road Transport Association, offering all possible assistance at future public meetings to be held in Berri and State-wide to arouse opposition against the Bill. It was stated—

and this will alarm the member for Chaffey—

Mr. Millhouse: He is looking frightened enough already.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I have allowed considerable latitude. Neither the honourable member for Chaffey nor any other member is the subject matter of the Bill. I think the honourable member has made his point. I ask him to return to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When honourable members opposite interject so freely, Sir, it is difficult for one not to be led from one's purpose. As a representative of the Murray districts I was interested in the report, as the matter affects my district just as much as it affects river districts represented by two other members in the House. The article also stated:

One Upper Murray firm with nearly 100 employees may shift to Victoria to avoid the proposed tax.

That is in direct contrast to remarks made by some Government members, particularly the Minister of Transport, that have appeared in the press, that this legislation will facilitate decentralization. I notice that the Minister of Transport has been claiming that many erroneous reports and uninformed opinions have been circulating in the State but, of course, that is inevitable, because Government members are not prepared to address public meetings to explain the real nature of the Bill. They can be guided only by the Premier's second reading explanation and the actual contents of the Bill. Certain interests at Loxton and Berri are holding public meetings in those towns to register formal protest at this legislation.

Mr. McKee: Will you be there?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope to be. Some of my constituents will be there, and I have a duty to them to protest against this measure. A double-page spread in the latest edition of the *Murray Pioneer* makes rather violent claims that I believe to be factual.

Mr. Ryan: It's an advertisement, isn't it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, inviting people to come to public meetings to hear the facts on this legislation. The speakers advertised are Mr. Sharley, Mr. Martin (Managing Director of the Grant Engineering Company Limited), and Mr. C. Seekamp (Chairman of Renmark Fruit Growers Co-operative Limited). It also says that Mr. Curren, the member for the district, has been invited to attend.

Mr. Hall: He will be able to explain it!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Of course he will, and he will explain it well.

Mr. McKee: To your disappointment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If he can explain to the people at the public meetings that this is good legislation, I shall be satisfied too, but I know very well that the people who attend these meetings will be appalled by the extent and ramifications of the measure. The advertisement is rather interesting, and it states in part (and members should bear in mind the loading on merchandise to Renmark would be upwards of \$2 a ton):

Housewives will pay in increased costs of all family commodities. Farmers will pay with increased freight on livestock, produce, etc. Businessmen will pay with increased overall freight charges. Home builders will pay for increases in building materials.

Mr. Langley: Do you believe that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: All members opposite know that such is the case.

Mr. McKee: Don't be silly.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not being silly. This is the sort of legislation which the irrepressible Socialists are forcing upon the public and which the electors of South Australia will deal with in a summary fashion at the next elections.

Mr. Langley: What a beaut!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know of the summary fashion in which the electors of the honourable member's district will deal with him at the next election when he tells them about his restrictive measures on the electrical trade. There is a horse for every course, and we can find a major issue to offer the people in Unley, Mount Gambier, Chaffey, Frome and in perhaps one or two other districts. The Murray River industry in which I have a special interest is the citrus industry, because the Cadell irrigation settlement is an important grower of citrus products. The Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association was active and quick off the mark in writing to members of the House of Assembly who represent the Murray River districts and presenting their case, pointing out that the citrus industry was not able to carry any further impost. The letter points out that the Citrus Industry Inquiry Committee, set up by the Government, reported that the industry needs relief already. Therefore, it is certainly not able to carry any more heavy burdens. I believe that the important part of the letter was the paragraph in which it pointed out that it loyally supported the railways system as far as it could but at times it found it necessary to use road transport. The letter reads:

It might be explained that the bulk of exports of citrus fruit from South Australia (around 600,000 cases this year) go to ship by rail. However, it is at times necessary to use road transport, especially for late supplementary quantities for which road transport is the only means of getting fruit to the ship in time. The citrus export trade is of great importance to South Australia. It is already difficult to compete on overseas markets because of our relatively high costs, which the industry is endeavouring by various means to reduce. The business just will not carry any additional without seriously prejudicing its continuance, much less its further development.

The Murray Citrus Growers' Co-operative Association wrote to all members of the other place and of the House of Assembly who represent the Murray River districts. Of course, the association knew well that the Liberal and Country League members would oppose this measure violently and the only letter it received that it thought of sufficient importance to reproduce and distribute among its members was the one from the member for Chaffey in which he said, in effect, that he did

not know very much about the Bill but that he hoped it would not have too serious an effect on the Murray River districts. I shall not read the honourable member's letter in full, because I know that he intends to explain his attitude later.

Mr. Langley: What was your reply about?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When I wrote to the association, I said that I was violently opposed to the Bill and that, when my Party was returned to the Government benches, we would restore the situation that obtains now. I am pleased to reply to interjections if I can hear them.

Mr. Lawn: Your violence would be harmless.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: All I should like to do in conclusion is to express my great disappointment that the Government has seen fit to introduce this measure, but I look forward to the great clarification the member for Chaffey will give to many people when he attends these public meetings in his district soon to explain the effect of this measure on them. If he has the courage to address public meetings and to tell the people all the details, I congratulate him, and I shall look forward to hearing the reaction to his remarks from the people of Loxton and Berri. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I make it clear at the outset that the first attack by the Opposition on this measure, which was promised in the policy speech of the Labor Party before South Australia went to the polls last March, occurred in my district. If any meeting held in South Australia had any more political significance than that, I have not heard of it. About three or four months ago, I received from a member of a so-called transport committee a verbal invitation to attend a meeting. I was asked whether I would go along and explain the provisions of the Bill to their members and the members of the Mount Gambier Chamber of Commerce. I indicated to this gentleman that I would attend the meeting and explain the Bill. The only notification that I received in relation to a protest meeting in Mount Gambier was when I read the notice in the press that I would be one of the speakers at this protest meeting against the proposed Government legislation. How many members of Parliament did attend this meeting? There were three.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Was not the Minister asked?

Mr. BURDON: I will let the Minister speak for himself, because I am speaking for myself on this matter. It has been referred to in violent terms by the Leader of the Opposition and he was followed by the member for Light who, I notice, has been quick to get out of the Chamber and into the gallery. However, I will not carry that any further.

I wish to deal with some of the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition as to what he says is to happen. It has been said that the maximum charge will be 2c and it has been indicated throughout the length and breadth of South Australia that it is to be both the minimum and maximum charge. I believe that certain amendments are to be made to the Bill and, when they are introduced with the reprinted Bill, a clear picture will emerge as to what is going on.

Mr. Hall: But will the charges be made by regulation?

Mr. BURDON: All these things will be by regulation, and they can be disallowed by Parliament. If members read the second reading explanation they will see some of these matters mentioned; that is, some of the things on which they have misinformed the people. Transport control was dealt with in the Premier's policy speech, when it was stated that it was hoped to raise about £200,000 through transport control in this State. In addition, it was hoped that some of the money now paid in transport fees or road freight costs would be diverted to the South Australian railways in an effort to make the economy of our railway system a little more healthy.

Every time a ton of goods is transported by road at present it is costing the South Australian taxpayer money. On the other hand, we have a railway deficit of about £4,000,000 a year, and every pound spent on rail freight assists the State Treasury. It has been said that this measure will be the end of the timber industry in the South-East, but I point out that not one stick of timber from the Woods and Forests Department's mills at Mount Gambier, Mount Burr and Nangwarry (which between them have an intake of more than 100,000,000 super feet of timber a year) is carted by road. Case timber, which is exported to the River districts and across the border, is protected by section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Freight rates are arranged *ex mill door*. Goods can be brought by road from Melbourne to Mount Gambier at a slightly cheaper rate than the rate at which they can be carried from Adelaide to Mount Gambier, because there is back-loading

from Melbourne. However, even though goods may be brought in more cheaply by road, no-one in Mount Gambier gets these articles one penny cheaper: the same price is marked on those goods whether they come from Melbourne by road or whether they come from Adelaide by rail or road.

The effect of this legislation on the decentralization of industry was referred to by the Premier when he was discussing this matter prior to the last election and again when he gave the second reading explanation of the Bill some time ago. The Leader made a violent attack in regard to this subject, but recently, when I asked the representatives of a certain industry in my district what effect they thought this Bill would have on their industry, they said that the Bill caused them no worry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: They did not even know what was in the Bill!

Mr. Shannon: It is going to be re-written, anyhow.

Mr. BURDON: The whole attack on this Bill has been made by taking it out of its context, and that was done for political reasons. If people had studied the Bill and the statements by the Minister, they would have realized what would be exempted under this Bill and what would be subject to a rate.

Mr. Quirke: Is that in the Bill?

Mr. BURDON: It provides for a maximum charge of 2c. It will be possible to take a load of stock from the South-East to Loxton without costing a cent.

Mr. Hall: What if you want to come to Adelaide?

Mr. BURDON: Then you are competing directly with the Railways Department.

Mr. Hall: How much a ton-mile would you have to pay?

Mr. BURDON: I cannot say that, but I suggest that Opposition members will be surprised at the rate to be charged. This will apply to articles carried between Adelaide and Mount Gambier, and where they travel over a certain route they will be subject to the provisions of the regulations and the rate applicable to that article. Various exemptions will be provided including, I understand, all categories of vegetables. This Bill has been specially designed so that in no way will it remove road transport from the roads. I believe that no form of transport should have priority over another, and have always believed that there is room for two transport systems to operate in this State. However, we have a public investment of nearly £70,000,000 in the railway system and I

believe that because of the carriage of super-phosphate and grain, that system is essential for the various parts of the State in which it operates. I am sure that no member of a rural district would like to see the railway system removed.

Mr. Casey: The member for Rocky River suggested it should be closed down.

Mr. BURDON: In the interests of the people, and of the economy of the State, it is essential that we maintain the railway system. It would be one of the most retrograde steps ever taken if the Railways Department was to abdicate in favour of private enterprise road transport because, if this ever happened, I would have no hesitation in saying that road transport would be in a position to hold the country areas to ransom. I do not want a monopoly one way or the other.

Mr. Hall: Did you say that road transport would hold the country areas to ransom?

Mr. BURDON: If we took away the competition of the Railways Department, that situation would arise.

Mr. Shannon: How many transport companies are operating in Mount Gambier today?

Mr. BURDON: Possibly three or four, but which are operating interstate I do not know. Under section 92, they can cross the border and go to Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane. A big proportion of freight is going that way.

Mr. Shannon: And there are regular trippers up to Adelaide? I see them going through the Adelaide Hills almost every day of the week.

Mr. BURDON: That is correct. This Bill will in no way interfere with their trade.

Mr. Shannon: You ask them! They have looked at this.

Mr. BURDON: There is nothing restrictive in this Bill about transport operating anywhere in South Australia. The Bill clearly indicates this. There is no restriction on transport operators. For the payment of a small fee they get a licence for 12 months. With that licence they can run anywhere they like in the State but, where they compete directly with the Railways Department, they will pay a fee prescribed by regulation. The primary producer is exempt up to eight tons; he can cart his own produce wherever he likes throughout the State. We cannot be fairer than that. He can compete against the railway system if he wishes to. He can bring his own produce to Adelaide at no extra cost. The same applies to other people in the country carting goods to Adelaide.

Mr. Nankivell: But I would not do it because it would not pay me. I send my produce to Victoria.

Mr. BURDON: A primary producer can take his wool by road or rail wherever he pleases. I have previously indicated that a primary producer will be exempt up to eight tons to cart produce wherever he wishes, and the ancillary carrier up to four tons to carry produce wherever he wishes throughout the State. Where a primary producer is competing directly with a railway service he will pay a fee prescribed by regulation (which is subject to disallowance by Parliament). The Woods and Forests Department sends the whole of its forestry products out of the South-East by rail.

I have made inquiries concerning the customer acceptance of this method of transport, and have been informed that the people concerned never complain about the way in which they receive their consignments of timber by rail. We know that much timber is forwarded from Mount Gambier privately. It has been stated that timber coming to Adelaide, under the terms of the Bill, could be subject to a charge of about 8s. for 100 super feet, but the percentage of the total quantity of timber sent out of the South-East would involve a charge of not more than about 1s. 6d. That added charge would amount to about 30s. for the 2,000 super ft. of flooring required for the average house. The *Whyalla News*, referring to a recent meeting of the Whyalla Chamber of Commerce, states:

Whyalla Chamber of Commerce will not support a protest over the proposed Transport Act Amendment Bill. The chamber discussed an approach from the Federated Chambers of Commerce seeking support for protest action over the provisions of the Government's road and railway transport amendments. Members agreed not to give support, in view of the fact that the proposed Bill, if carried, would not materially affect Whyalla's present transport situation. The chamber secretary (Mr. M. Lynch) said that members expressed the view that they enjoyed good transport services through the road-rail co-ordinated service at present functioning between Adelaide and Whyalla. It was not expected, in the event of the Bill becoming law, that freight rates would be increased above the existing rates so far as Whyalla was concerned. Mr. Lynch said the proposed transport legislation was unlikely to affect Whyalla or Eyre Peninsula as the provisions of the Bill were directed to be of assistance to decentralized industry.

Every attempt has been made to draw red herrings across the trail and obscure the true purpose of the Bill. In the last 30 years three Royal Commissions have been held to inquire into transport operations in South Australia, and all have decided in favour of co-ordinated services. The purpose of the Bill is, as was

expressed by the Whyalla Chamber of Commerce, to decentralize industry. During the inquiry conducted about 15 years ago into the broadening of the gauge from Wolseley to Mount Gambier and the extension to Millicent (the Leader should have knowledge of this) representations were made by all stockowners' associations, district councils (including the Mount Gambier and Naracoorte councils) and chambers of commerce to the effect that it was essential that the gauge be broadened for the further development of the South-East timber industry and in the interests of primary production. It was considered necessary in the interests of the people of the South-East to have a broad gauge railway service to the South-East for the transport of stock to the Adelaide market.

Today the Leader of the Opposition is decrying the expenditure of £6,000,000 of public money to provide this service from Wolseley to Mount Gambier—to provide for the laying of a broad gauge line, the necessary station, track, yard installations and rolling stock. This shows a total disregard of the public by the Opposition. I believe that the Government in the interests of the public has an obligation to maintain the railway system as efficiently as possible. In many respects the inefficiency of the railway system is solely because of the lack of co-ordination which has existed between road and rail transport for many years. It can be seen in interstate journals and copies of railway news that all the other States are going flat out in relation to rail transportation. Their systems are well ahead of ours. Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria have stringent controls on road transport. In every other State, regulations control transport and, in the interests of the people, it is necessary to protect the huge investment in our railways.

The co-ordination that will be brought about by this Bill and the resultant benefits will reduce our annual deficit in maintaining our railways. South Australian taxpayers now pay an average of £4 a year to meet this deficit, and an appreciable increase in revenue from rail freight, whether it be £500,000, £750,000 or £1,000,000 over a period of a year, will mean a significant reduction in the amount the taxpayers will have to contribute to the deficit. This will enable essential works to be carried out. I am looking forward to having built in Mount Gambier another high school, which is estimated to cost about £500,000. I know that other honourable members are looking forward to having high schools built in their districts,

and anything that can be done to assist the Treasury in this respect is in the interests of the State and the people. The introduction of this measure was clearly promised in the policy speech of the then Leader of the Opposition at the last elections, and that policy was endorsed by the people. The Bill has genuine benefit for the people of South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I have listened to an extraordinary speech by the member for Mount Gambier. According to him, this Bill will not cost the country taxpayer anything. If that is so, what is the reason for introducing it. The Government will receive £200,000 a year from the tax and the Railways Department will benefit by about £1,000,000 of which £500,000 will be profit. A statement to that effect was made by the Minister in another place, and honourable members can read the report in the newspapers they have. If no-one is going to be taxed, where will the £1,000,000 come from? That may not be from added freights, it may be from increased freight charges. Increased freight charges on existing business, and the added business that will be forced off the road on to the railway system will make up the difference. I am deeply concerned for many people in this country who have invested thousands of pounds in a fleet of vehicles and have given wonderful service over a long period to the public. It is useless for honourable members opposite to say that the primary producer, provided that he uses only an 8-ton vehicle, can go anywhere. We know that, because it is in the Bill. It is not actually in the Bill, but regulations can be made so that any route in South Australia can become a controlled route.

Mr. McKee: The matter of an 8-ton vehicle is in the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know that, but any route can be declared by the Minister to be a controlled route. Honourable members opposite say that a person could travel from Mount Gambier to Loxton with goods, but how long would such a person be allowed to do that with the powers in the Bill? That is why the clause is there, and the Bill is arranged so that it can completely tie road transport when it operates anywhere in competition with the railways. It is useless for members opposite to try and persuade us, or the people of South Australia, that this is not so.

The original Bill contained four pages, and already there are three pages of amendments. The amendments give a clear indication of what is to happen, and that indication was clearly missing from

the Bill as it was introduced here. Honourable members know that. If there has been a tremendous upsurge in the country against the introduction of this legislation (as we know there has been and there is continuing to be) it is mainly the fault of the people who introduced this Bill. If the Bill was examined as it was given to us, without the amendments, and placed in the hands of any layman, what could he make of it? Only a measure of absolute repression, and that has been realized by the Government consequential upon these protest meetings throughout the country. Now we have a little clarification in the form of amendments, which we are now told are not sufficient. Neither they are.

Let me give one illustration, taking Mount Gambier as an example. The tax on a 10-ton load at the rate of 2c a ton-mile on goods from Adelaide to Mount Gambier would amount to \$60. It is necessary to get a permit to do that. It has been said that permits will be readily granted, but I do not think the Transport Control Board will readily grant anyone a licence and thus deprive itself of \$60. That is ridiculous! It will be a controlled route, and it will not pay anybody to operate on such a road. This will break the transport industry of South Australia.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Why has it not gone broke in other States?

Mr. QUIRKE: The other States are entirely different. In fact, South Australia is unique in this. Anyhow, the fact that these people have not been broken in the other States is no argument at all, and I still say that it will break people here.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You are crying disaster.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not. We have here a Bill that will destroy the road transport system of South Australia and those people who have built up that road transport. I know what will happen. One business firm in Clare trades in a multiplicity of goods and the people in Clare are accustomed to seeing a 10-ton or 15-ton load of practically every conceivable thing for country requirements. That truck can go around to the various supply places in Adelaide and gradually make up its load as it goes along, and the load can then be put down at the point of distribution and everything on it can be sold from that one point. People now charge for putting goods on the railways, and in addition goods will have to come from a dozen different places in Adelaide to Mile End and then be taken to Clare and unloaded there. Nobody is going to tell me

that that will not increase the costs. That man told me that the margins on his business are so small with the competition that exists today that he will have to cease operating. Another motor truck operator who transports other materials will be taxed because he carries goods that can go on to the railways. Another person has told me that he will not be taxed because he is primarily concerned in the season with the carting of grapes and at other times with the carting of road metal, sand and materials for Government contracts. This will inevitably have an affect on the sale of motor vehicles. I could name half a dozen persons who would have replaced vehicles by now, for they get rid of them after they have done a certain mileage and buy new ones. However they are not buying trucks today, and the effect is being felt here in the city. It is inevitable that there will be a dearth of sales of motor trucks in South Australia.

The member for Mount Gambier said that all timber was carted by rail, but I can tell him that all the shooks of timber used in the dried fruits industry are carted not by rail but by road because it is a more expeditious way of getting them from one point to another. Apparently the convenience of the people is not to be considered; the only aim is to get goods on to the railways and to increase the tariff charges on the railways and thereby garner £1,000,000: we have had a flat statement from the Government that it is going to get £1,000,000 by breaking the road transport industry and causing untold inconvenience to an untold number of people in the country. This is an attack on the country storekeepers and the people who trade with them. No-one else is concerned. The railway lines run into the country and the goods are transported out and brought back. I know people who live near a railway who use the railways for transporting cattle and other goods. The position could resolve itself.

I had experience with the Transport Control Board when it was operating, and it seems that we are going to have a repetition of that nonsense. Three lines of young sheep at Hallett from three people were sold to a buyer at the bottom end of Yorke Peninsula. He applied for a permit to take them by road and was refused, and the sheep had to be boxed at Hallett, were taken by rail to the marshalling yards at Dry Creek, and thence to Paskeville. They were then put on road vehicles for the remainder of the journey. It took days, whereas if they had been loaded early at Hallett and transported by

road, they could have been delivered at their destination before midday. The convenience of the people and the security of the stock concerned no-one except the buyer and the seller. The board was concerned with getting the freight on to the railway system, and it did not consider who suffered. I can see a repetition of that incident, because the legislation being introduced is backed by more stringent measures than those which operated before. The Minister said that we were crying before we were hurt, but we are going to be hurt, and must be. People that live on a railway line and who live between railway lines must be hurt because from no-one else can come the £1,000,000 the Government hopes to collect, and the £200,000 for road transport. This money will not be obtained from Adelaide or within 25 or 50 miles of Adelaide. It will come from the far-flung country districts and people living there will pay the piper.

Mr. Casey: That is different from what the Leader inferred.

Mr. QUIRKE: I did not hear him and I am not much concerned with that. It will be interesting to hear the member for Frome speak in this debate. I suppose we will have that privilege, because he will have to talk well to make his alley good on this one. On Friday night there is a meeting at Clare of people from the surrounding districts.

Mr. Curren: Who has been rostered from the Opposition to attend?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know any Opposition people around there, but does the honourable member wish to come? Does the member for Frome want to, because I will invite both members.

Mr. Langley: You say that you are not interfering with other people's districts.

Mr. Curren: You invited any member of the Opposition to go.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have been invited to go and shall be there. If the member for Chaffey wants to be there, I will invite him. I am concerned about how the wine industry will be affected. The present custom is to transport wine in tanks. A 1,000-gallon tank weighs more than five tons. If three such tanks are placed on a large vehicle, the overall weight will probably exceed 20 tons. If that vehicle is going to another State there is no concern, but much wine is moved from the Murray River areas and the Barossa Valley to Adelaide, and even farther afield than that, in these tanks. Will those people pay this toll? They will need to find out whether they are to pay it. That



industry has had a big enough thrashing already; we do not want to thrash it any more. What is the position of the man in a country store who with his own vehicle takes delivery of oats and barley where he has a permit to sell it for feed purposes? Can he go out and get that stuff and deliver it free? No. There is much more to this than just the control that is supposed to give a little extra to the road hauliers. This legislation, by its ramifications, can control every vehicle on the road, including passenger and bus transport. It needs only a change in the regulations to do so.

I strongly opposed the previous Transport Control Board: I shall strongly oppose this Bill, with less chance of achieving any good. Instead of trying to alleviate and improve conditions, this Government seems bent on destroying something that has been developed and on pulling things down. To pull down this transport set-up will be a major calamity for South Australia. It is all very well to say it does not happen in New South Wales but, as a result of what has happened there, everything is dearer in New South Wales. It can be dearer here if we pay \$60 for a truckload of stuff from Adelaide to Mount Gambier. The only person who pays the \$60 is the poor, unfortunate person at the end of the line, who pays the final price. It matters not whether it is rail freight—he still pays it; it is the consumer who pays for everything. This is not a good proposition. We should be building up this country on the basis of roads. We need no more railway systems; we want more roads. The past road programme has been truly magnificent. We realize that when we look at the enormous areas of the State covered by bitumen roads. At this time we should not be breaking down; we should be building up in every possible way. The development of this State has, generally speaking, only just begun. However, we are concerned here not with building up this State but with destroying what has already been accomplished. The transport industry cannot be allowed to suffer. If this Bill does not entirely destroy that industry it will at least add to the cost of living structure of the people in this State, when vehicles are completely controlled, and when the Railways Department will have collected an additional £1,000,000. The Bill will also destroy many small carrying industries, particularly once the department, after having reduced its charges, decides hungrily to increase them. That is just one example of the ruthlessness of the Bill in

order to achieve its ends. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): Despite the dire predictions of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) of how fearful I am of the results of the Bill, as well as predictions by other Opposition speakers about the doom of the transport operators and country people generally, nevertheless I support the Bill, because I know that, as usual, members opposite are endeavouring to strike fear into the minds of country people. They have used baseless arguments similar to those used by the vested interests endeavouring to stir up public opinion against this measure. A good example of this tactic is contained in the *Murray Pioneer*, quoting a statement made by the Road Users Conference Committee to the effect that the committee had estimated that the cost of living for a family of four in the country would increase by 10s. to 15s. a week. I shall take the town in which I live (150 miles from Adelaide) as an example. Even at the maximum rate of 2c a ton-mile that would come to about 30s. a ton. Working this out another way it would come to one-sixth of a penny a pound to transport goods to Berri. Therefore, an average country family, with four hearty eaters, would need to eat half a ton of the goods, on which transport is taxed, in one week. I have yet to find any family of four in the country (even though they are hearty eaters) that would eat half a ton of goods. This is a false argument and shows the extent of the untruths spread to strike fear into the minds of people in country districts.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you deny it will increase costs in the country?

Mr. CURREN: As far as my town is concerned, this argument might have some value if it were not for the fact that at least 80 per cent of the groceries, the transport of which will be taxed, are already transported by rail. Eudunda Farmers is the largest grocery store in the town, and the company's policy is to transport 100 per cent of its goods by rail. Four other stores located in the town and surrounding districts are supplied by rail and only one grocery store in the town carts by road, and the owner operates his own truck. That shows how baseless is the argument advanced in that respect. The member for Light made some dire predictions about how fearful I am.

Mr. Freebairn: I will say that you are putting up a brave front.

Mr. CURREN: I can assure the honourable member that I am not merely putting up a brave front. I have spoken to the local Chamber of Commerce, which is the chief organizer of the opposition to the Bill.

Mr. Freebairn: Will you address the public meeting?

Mr. McKee: What about you?

Mr. Freebairn: I will be happy to do so.

Mr. CURREN: If the honourable member will be patient, I will tell him the invitation that I have accepted to attend meetings. As I said, I met the local Chamber of Commerce last night and, to the best of my ability, I explained what was contained in the Bill, what was the Government's intention in introducing it, and what regulations would be made. The Federated Chambers of Commerce in South Australia, with one exception that was previously referred to by the member for Mount Gambier, is, on principle, opposed to transport control. I did not hope to convince them or to have my explanation accepted, but the meeting was quite a friendly one and it was attended by people I have known for many years, although we have a difference of opinion on this matter.

Mr. Nankivell: You referred to regulations that would be in this Bill. Where are they?

Mr. CURREN: I said regulations would be promulgated. On Thursday night I shall be meeting members of the Renmark Chamber of Commerce and hope to have a friendly discussion with them. Despite the remarks made by the member for Light on whether any Government member will be attending a public meeting, members on this side of the House have rightly refused to attend protest meetings. The meeting at Berri has no reference to protests.

Mr. Freebairn: Why do you think it is right to refuse to attend a public meeting?

Mr. CURREN: I refused to attend a protest meeting. There is quite a difference between a protest meeting that is advertised as such and a public meeting. I have accepted an invitation to attend a public meeting at Berri next Monday night and no doubt the honourable member for Light will be in the audience and will try to ask curly questions.

Mr. McKee: It is not in his area.

Mr. Freebairn: But my constituents will be there.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Light cited an example and what he said showed that he did not have any idea of what the Bill means. He gave the road mileage to Renmark as 213½ miles, and said that, at 2c a ton-mile, the

tax would be \$4.27. He has not a clue what this is about, because any road tax on journeys between Renmark and Adelaide would be based on the road mileage direct, through the punts.

Mr. Freebairn: Not under the terms of your Bill.

Mr. CURREN: The honourable member ought to look at the Bill. He also referred to the effect that this so-called vicious tax would have on the citrus industry. I checked with an executive of a particular co-operative packing company in my town and found that at present 60 per cent of the case timber used by the co-operative comes to it by rail and the other 40 per cent is transported from Williamstown by road. The cost to the co-operative is exactly the same in both cases when regard is had to the extra payment and the cost of loading and unloading the timber. The executive said it is a great nuisance to have to do it that way. Under the provisions of the Bill timber carted from Williamstown to Berri is exempted; therefore, all the citrus case timber transported to Berri will not be subject to any further cost than at present. That comment adequately covers the dire predictions made by the honourable member that the citrus industry is doomed. It also adequately answers statements that have been made by a vocal gentleman, the President of the Berri Chamber of Commerce, who is also the chairman of the organizing committee, as it is called. I am not naive enough to believe that it is only a public meeting for people to attend and hear all the facts. I am well aware that it is a protest meeting, but I am happy to attend and to talk to the people there. As I have stated to both Presidents of the Chambers of Commerce in my district, if I cannot supply the answers I can soon obtain them from the Minister. That is the spirit in which I have approached the subject, and I trust that the people in my district will not be scared by comments such as those made by the member for Light. I have spoken in an attempt to clear the atmosphere and answer the unfounded and wild and woolly remarks made by the honourable member.

Mr. Freebairn: We can see that the honourable member is squirming.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs.

Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes. (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutcheas, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HEASLIP: This is the Labor Government's first session, and we are here debating this matter at 2.48 a.m. I believed that we had responsible Government, but I wonder whether it is a responsible action to keep us here at this hour debating a Bill, the delay in the passing or the non-passing of which would result only in South Australia's receiving some benefit. The so-called responsible Government sees fit to keep this House sitting to debate a Bill at this hour when any responsible Government would want to see that members of Parliament were home in bed. Any responsible person should be in bed at this time of the morning. What the electors who put this Government in power will think of it is not hard to imagine. Government by exhaustive legislation is not good Government. I thought the Government intended to be in power for three years, so why rush to push through legislation in this first session of Parliament? The action of the Government is deplorable in that at 2.52 a.m. we are debating this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! That means that for about four minutes the honourable member has been speaking and not addressing himself to the Bill. I ask him to do so.

Mr. HEASLIP: I thought I was addressing my remarks to the Bill. There is no need for this Bill. I have listened to previous Government speakers and have not been impressed by what they have said. The Premier in his second reading explanation spoke about everything that was not in the Bill. He referred to the control by the Minister, although we do not know if it will be the present Minister or another. A second reading explanation should explain the details of the Bill introduced to the House, as members are supposed to know what they are passing. If anyone can tell me what this Bill means, he is a wizard. I have heard suggestions from members opposite that by regulations and so on the Bill will mean this and that. How do they know? Who knows? Nobody knows. With this Government, a new Bill is put on the file and,

before the second reading debate on it has finished, there appear pages of amendments to a Bill that is itself an amendment. How are we to understand or interpret such legislation? It is beyond me and most honourable members.

This is not the first Bill to be dealt with in this way. The Bill will benefit nobody but the Railways Department. This Government believes that because some other State does something South Australia should follow suit, for the sake of uniformity. I do not know why.

Mr. Law: What about the Companies Act?

Mr. HEASLIP: I should have thought that the member for Adelaide would realize that the Companies Act applied throughout Australia, and that it affected other countries as well. It is desirable that that legislation should be uniform, but it is impossible to unify legislation in regard to the co-ordination of transport. The Premier seems to think that South Australia should follow the pattern of the other States, but he cannot be aware that this State is peculiar to the others. Under a Liberal Government, South Australia has, over the last 15 years, built up its industries much more than has any other State; it has also brought more people into the State and has been responsible for better bank accounts than has any other State. The Premier said that South Australia was the only State that did not exercise control over transport. That is probably why we have made such progress. South Australia did not have the people, markets, industries or water to enable great progress but, through the wisdom of a far-sighted Premier, industries were encouraged here. However, the markets are not in South Australia and goods must be exported to the Eastern States or overseas.

Mr. Ryan: You said that over the years the State progressed because there was no control over transport, and yet your Government removed control only 12 months ago.

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that; the previous Government provided for open competition. However, this Government does not believe in competition but in Government-controlled monopolies, and that is what the railways will become under the Bill. The Premier said that he believes in an open system but the railways system will be entirely closed. Under the Bill the Minister will have dictatorial control. The Bill was designed to produce revenue, and it will probably bring to the Government the £1,000,000 the Premier said he would get from the railways; but he did not say how he would get it. We can only

guess how that will be done, just as we can only guess what will be in regulations that will be gazetted later. An amount of £1,000,000 will be raised by compelling people to use the railways and by eliminating all road transport. All those hauliers who have been making a living and who have been assisting industry in South Australia will be put off the roads simply for the benefit of the railways.

It was never intended that the railways should take money from the producers to swell Government revenue. They were put there to open up the country so that it could be developed. The department has made a loss ever since it was established and I think that the Government that first put down a railway knew that it would not pay. It was necessary to provide the railways in order to open up the country. However, this Government takes a different view and says that it will make the railways pay. In doing that, it makes the people in the country pay. Earlier today we were discussing passenger transport.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yesterday.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. I had forgotten that it was now nearly 3.15 a.m. Passenger transport does not mean a thing. The producers are the ones who pay and who keep the railways going. The farther they are from the metropolitan area, the more they will be sluggish to enable this Government to collect £1,000,000, from which it will pay an additional week's wages to railwaymen from January 1. That is all non-productive. The people in the country will have to pay it. The member for Enfield may decry that. In fact, I do not blame him if he cries, because it is 3.15 a.m.

Decentralization is on the platform of the present Government but it is the people who are remote from the metropolitan area that will be sluggish by the Government. This Bill will not give decentralization; it will kill those industries not in the metropolitan area and those not near the markets. The extra costs brought about by this Bill will mean the loss of many of our markets in the Eastern States. It is not the only extra cost brought in by this Government; it has brought in plenty, but it is the last straw that broke the camel's back.

Mr. Ryan: Tell us how we will lose markets to the Eastern States.

Mr. HEASLIP: We depend on the Eastern States, where the markets are. Industries that have been built up by the previous Government must get less and less and we must get more unemployment. We cannot compete with the Eastern States unless costs are maintained at a

reasonable level. However, nothing in this Bill will help to do that and it will simply make things worse.

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing in the Bill saying that we are going to charge people in other States.

Mr. HEASLIP: In any case, I have not heard of any industry that has come to South Australia since we have had a Labor Government, and I believe this Bill will eventually close down many industries. Road transport may be more costly in many cases but it is more efficient and quicker than railway transport. Railways, because they are railways and because of the break of gauge are slow by comparison, even though they have been improved. I have had the experience of a machine breaking down and a part not being available in Adelaide or Melbourne but Sydney was contacted on a Friday afternoon and the machine was operating again by the following Monday morning. If it had to come by rail it would have taken a week.

Mr. Ryan: Who said there was any charge on road transport to other States?

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that. I appreciate the hour is late and the honourable member for Adelaide does not seem to realize—

Mr. Ryan: The honourable member for Adelaide is in the Chair!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide did not make any interjection.

Mr. Ryan: Who is asleep now?

Mr. HEASLIP: It must be too early in the morning for me, too. However, I did not mention interstate transport; I merely said that it often paid to send goods by road transport even though it was more expensive.

Mr. Ryan: This Bill does not prevent that.

Mr. HEASLIP: This Bill will destroy all transport by road.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish! You had better get some sleep.

Mr. HEASLIP: It would not pay a haulier to keep a fleet going and take a chance of getting interstate runs just occasionally.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The interstate hauliers will still be working.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but there will be much less road transport. The question of interstate hauliers is only part of my argument. I grow wool at Appila, which is 12 miles from the nearest railway line and road hauliers load that wool and cart it to Port Adelaide for less than what I could send it by rail.

Mr. Ryan: Then the poor old primary producer at Port Adelaide has to get rid of it for you?

Mr. HEASLIP: The poor old primary producer grows the wool and keeps his cost down.

Mr. Ryan: You have said dozens of times that anybody who handles primary products is a primary producer, so therefore the wharfe is a primary producer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It is now 3.22 a.m.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Time is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is not popular with the country people whom I represent, and I do not blame them for hating it.

Mr. Ryan: How can you represent them?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do represent them, and I have done so for 16 years. A letter that I have received, headed "Open Roads and Road Tax", states:

Please find enclosed for your information resolutions which have been received by the executive committee of the above association (the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers Association) from our various branches and divisions in regard to road tax and the open roads principle in respect to transport control. I was asked by the executive to forward the following resolutions which were presented to the last meeting of the executive on July 13, 1965:

Charra Branch: We oppose the reintroduction of the Transport Control Board.

Pinnaroo, Orroroo Branches, Eastern Eyre Peninsula division, Lower North division: That this branch request the executive of the association to take all necessary action to have the "open roads" principle in respect of road tax maintained in the present Act, and that they continue to press for a Federal fuel tax in lieu of State road tax.

Eastern Eyre Peninsula division: That Eyre Peninsula transport should have free access to roads over the whole of South Australia.

Northern Yorke Peninsula division, Lower North division: This division executive requests the State executive of the association to continue to press for the association's executive policy of a Federal fuel tax in lieu of the State ton-mile road tax rate.

Northern Yorke Peninsula division: This division executive supports the existing "open roads" system of road transport as implemented by the previous Government, and strongly protests against the reintroduction of the Transport Control Board or any other means of restriction to the "open roads" policy.

Orroroo Branch: This branch executive entirely supports the policy of the association with regard to "open roads" without transport control restrictions of any kind.

Mr. Jennings: What about Appila?

Mr. HEASLIP: That has no railway line or silo. It is not bad enough for people who live 150 miles away from Adelaide to be refused unconstitutionally the right to have a silo, but now, in addition this road transport control will be foisted on them.

Mr. Casey: Do you think it is disadvantageous to live 150 miles from the city?

Mr. HEASLIP: It depends on the Government under which you live. The letter continues:

You will appreciate that many members of this association were opposed to the principle of road tax originally, but realizing extra finance for roads was needed, brought about the adoption by the association of a policy in respect of a Federal fuel tax which we still feel would be by far the most practical solution to the insufficient finance which is at present available for road works throughout Australia. You would be aware, of course that the administration necessary for the collection of road tax charges is duplicated in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, which involves a tremendous expenditure to collect a relatively small amount. Machinery is already available through Custom and Excise to collect fuel tax, and any increase in the tax itself would not increase administration costs to any marked degree. The second point which is brought out by the above resolutions concerns the matter of "living" with the present legislation which was enacted last year. In other words, as we were not successful in having the legislation stopped, we have endeavoured to look at same as objectively as possible from the point of view of its effect on our members. The only single factor in favour of the Road Tax (Maintenance) Act was the fact that it would do away with controlled routes, thereby restricting the powers of the Transport Control Board enabling the eventual introduction of the "open road" principle to come into effect. Any move, as has been suggested, to alter this section of the Act, and revert back to controlled routes, will meet with tremendous opposition, as exemplified in the foregoing resolutions. Road transport, either by truck or private owner, has played a major part in the welfare of this State.

I could not agree more with that. It continues:

Our reasonably static costs in production, in regard to primary produce, has enabled a satisfactory cost of living index to be maintained, which is in no small way due to the judicious use of road transport. Any move now to impose further penalties on primary producers would be dangerously short-sighted, and therefore we appeal to all members of Parliament to recognize the need to avoid a situation which cannot be allowed to occur, as purported in this matter. Favourable consideration of the accompanying resolutions will assist to consolidate and encourage the future development of this State.

At a deputation which waited on the Minister of Transport last week opposing the

reinstatement of the Transport Control Board, he informed the deputation that the Government had not finalized consideration on the question of co-ordination of transport. He was examining all aspects of the question.

That is the familiar procedure in most of the legislation we are dealing with: the Government has not "finalized consideration of the question". A Bill is introduced into this House and, before we have finished dealing with it on second reading, it is amended and we do not really know what is in those amendments.

The member for Adelaide mentioned Orroroo. Here is a letter from Orroroo:

We the Executive of the Orroroo Branch of the South Australian Wheat and Wool-growers Association strongly oppose the proposed legislation to reinstate the Transport Control Board. It is felt that the open road system has been most beneficial in this area, particularly in respect to the fast transportation of stock. Thanking you for any assistance you can give to this matter.

That letter is signed by the Secretary. There are plenty of people with station properties 20, 30 and 40 miles out from Orroroo, and many of them have not their own trucks. They rely on hauliers to get their stock to the market. If they are forced to put the stock into railway trucks, it will take much longer and the stock will get much more knocked about. Past practice has been for them to get hauliers to load the cattle at the station and transport them direct to the abattoirs. The cattle arrive there in less than half the time and in far better condition than they possibly could if they had to be unloaded, then loaded into the railway trucks, and then unloaded again when they reached Adelaide and put into the yards. Those people will miss the right to use road transport if they are not allowed to do so. The member for Chaffey had a few things to say on this. He said that if the Bill were passed it would not materially affect costs of the people in his area.

Mr. Freebairn: He was not very convincing, was he?

Mr. HEASLIP: No.

Mr. Curren: I referred to the cost of living.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is the same thing. I have here a letter from the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association, which states:

It is desired to register through Parliamentary representatives the concern of the Murray Citrus Growers' Co-operative Association at the proposed transport control legislation, and its strong objection to such legislation being implemented. The effect of transport control must inevitably affect the cost of production of all primary products, as well as

adding to the cost of living of all people living in country areas.

Mr. Freebairn: That does not mean only the packing cases the member for Chaffey has mentioned.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, it must affect all people living in country areas, and even people living in the metropolitan area, because the consumer has to pay the added costs ultimately. The letter continues:

Recent impartial and official investigations of the citrus industry in South Australia by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and more recently by a committee of inquiry set up by the State Government, provide ample evidence that the industry needs relief from rather than any increase in costs.

Indeed, we should decrease costs if we are to continue to progress as we have progressed in the past 20 years. Continuing:

Apart from the exemption of the product itself, it is obvious that additional costs would accrue on all materials used in connection with the growing and subsequent processing and packing of the fruit. This would have a particular application to citrus fruit disposed of as a processed product. In addition, presumably, canned orange juice would not be classified as a perishable product.

In these circumstances it is quite conceivable that serious consideration could be given to shipping products of this nature from interstate outports instead of from Port Adelaide. It might be explained that the bulk of exports of citrus fruit from South Australia, around 600,000 cases this year, go to ship by rail. However, it is at times necessary to use road transport.

Mr. Curren: Would you like my reply to that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have it. The letter continues:

Especially for late supplementary quantities for which road transport is the only means of getting fruit to the ship in time. The citrus export trade is of great importance to South Australia. It is already difficult to compete on overseas markets because of our relatively high costs which the industry is endeavouring by various means to reduce. The business just will not carry any additional without seriously prejudicing its continuance much less its further development. These representations are respectfully submitted to all Parliamentary representatives of citrus-producing districts with confidence that they receive careful consideration and support.

Mr. Freebairn: Liberal members gave careful consideration.

Mr. HEASLIP: I should think they would have. That letter is signed by Mr. Medley, the General Manager. Not only Liberal members gave attention to the letter. The member for Chaffey replied to Mr. Medley.

Mr. Curren: You are not going to criticize me for replying to correspondence?

Mr. HEASLIP: No. The honourable member's letter reads:

Dear Sir, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated November 9 *re* transport control legislation. I hasten to assure you and the members of your association that I consider the fears expressed in your letter to be without sure foundations. Having stated the provisions of the present amendment Bill and having some knowledge of the proposed rates and list of exempted items, I feel your sweeping generalizations cannot be supported. However, should there be any particular points in the present legislation which you feel would be detrimental to citrus growers, I would be pleased to hear them.

Mr. Freebairn: They wrote back smartly, too.

Mr. Curren: You are going to read the letter in full, I hope?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, I will. The exempted items are in the Bill and the rates can be from  $\frac{1}{2}$ c to 2c. I understand there is an amendment on the file with regard to 2c.

Mr. Freebairn: If you read the letter of the member for Chaffey you will see it states that the Minister can vary the charge up or down.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member's letter continues:

On the two points you did mention, that of canned citrus juices and export shipments by road, I am quite sure that ample cover is given in the present Bill.

Nothing in the Bill provides for any protection whatever. Perhaps the honourable member has some information not available to members on this side or to the public. However, I do not know how even he could know because the Minister would be the only one who could know. He may not be there for long, however. There could be another Minister tomorrow. The letter continues:

Take export citrus first—fresh fruit is totally exempted and a rail service is not available to meet the emergency you quote. On the matter of canned juices—should B.F.J. be put at a competitive disadvantage with metropolitan or interstate competitors, an application to the Minister showing the exact position and disadvantages should result in an exemption being granted.

What an assurance that is to the growers! What a future they have? No guarantee is given; they may get an exemption at the whim of the Minister. The granting of such an exemption depends on whether the Minister is in a good mood or a bad mood at the time. One man will make this decision, not a board, but a dictator, and that Minister may have friends here.

Mr. Ryan: The way you are carrying on, you wouldn't have a friend in the world!

Mr. HEASLIP: It wouldn't matter much, would it?

Mr. Ryan: It is now 3.47 a.m.

Mr. HEASLIP: I asked for an adjournment at 2.45 a.m. and was refused, so what does time matter now?

Mr. Freebairn: The morning star rises presently.

Mr. HEASLIP: It may have risen. The letter continues:

With these two examples to reassure you, I am certain that upon closer study of the proposals you will realize that very little, if any, harmful effects will be felt by your particular industry or by country people generally. Trusting to hear from you on any particular points on which you need further clarification.

The letter was signed by the member for Chaffey. I am not engaged in the citrus industry but, if I were, that letter would not give me any comfort. If a person does not get an exemption, he will have to carry the extra cost.

Mr. Freebairn: Not comfort, but grim foreboding.

Mr. HEASLIP: At this time of the morning, I do not know whether you would be able to sleep with that over your head. However, the General Manager of the Citrus Growers Co-operative Association replied to the member for Chaffey, Mr. Curren, as follows:

Transport Control. Thank you for your letter of November 16. We appreciate your reassurances that the fears expressed in our letter of October 9 are without foundation.

They are optimistic if they are reassured, because I am not. The letter continues:

This, we hope, will prove to be the case, and some positive confirmation to that effect by the Premier or appropriate Minister would be welcomed by many country interests and primary producers.

The only way that those people can get that assurance is in the Bill itself; but it is not in the Bill. As in the case of so many other Bills we are getting, it is not there. It was only an explanation on the second reading, but not necessarily the correct one, and that is no assurance to the people, to me or to anybody on this side of the House when we are asked to pass this legislation. How can we do other than oppose the Bill? We have no idea what could come from it, and only the Minister is able to give that information. He is the one who decides it, and not even Government members can make such a decision. The letter continues:

The following are some matters on which there are at least some misunderstandings: (a) the only reference to the exemption of

fresh fruit as a perishable commodity was in the Premier's second reading speech, there is no specific reference to it in the Act, presumably it would be subject to ruling at the discretion of the Minister or other authority. (b) The Bill does not stipulate scales in relation to mileage, taxes, weight limits, etc. (c) There is an impression that the proposed legislation could be a prelude to a general increase in rail freight rates. It could be that on these and other matters producers are not fully and accurately informed. It is suggested that this position could and should be clarified by a clear authoritative statement on behalf of the Government so that we may pass the necessary information on to members of our association, we would greatly appreciate it if you could let us have copies of relevant *Hansard* reports and any other information which has a bearing. Meantime, we are circulating copies of your letter, as a matter of interest, to members of M.C.G.C.A. central executive and others interested.

Mr. Freebairn: And it will be of great interest to them, too!

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope that it will be, although I do not know that they will get much out of it. That is the reply sent to the member for Chaffey. He is one of the Government members who endeavoured to explain what the Bill meant. Quite frankly, I could not follow it, and I cannot believe much of what he said because it is not in the Bill. It may be what the member thinks, but that does not say that it will be that way or that it will happen, because it is not in the Bill, and the Bill is the legislation.

Mr. McKee: You are only making it difficult for *Hansard* and members of the press by repeating yourself so often.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think that the honourable member should take exception to what I am doing. As a member of the Government he is the one who is responsible, It is not by my choice that I am here at this hour of the morning. We asked for an adjournment of the debate but we were refused it, so if we are here for hours yet it is not the Opposition but the Government that is responsible, and the Government cannot blame me for it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But the Opposition is keeping on repeating its arguments.

Mr. Millhouse: The Attorney cannot interject when he is not sitting in his own seat.

Mr. HEASLIP: Clause 20 repeals sections 39 and 40 of the principal Act, and in my opinion it is the most important clause in the whole Bill. It repeals the provisions that the previous Government in its wisdom (and to the entire satisfaction of the people of South Australia) introduced when the legislation was last

before this Parliament. Those provisions gave an open road system to transport in South Australia, not the so-called open road transport to which the Premier referred. Although he calls it an open system, it will be closed immediately because road transport will be taxed off the roads. The section this Government is now deleting is the one that made it possible for people to use road transport without having to pay exorbitant charges. It gave free and open competition between road and rail. Despite that competition, the railways still carried on, and as a result of the competition that existed industries were infinitely better off. It is the deletion of the provisions inserted by the previous Government that makes this Bill so bad. I deplore the fact that those provisions are being deleted. I am certain that this legislation is bad for South Australia, and I am sorry that I am here at 4 a.m. in opposing the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Cumble, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda (teller), Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. RODDA: This Bill is such a bad one, with so many bad things one can say about it, that one hardly knows where to begin. With my colleagues, I have also received many protests about this Bill, and the member for Light said that the Premier, whom I regard as my friend, had had a difference of opinion with me about a telegram. I shall refer to that later, but it is true that I received telegrams from the Chambers of Commerce at Mount Gambier, Penola and Naracoorte. I forwarded these telegrams to the Premier, posting two and handing one to him personally. I may have caught him on the wrong leg but he dismissed that last one by shooting it into the wastepaper basket. That is no way to treat my constituents. However, be that as it may, we on this side of the House are good sports and shall get on with the job, even if our communications are summarily dismissed.



The State Government is endeavouring to reintroduce the control of road transport operations in this State by this legislation. It is a financial Bill, so the Government will move heaven and earth to get it passed. I think that is fair comment. I can see by the way the member for Port Pirie is smiling that he means to do his utmost to get the Bill through. The Bill seeks to co-ordinate road and railway transport but I believe it seeks to control road transport for the benefit of the Railways Department and to the great disadvantage of our country people. It gives complete control to the Minister of Transport (whoever he may be) who can permit us to either carry or not carry our goods (whatever they may be) by road on payment of a ton-mile fee. The Bill affects everyone—the farmer, businessman, transport contractor, housewife, builder or working man. The Bill does not say how much this ton-mile fee is but, as the Leader said, these amendments refer vaguely to up to 2c a ton-mile, depending on the degree of competition with the Railways Department. Some goods of a perishable nature, together with mails, road-making material and other such things, are to be exempt. The Bill does not say this. The Premier has told Parliament in his second reading explanation:

The benefits to be received from this legislation will be increased railway earnings. It is not expected that the fee involved will produce revenue in excess of £200,000 per annum. It is expected, however, within the first full year of operation railway revenue will increase by £1,000,000, half of this increase being clear profit. The position should improve still further in subsequent years. . . . It is also proposed to extend control to the ancillary carriers, the majority of whom operate vehicles of such a capacity that they do not even make any payment in respect of road maintenance contributions.

We all know that this revenue to be raised by control will not be used for road maintenance, about which the Premier is so concerned, but will go instead into a Railway Improvement Fund, which means that it can be used for anything, despite assurances to the contrary from the Minister of Transport. The money will go not to the roads, from which it came, but to the Railways Department. The Premier also said:

Present railway losses are approximately £3,600,000 per annum,

and the Government must take all possible steps to reduce losses. It is the Government's duty to make the Railways Department as economically self-supporting as possible, but that should be effected by increasing efficiency

and introducing new rolling stock and methods of freight handling. The Premier also says that the citizens of South Australia will finally have to meet the Railways Department's losses. I do not suppose that is so bad, so long as we all share the cost, and not just the country people. Why should the country people pay another £1,200,000 in the first full year for the privilege of living in the country? Of course, this will be higher in subsequent years.

I believe that country freight already provides about 80 per cent of the revenue of the Railways Department. The Government has stated that it wants to wipe out the £3,600,000 deficit, so we can expect railways freights to rise substantially as road transports and private vehicles are forced off the road. In Queensland, where no effective competition from road transport exists, rail freights over a 300-mile journey are as high as £18 a ton. While competition exists in South Australia, rail freights are about £5 a ton over a similar distance. Let us not imagine, however, that they will stay at that figure when transport control is reintroduced. The Minister said it was ridiculous to claim that the cost of living in the country could rise from 10s. to 15s. a week for a family of four as a result of the passing of the Bill. We believe that time will prove that figure to be absolutely correct.

One of the most interesting things about the Bill is what is not in it; it is fascinating to compare the Bill and the Premier's second reading explanation, for they are poles apart. The Bill gives complete autocratic control to one man—the Minister, without any right of appeal. Is this democracy? We protest against this legislation, before it goes further. The Bill gives dictatorial power to the Minister; it will squeeze out road transport, leaving us at the complete mercy of the Railways Department. Our cost of living must consequently rise, and the country man will pay the city man's share of the increase. I was one of the members of Parliament who attended the protest meeting in Mount Gambier—

Mr. Hall: You were invited?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, and I was also invited to attend a meeting in the district of the Minister of Lands next Friday evening, which I shall attend. The *Border Watch*, which is a worthwhile paper, had this to say:

One of the biggest protest meetings ever held in Mount Gambier unanimously carried a motion on Friday night protesting against the South Australian Government's proposed legislation to restrict road transport. Nearly 500 people from all walks of life attended the meeting organized by the Road Transport Co-ordinating Committee. . . .

So great was the attendance that an overflow of about 100 people had to be accommodated in the supper room. One of the principal speakers was Mr. J. R. Hopgood, who is chairman of the Road Transport Co-ordinating Committee.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Have you read what Mr. Yoannidis said?

Mr. RODDA: He was voluble and very much against the Bill. The article continued:

It is said to be designed to co-ordinate road and rail transport, but we believe its main purpose is to extract dollars from our pockets—I say our pockets meaning the country—because that is where freight costs begin and end. Mr. J. R. Hopgood, Chairman of the Road Transport Co-ordinating Committee, told a public meeting in the City Hall on Friday night. Mr. Hopgood said the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, 1965, placed under the control of one man the South Australian Railways, the Municipal Tramways Trust, the Transport Control Board, the Taxi Control Board and intrastate airways.

That is the thinking going on in South Australia about this contentious legislation. The article continued:

It virtually removed the office of the Commissioner of Railways, a task of great magnitude. The present Minister, no matter how capable or conscientious, could not remain for all time, and Governments, no matter which side, were notoriously fond of hanging on to whatever they could get their hands on.

The House can see that the meeting was castigating not only this Government but all members of Parliament, whatever their political complexion. The article continues:

This new tax would cost the country people £1,000,000 to £1,200,000 in the first year “for the privilege of being in the country, and more each year after.”

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will they get any benefit from the £1,000,000?

Mr. RODDA: I imagine they will have to use the railway system to get the benefit.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What will they get for that sum?

Mr. RODDA: They will lose their trucks.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They will get service, won't they?

Mr. RODDA: I will come to that later. The article continues:

The Bill did not fix control routes, mileage taxes, weight limits or exemption (except some minor ones) and was a “blank cheque to remodel the whole of the State's transport industry”. Mr. Hopgood said road transport costs must rise if fees proposed under the legislation were introduced and railway freights were sure to be increased. This would be extremely detrimental to country interests, and particularly to a decentralization programme.

This was a real fear expressed by the people to whom we spoke afterwards. I cannot say they were all supporters of the Government or of the Party to which I belong, but they were genuinely worried about this legislation. Referring to stock charges, Mr. Hopgood is reported to have said:

The primary producer, of necessity, employed hire and reward carriers to cart most of his stock from this area.

He was referring to the Mount Gambier area. Continuing:

It was estimated that if the fee of 2c per ton mile were imposed, this would result in an increase in cartage between 3s. 6d. and 7s. a sheep and £1 15s. or £3 10s. a beast, depending on whether the ton mile fee were payable both ways or one way.

He also said that clause 5 might tax furniture being transferred from storage. When a young couple are saving for a house, they, too, would bear some of this tax. Even some of our young men who have gone overseas to fight for the freedom of this country would be caught up if their furniture was stored while they were away. Perhaps the Government will exempt those people. I hope and think that it will do that. We certainly hope that those people will be exempt.

No-one yet knows how the permit system will be administered. If the Government is going to issue these permits as freely as it says it will, it may be difficult for collections to total what has been anticipated. In any case, Parliamentary representatives are being asked to vote on legislation that is about as clear as mud. It was particularly pleasing to see in yesterday's *Border Watch* a statement by the Minister of Transport acknowledging some of the criticisms I have outlined. In particular, I refer to amendments that he says will be made to the Bill to specify the maximum rates of charge, the exempt journeys, exempted goods and maximum charges.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you notice that he talks about uninformed comment?

Mr. RODDA: I think the Leader put the matter in a nutshell when he drew attention to the diversity between the Bill and the Premier's second reading explanation.

Mr. Freebairn: Don't you think the Labor Party has itself to blame for the lack of information?

Mr. RODDA: I think it would be most difficult to find anyone else to blame at this stage. The meeting at Mount Gambier amplified the State-wide interest, and it was evident that feeling was running high. The press has reported that 500 attended the meeting, and

other reports put the attendance at 600. I should settle for 500, but there were many in the street listening to the meeting. We went there with some trepidation. We were warned that there may be some "chuckers-out" there—some rabble that would deal with people like myself. When I arrived at the foyer, I assumed that they were timber cutters. They had biceps on them as big as those on Hereford bulls, and they had expansive chests. However, nothing like that eventuated. The meeting was lively and the vote was unanimous.

Mr. Freebairn: They were angry at the end of the meeting, weren't they?

Mr. RODDA: I think they were angry before the meeting. I considered the meeting a fair indication that the Government's Bill was not popular. In Naracoorte are about 50 transports that support quite an industry and supply not only South Australia but also places across the border. The people are genuinely worried about what will happen when they have to use the railways.

Mr. McKee: Was there anybody there from the Australian Road Transport Federation?

Mr. RODDA: I was too busy talking to people and shaking hands to inquire. I did not inquire into the *bona fides* of the people present, or their origin.

Mr. Freebairn: Where were the Labor members?

Mr. RODDA: They were not in Mount Gambier. Referring to the people I did worry about at Naracoorte, many truck drivers told me what they intend doing, and they said it not as a promise or threat but merely as a statement of fact. They will not register their trucks except for interstate hire. This has worried the local primary-producing community and I know it must worry the Minister of Lands and cause him concern as it causes me. How are we to get stock to sales if these transports that normally shift the stock are going to be sporting interstate plates? I issue this warning to the Government that the South-East business will go over the border under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution and it will bring in its wake the special difficulty of the major transports sporting interstate plates and because of this they will not be able to cart stock from the farm to the saleyards. We have 4,500,000 sheep in the Lower South-East and many wool-growers have told me that they will send their wool to Melbourne next year. This is a bad thing for Adelaide. Most South Australians have been loyal over the years. I have 40 bales of wool to go down next week, and until now I have always been loyal to the Railways Department. My wool is normally carted to

Naracoorte at a cost of 5s. a bale with a further 12s. 6d. a bale cartage on the railways to Adelaide. People are so upset by this legislation that they will send their wool to Melbourne, and I am not sure that I may not do the same.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will there be a similar meeting at Naracoorte?

Mr. RODDA: I understand so.

Mr. Freebairn: My people are keen to have a meeting at Riverton.

Mr. RODDA: The ancillary owners have expressed concern, as they have trucks up to eight tons and they will head for Melbourne under section 92 of the Constitution when this Bill becomes law. Everybody is fearful of it, and it is up to the Government to make some appreciation of this difficult situation.

Mr. Shannon: Won't it have this effect, that people who cart their wool and stock to Victoria will not come back with empty vehicles but will bring back goods normally bought in Adelaide?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, I suppose so, and some people are already arranging credits in Melbourne to bring back goods and chattels.

Mr. Ryan: You said you have been loyal to the railways previously.

Mr. RODDA: And I still say it.

Mr. Ryan: And that you are going to use the railways for your 40 bales of wool. In that case you will not be incurring a penny in additional cost under this Bill, will you?

Mr. RODDA: Of course we will.

Mr. Ryan: Why?

Mr. RODDA: We have no alternative but to use the railways. What guarantee have we that charges will not increase?

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. RODDA: We have no guarantee that the Government will not increase the charges.

Mr. Ryan: If you still operate under the same system, it won't cost you a penny more.

Mr. RODDA: Why should we operate under the same system? I am loyal to the railways, and I do not deery their importance.

Mr. Ryan: You are trying to give the impression that it will cost you a lot more, even though you will be using the same system, and I say that is rubbish.

Mr. RODDA: It is not rubbish at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria will please stick to the Bill.

Mr. RODDA: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. What concerns me is that under this Bill people are being controlled, but the South Australian people will not submit to control. Despite the assurances I am getting from my

friend, the honourable member for Port Adelaide, I would be failing in my duty if I did not truthfully explain the situation.

Mr. Ryan: I never gave you any assurance.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I ask members not to interject.

Mr. RODDA: Mr. Speaker, the people of South Australia have been loyal to the railways, and I do not think anybody is growling about the £3,600,000 we are losing on them each year, for the railways are important in shifting the grain harvest and carting superphosphate to enable the country to produce. There is no substitute for production, and we must go on irrespective of who is in Government. I have used the railways and I will probably continue to use them, but I am not going to be forced to use them. We are mindful of the importance of transport, for we must be able to move our produce from one point to another. In the South-East there is a great feeling of concern at what is behind this Bill. I think by now the House will have got the message that I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman (teller), Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Ferguson and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When I moved that the debate be adjourned, I did not expect my motion to be accepted, but that does not alter the fact that I protest at the way this legislation is being pushed through. We have often heard statements that legislation was being pushed through the House, but never to my knowledge has it been done in this way with the whole debate on an important Bill being put through in one day against the wishes of the Opposition. This day had already been taken up with discussions on other important matters.

Mr. Lawn: The previous Government introduced legislation and told the Opposition that it could not move amendments.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a particularly obnoxious method of doing business and will reflect badly on the Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You wait until you find out what the public thinks about your actions.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government is happy to get rid of this legislation as soon as it can. We were told that it would give effect to the promises made when the Government faced the electors. It made a number of promises to which there have been some surprising sequels, following the election. First of all, the Government was going to lift the road tax on Eyre Peninsula. Much was said in the previous year's debate about how Eyre Peninsula was to be exempt from this tax. Almost the first action of the new Government on taking office was to say, "We are very sorry but we cannot lift the road tax on Eyre Peninsula. That is bad luck and the less said about it the better." Not very much had been said about it except that it may have had some passing reference on Eyre Peninsula.

It may be of interest to mention one or two matters connected with this Bill. In 1964 the then Opposition made great play about transport, how Eyre Peninsula was in such difficulties that it would see to it as soon as possible that the road tax was lifted there. The present Attorney-General stated in the debate on the Road Maintenance Bill:

The people who will benefit from this amendment are the grain farmers on Eyre Peninsula, hardly any of whom live in the district of Whyalla, but many in the district of the member for Eyre and the Minister of Works, the member for Flinders.

It seemed to me that the honourable member was getting a little political and was making a set at that seat, wanting to embarrass the member for Flinders. I think that would be a fair assumption. I shall not read all of this but it is interesting to note that he went on to say:

I do not mind if the Premier comes to my district and debates it with me. I have a few road hauliers in my district. I do not mind debating it before an audience of road hauliers or of anyone else, and I am certain that the members for Murray, Mount Gambier, and Millicent will be happy for the Premier to win votes for them by going into their districts. He has done it successfully on previous occasions and I am sure they will welcome his doing it again. If all the Premier can put up is the kind of gobbledegook that he saw fit to say on local matters, omitting things in High Court judgments on these matters, we have little to fear and much to look forward to at those debates.

I do not know about those debates, particularly in Millicent and Mount Gambier. The honourable member was willing to throw down a challenge on behalf of the member for Millicent and the member for Mount Gambier last year. It seems now that the invitations to meet him in those districts are treated with considerable circumspection by the present Government. It is not a good subject here.

Mr. Lawn: Is this in the Bill?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have heard something about this meeting at Mount Gambier, the most extraordinary feature being that neither the Minister nor the local member attended. It is one of those meetings that I shall have to refer to later, because of the thoroughly political way in which the present Government explained a serious matter last year. Member after member got up and said he was not clear about the districts of Flinders and Eyre Peninsula, that the position there was dreadful; that all the things that they were suffering would be lifted. The Premier of the day was told that he was talking gobbledegook, that the Act was not right and that this would all be changed. As we know, nothing was changed. In fact, it was forgotten as soon as possible. Another point made by the new Government, as part of its platform policy, was in regard to its attitude towards Executive control. The Government expresses itself in favour of Parliamentary control; it wishes the voice of the people to be heard. The Labor Party has always been opposed to Executive control, its reasoning being that it must give greater opportunity for the voice of the people to be heard in Parliament.

Mr. Lawn: You will still be permitted to speak and to move amendments; that's more than we were permitted to do.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Adelaide is extremely generous and broad-minded. As a matter of fact, a few years ago he was not allowed to move amendments to the Long Service Leave Bill, for he had received instructions from his executive outside the House that he was not to do so.

Mr. Lawn: No-one outside the House told me that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member agreed to that, and had to suggest during the debate that we might like to move amendments.

Mr. Lawn: I didn't do anything of the sort.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member did; I can remember the occasion. He asked us to move amendments, because he did not have the power to move them himself. The Government does not really rely

on Parliamentary control, about which it has so much to say (mostly at election time). As a matter of fact, this Government has done most of its work by Executive action.

Mr. Lawn: Have a look at *Hansard*. It is twice the size this year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Even in this Bill, wherever the board is given any power, that power is governed also by that of the Minister to give instructions. That provision applies throughout the Bill, and the Minister will have far more Executive power than has ever existed hitherto. Government members do not seem to realize the tremendous Executive powers provided. If they do realize it, they have not admitted it, and yet almost every Bill that we have seen introduced into the House has sought to give the Minister concerned the widest powers. However, as the voice of the people is heard, often outside Parliament, the Government has backed down.

I have previously complained that the second reading explanations of Bills are not even a fair summary of what the Bill actually contains. That is just as true of this Bill as it is of previous Bills that have been discussed. The information provided is misleading; amendments placed on files after second reading explanations are given are nearly as lengthy as the Bills themselves. This is being done for political purposes. The Government apparently hears the voices of the people occasionally, because those voices can, indeed, be loud. The Government consequently adopts a political attitude. The Bill can relate to every road in South Australia if the Government wishes, and I am afraid that control will be progressively imposed, and not at all to the liking of country people, whether they be on Eyre Peninsula (whose interests the Government was so keen to defend last year) or in any other area of the State. Last year we had the present Minister of Education travelling over Eyre Peninsula, and it is amusing to recall how he seemed to find friends in places that had to protest about the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill. He did much organizing to say that the Labor Government, when it took office, would lift the tax.

Mr. Millhouse: It was going to exempt it altogether.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. I do not know whether the Minister will go back to Eyre Peninsula to explain how it all happened and how this road maintenance tax still applies in the area, but that is his business.

The Bill makes many changes to the functions of the board. The exemption in mileage will be altered by an amendment, and that tends to make nonsense of that part of the second reading explanation. The exemption is extended, under certain conditions, to 25 miles. The board no longer has the duty of giving preference to existing licence holders. I notice there are some ruthless penalties imposed for breaches of the Act. It is rather unusual to see legislation with a penalty of not less than £25, which is fairly steep. Usually a much milder amount is set as the minimum. It is clear that the Government is determined to get "stuck into" breaches of the Act. Nobody wants to see transport operators commit breaches of the law, but the severity of the penalty surprises me. Reference has been made to the South-East and to other parts of the State, and the meeting held in the South-East has also been referred to. In the *Border Watch* of November 16 there is a report of what I believe Mr. Hopgood said, which reads:

The primary producer, of necessity, employed hire and reward carriers to cart most of his stock from this area. It was estimated that if the fee of 2c per ton mile were imposed, this would result in an increase in cartage between 3s. 6d. and 7s. a sheep and £1 15s. or £3 10s. a beast, depending on whether the ton mile fee were payable both ways or one way.

A sum of £1 15s. a beast without any relation to freight costs at all, but simply as a tax, is a colossal slug. Anyone who goes to a cattle market where a special store sale is held (although they are going out at present) or to a Monday cattle market will see large semi-trailers from the South-East. Millicent Transport is one company represented and many other companies have trucks there as well. South-Eastern road transport moves a great many cattle from that market.

During the winter, when store stock (and it was very poor stock) was being brought out of the northern areas, not only were store sales held on the normal weekly cattle days but special sales were held when up to 1,500 cattle a day were sold. Most of those cattle were not slaughtered, nor were many of the Monday market store cattle slaughtered. They were moved to paddocks, mainly in the South-East. The South-Eastern cattle were largely carted in road transport vehicles and a service was provided for the Far North.

When graziers in the Far North hear of this amending Bill, they will be considerably distressed by the upset in transport arrangements between Adelaide and the South-East, and

justifiably so, because they depend to a large extent on road transport for the transport of stock in poor condition. It is essential to get such stock into a paddock at the earliest possible time, and road transport is almost always preferred by the new owners of the cattle. In some cases, the Northern graziers, have carted or have had cattle carted to the South-East, have agisted them there for some time to let them settle down and have then sold them in the district. Again, that was done by road transport to the South-East to a large extent, and over the years the Railways Department has lost much business to road transport. Are we going to see this forced back again? If we are, the owners of store stock will suffer thereby, as will the vendors of that stock.

I have mentioned the bad record of the Labor Party in regard to road maintenance contributions. The then Opposition wanted to amend the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act by reducing the eight-ton minimum to four tons, and that is another pointer to the Party's bad record. However, honourable members opposite are learning, because they have provided in this Bill for eight tons in certain circumstances. This is strange; but it illustrates the highly scheming attitude of the Government in matters that have some political import. The Government's argument that it is doing the best for people is rather hollow when one looks at the record of the Labor Party during the last session and during this session.

I have explained how in 1964 honourable members opposite wanted to exempt Eyre Peninsula, yet one of their first actions in Government was to cancel the move. The general attitude of the Labor Government is to decry road transport generally and to hit it heavily. This country has always suffered transport problems. We have always had an enormous transport bill because of our small population, and it is a sad position when we settle so heavily on a type of industry that is so vigorous and satisfactory to so many people.

I do not think there is any reason to decry the railways. They have done a wonderful job on many occasions and in many circumstances. However, I think that, in the long run, loading their opposition with such a heavy handicap will not do the railways any good. It will not make for efficiency in the railways. There may be a period when the railways will benefit considerably, but this legislation will not help their efficiency in the long run, and I think it is a bad thing for them. I do not think we should foster the railways artificially

by holding back this lusty competitor and thus shackling one of the finest industries in the country. By doing so, we are denying the fact that transport is one of our greatest problems. Unless we realize the importance of road transport, as a State we are going to suffer. We have had many advantages in South Australia by being able to produce in an atmosphere of relatively low cost, and we have been well served by our road transport services. However, that will not continue if they are loaded with these heavy imposts.

It is not known what these costs will amount to, because once again we have this example of Executive control whereby the Minister can set almost any figure he wishes. It is difficult to debate the details of a Bill when the Minister has such wide powers. I believe it is a serious criticism of the Government that it has introduced the Bill in this form and that it is pushing this Bill through in such a long sitting. I urge members to show by their voting that this is a rotten Bill. I believe it is a bad measure. I do not like it one bit, and I hope it will not succeed. There is tremendous indignation in country districts over it, and that indignation is fully justified. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Ferguson and Teusner. Noes.—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HALL: I endorse the remarks made by the previous speakers in this debate. May I say that I, too, am sorry that we are debating this question in such a forced manner at this hour of the morning.

Mr. McKee: There is no hurry; take your time.

Mr. HALL: Apparently we are to be forced into debating this matter in one swoop without any adjournment. This is a most unusual method, and it certainly has not been employed in any major Bill this session.

Mr. Lawn: You took up too much time earlier.

Mr. HALL: I say we are being forced to get this Bill through because it is a distasteful measure to the Government. It seems that it is being forced through in one sitting at a time when the public will not be so much aware of it. There need be no apology from this side of the House for our wishing to speak as we would have spoken normally according to the list that was prepared many days ago. It is no use members opposite complaining about being kept here until this hour. As I said, our list of speakers was prepared days ago, and there must be some reason for trying to force this measure through at such a pace at this hour of the morning. I say the reason is that this matter is totally distasteful to the Government. I believe it is a matter that has threatened Government members electorally and they realize it, so they are trying to rush it through under cover of an early morning debate. This legislation is setting the clock back many years in South Australia, and is a Socialist means of chipping away at the edifice of freedom in this State. It is another restriction on personal and business freedom, and one more additional charge of the many being levied by this Government. It is a charge that will be borne in the main by country areas, but the Minister who initiated this legislation has the audacity to say that it is helping decentralize industry in South Australia. Country areas are to bear the brunt of the £1,000,000 extra charges; it is not to come from certain goods or from primary producers (if we believe members opposite), but obviously to come from country towns, because where else can it come from? The first major decentralization move by the present Government is to charge country people the sum of £1,000,000 each year for the privilege of living in the country. It is no coincidence that two Bills have been introduced giving dictatorial powers to the Transport Minister—one for complete control over the railways and this Bill to give complete control over road transport. With these Bills passed, the Minister would have complete dictatorial powers over the transport network of South Australia. This network, operating efficiently in economic balance, is to be severely tampered with and wrecked by Socialist theories applied by a Minister responsible to Caucus, so that these Socialist theories are administered with iron discipline.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Controlled by people up the street.

Mr. HALL: Yes, by people other than those representing the electors. This is demonstrated by the fact that Government members refuse to attend protest meetings that have been organized. It is obviously a Party decision or a direction from Caucus or the Party. Not every member opposite would be frightened to face up to the responsibility of attending meetings in his district.

Mr. Shannon: They are being discourteous to their electors.

Mr. HALL: I do not believe they would do that, or that everyone is scared.

Mrs. Steele: The electors will form their own opinion.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and demonstrating it at meetings such as the one held at Mount Gambier. I believe that the non-attendance of members opposite is because an instruction was issued.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't members of the Government Party go to meetings?

Mr. HALL: They have been instructed not to, and they cannot deny it. We know they have been told to keep away from these meetings. The normal needs of the district to be represented is being undermined so that the electors are without representation in this House on this vital matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They have representation that is voting against their interests.

Mr. HALL: Yes, particularly as this is menacing legislation, with two Bills being introduced in quick succession that give complete control of rail and road transport to one man, who is responsible to people outside this House, the so-called faceless men. If these men are not faceless, let them be named. Who are the bosses who framed this legislation? I could use the same tactics that I used in the debate on the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill. Who in this House framed this Bill? Was it the member for Chaffey or the member for Mount Gambier or the member for Millicent? Did they frame the Bill?

Mr. Shannon: They asked for it to be withdrawn.

Mr. HALL: Who did frame the Bill? We have to be specific; someone is responsible. It makes no difference to this House whoever was responsible outside. Members who sit here and support it are all equally responsible. We are accused of being political. What a side-show and circus we are when we are accused of that! Is not this politics from the ground up? Of course it is. If we had not had a change in

the political scene, road transport could have continued unfettered in this State. It is entirely political, and it is rubbish for members to cry, "You are being political." What else are we being? Some of us are here to encourage freedom, others to restrict it. Of course we are being political. We are being entirely political when we say that we shall throw this out of the window (if this Bill passes) as soon as we return to power.

Whom will this Bill affect? It will affect the road transport operators, who have become highly efficient in competition with each other and with the Commonwealth and State railway systems. This system has grown up since the Second World War and has been fostered and assisted by better trucks and better roads. It has grown into an efficient network. We have had statements from members opposite, and in a few letters, to the effect that the Railways Department is supported by the finances of the State and that road transport gets its roads free, so this is an unfair advantage. Again, what nonsense! If anyone examines the fees and taxation paid by road transport, he will appreciate the millions of pounds collected each year from that source.

Mr. Shannon: It is the most heavily taxed section of the community.

Mr. HALL: Yes. There are taxation, registration fees, a tax on spare parts, a sales tax. Every item that a road transport operator touches is heavily taxed, yet we hear this nonsense that he is running on free roads provided by the Government. We know that not all the money collected from road transport is returned to the roads, that more money should be returned to the roads from that collected by the Commonwealth. It is nonsense to say that the Government provides roads, thereby creating a concession for road transport. Road transport pays its way well in our community. It has developed efficiently. Why is it that at the stock sales in the main stock-selling centres of the Mid-North we find trucks lined up on the rails and road hauliers present, too, both seeking business? The Railways Department has an efficient agent who walks around the sale, talking to buyers and trying to induce them to send their sheep by rail. Also present are the road hauliers. Almost invariably nowadays most sheep travel by road, but apparently that is a crime. Why is it wrong, when it represents efficiency of movement and saving in health of the animals? We have a system developing in competition and efficiency in this community which, I believe, is growing around the Railways



Department's debt. We have other undertakings with a higher capital investment than that of the Railways Department, which are growing at a faster rate than the railways investment is growing. However, we are to turn our backs on efficiency and to tell the primary producers to use a less efficient method thereby artificially helping the Railways Department's finances. The local carrier serving my area can place superphosphate in my barn at £1 a ton, without my touching it or even seeing it. It merely involves a telephone call, and the goods are delivered that evening. The efficiency of the service is tremendous, and could never be equalled by the railways service. This service will be one of the first things to be hit.

Mr. McKee: What makes you so sure?

Mr. HALL: Because I pay the bills, and happen to know.

Mr. McKee: What makes you so sure that it will be dearer?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has said that the Railways Department will receive £1,000,000 more in revenue, and he will use this legislation until that is achieved. Let him deny that!

Mr. McKee: It will come back on railway freight.

Mr. HALL: Of course it will, because we shall all be forced to use the railways. Of course, it will be a successful venture from a Socialist's point of view, if this legislation passes!

Mr. McKee: How is it that transport is flourishing in all the other States, where this legislation is more stringent?

Mr. HALL: The Government has looked to the other States for some peculiar schemes this session, and it is no use its bringing them back and saying they will apply to South Australia. The honourable member knows that transport is not flourishing in the instances that I am giving. Stock and superphosphate, etc., cannot be transported in this State similarly to the way they are transported in other States. The general carriers and merchandisers in Balaklava will go bankrupt under this legislation. The local carrier in my town will go bankrupt, and the purpose of the legislation is to make him go bankrupt. What other purpose is there? Do honourable members think that freight carried on the rail system can be increased without decreasing the freight taken by road?

Mr. McKee: The answer is that transport will flourish the same as it does in other States.

Mr. HALL: We are not dealing with fairy tales; we are dealing with the economy of

my local merchandisers. Their livelihood is threatened by this legislation, which makes no provision for compensation. The attitude of the Labor Party is that everyone in business is making an overpowering profit and that they can afford to have about 33 per cent taken from their gross turnover without their being hurt. Honourable members opposite have no idea how business works. If 33 per cent is taken from the gross turnover of a man, he is broke. Let honourable members opposite talk to a person in my town who has built up a business from nothing by hard work since he was 14 or 15, when he should still have been at school. He has built up his business; he has two trucks and provides a much needed service for long distance transport. If the legislation is passed he will have no alternative but to go out of business.

Mr. McKee: You are frightening him out.

Mr. HALL: Let the honourable member look at the meetings being held in country towns in South Australia. Not one member of the Labor Party attends these meetings to explain this favourable situation! If it is so favourable why do they not attend the meetings? They refuse to attend because they are not allowed to and because their case stinks. The local people to whom I am referring and who I could name carry on these small businesses, and this is a hard life and always has been. Handling diverse stock at all times of the day and night is hard work and no overtime is paid. Yet, in one swoop, the livelihood of these men will be taken away. What is to be done with these people, who will be unemployed?

Mr. McKee: They can get a job on the railways.

Mr. HALL: Let the honourable member tell them that; that is a marvellous alternative! The Labor Party believes in destroying these businesses and making everybody a servant of the Government. That is galloping Socialism. It is obvious that Government members have not considered the personal effect of this legislation.

Mr. Shannon: Some of them have.

Mr. HALL: They have only considered Government finance, and they see this as an opportunity for getting more money. Therefore, they hit smaller businesses. Those affected will be owners of small firms and drivers employed by the firms, and there are hundreds in this category in the State.

I resent the implication and the statement by members opposite that the meetings in country towns are politically inspired. What

nonsense, Mr. Speaker! We have been invited to these meetings and so have members of the Government Party. The first I knew of the meeting in my district was when I was telephoned last Friday night and invited to explain the Bill at the meeting. As it turns out I cannot attend because of a previous engagement. However, these meetings are supposed to be politically inspired. Perhaps they are politically inspired because the legislation is a result of false political theory. The whole legislation is a political, financial fraud. Another aspect that the Socialist theorists could not be expected to consider is the practical work of the loading of trucks. We are to have a top rate of 2c (2.4d.), and the one-third of a penny a ton-mile will be carried in addition, making a total of 2.7d. A semi-trailer loaded with 10 tons will attract a rate of 2s. 3d. a ton-mile. I would think that I would pay between 5s. 6d. and 6s. 6d a mile, including the one-third of a penny tax. These rates are to be increased to 6s. 6d. and 8s. 6d.

That will mean that a truck will have to move fully loaded or be left empty. The same charge will be made whether there is one ton on it or 20 tons on it, and the tax is so severe that it will be absolutely uneconomic for a truck to move partly loaded, even to the extent of being 5/8th loaded. It will be necessary for a truck to be fully loaded. The great efficiency of road transport will be eliminated in this way. Any person who is associated with road transport in a practical way knows that the profit is in back loading any material that is available. Let the great economist from Port Pirie tell us that back-loading will not be eliminated. Let him say how 2s. a mile can be absorbed on a half load.

Mr. McKee: You are half loaded now.

Mr. HALL: It has been suggested that the member for Glenelg can tell us, but I doubt that.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I do not think they are allowed to tell us.

Mr. HALL: His master is not here to permit him.

Mr. Langley: You ought to talk about the master!

Mr. HALL: The elimination of back loading will have tremendous consequences for road transport operators. However, this major factor has not been mentioned in the debate. There was no mention of it in the Premier's explanation and it has not been mentioned by any other member from the Government side.

The Government has put abroad the fallacy that because farmers own trucks they are exempt and that this legislation will not affect them. That disregards the fact that many farmers own trucks that they use around the farms but that, because the trucks are fully utilized on the farm, the farmers employ contract carriers. They have not the time themselves or cannot obtain the labour necessary, and they make use of contractors in this field.

Mr. Shannon: A big percentage of grain is carted by contract these days.

Mr. HALL: The primary producer is noted for the way he spends his money freely and in many instances he likes to spend that money in his local town. All the goods that come by road will be much higher in price because of this legislation. We have a second fallacy, although it is not so much a fallacy as a fraud, and that is that this Bill will assist decentralization. Decentralization! Putting my merchandisers out of a job; that is the assistance that it will give in my territory! What a swift change from the emotional arguments that we used to get before the Liberal and Country League came to this side of the House! This time last year the emotional arguments on decentralization were in full cry, and apparently at that time we did not have one good example of a decentralized place in South Australia. However, I notice that as soon as the Government changed the Premier went off to Whyalla to open the steelworks there and it was the most marvellous example of decentralization in the country, according to his comments. Apparently the Government discovered that, but now it is out to destroy it. How can such industries as exist at Mallala and other country towns exist if this Bill becomes law? How will this Bill assist such industries? People are not as silly as that, and the Government cannot sell that idea to them. Honourable members opposite have been instructed that they cannot attend these public meetings, and that would be because their political merchandise is rotten.

Mr. Langley: Have you spoken at any of these meetings yet?

Mr. HALL: I have already told members that these meetings are not political, but I would go to them if invited.

Mr. McKee: This is your trouble—this Bill is so good it has you worried.

Mr. HALL: Let me say this, that I have at heart the welfare of transport operators in this State, together with the economy of the State as a whole, and to that extent I am extremely worried. Why should I take time

to debate this Bill with members opposite, who cannot see past the first little theory in their Socialist notebook? It is that I am concerned for the people in my electorate, and, even if the members for Mount Gambier, Chaffey and Millicent ignore their constituents, I do not ignore mine. Why should I?

We have another fallacy, and that is that we have left a freedom of choice under this Bill. Freedom of choice! No doubt any millionaire who wanted to go bankrupt quickly would be able to have such a freedom by earthing half loads, ignoring the railways or paying off so much a week to the railways—and remember that it is paid to the railways and not into Government revenue. Every time a person runs up and down alongside the railway tracks he would be able to say, “I own a bit of that because I have contributed so much towards it.” Anyone who operates with a profit motive, all the little carriers who so operate (and although it is repugnant to members opposite, this profit motive does exist) cannot afford these payments, and people who want to truck their sheep cannot afford the payments. Therefore, where is the freedom of choice? I believe it is a freedom to go bankrupt or use the inefficient system of the railways.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Or be employed on the railways.

Mr. HALL: Yes, that is the third and major alternative. Do honourable members opposite know what poor store stock means? Do they think the railways can carry such stock? Honourable members opposite would not know what the term means. There is only one means of transport that could carry such stock, and it is road transport, because of its efficiency, regular and convenient time of departure and arrival, and the elimination of double handling. It is no good the member for Frome, who has suddenly become interested again, interjecting.

Mr. Casey: I was just listening to your point about store stock being carried on the railways. What happened in 1959?

Mr. HALL: I am concerned not with that but with what is going to happen in 1966. I am well aware of what store stock transport means, because I indulge in it myself. It is impossible for a person to transport certain lines of stock unless he has an efficient means of transport at his disposal. The member for Frome should know the position in this respect, because his district supplies much of this stock. In the honourable member we have one member of the Government

who surely could explain this Bill to the public meetings, and I should be happy if on Friday week he would come to Balaklava. In fact, I would run him up from town and run him back.

Mr. Quirke: They would run him off, though.

Mr. HALL: I will not be going there, so I would not be able to criticize the honourable member in any way. He could have the meeting to himself and explain this matter. He would not be game to go there.

Mr. Millhouse: He is not taking you up on it.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member for Frome has his instruction from the faceless men.

Mr. Langley: I would rather have them than a dictator.

Mr. HALL: I wonder how the member for Frome takes this instruction; I thought he had rather an independent mind on one or two occasions.

Mr. Millhouse: Not three times, though.

Mr. HALL: I wonder what will happen to him the third time he gets to be of independent mind. If he tries to buck these faceless men, something will have to go. The honourable member for Mount Gambier attacked the public meeting at Mount Gambier as being political.

Mr. Casey: He did not attack it.

Mr. HALL: He certainly did not ally himself with any views expressed at that meeting. I accept that the honourable member has made his views clear in that he absolutely supports this Bill, and in so doing he goes against the wishes of every person who attended the public meeting at Mount Gambier. I think the honourable member will have grave doubts about this matter, and that as time goes on they will become more grave. It is a very serious matter. When 500 people attend a meeting without their local representative it is like a hive of bees without a queen. No-one can say that the Liberal Party swamped this meeting, for the other side was invited and if they had attended I believe the representation would have been at least equal. The Minister of Agriculture tried to depreciate the meeting because on one occasion one man uttered somewhat offensive remarks, but apart from that I do not think the meeting was discourteous. I have read the reports, and every honourable member opposite appears to have read them. As I say, I do not think the meeting was discourteous. What was the reason for members of the Government

not attending, if it was not their reluctance to face up to their own policy? There was no physical violence or name-calling at the meeting, which was as quiet as I would expect a meeting at that town to be. They are responsible citizens.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was arranged by the Chamber of Commerce, wasn't it?

Mr. HALL: By one of the local bodies.

Mr. McKee: It was arranged by the Liberal and Country League organization.

Mr. Nankivell: What rot!

Mr. HALL: Then isn't it amazing what support the Liberal and Country League has at Mount Gambier at present! The member for Mount Gambier said we had mis-informed the people, but he failed to inform them at all. We are expected to accept the second reading explanation as Gospel truth, but the past performance of the Government when in Opposition, as referred to by the member for Alexandra, particularly with reference to the ton-mile tax on Eyre Peninsula, does not encourage this acceptance. We are to accept statements made before the election and the denial after the election, and we are to believe the other tripe dished up by Ministers. Surely one would not expect a person in the street to be caught twice so why should we believe a second reading explanation so avidly when the details are not in the Bill? On past performances, why should we? The member for Mount Gambier said that if the railways should abdicate it would not affect operators in his district and that there was nothing restrictive in the Bill. What are we talking about, if this is not to affect operators there and there are no restrictions in the Bill? In addition to sales tax, field tax, registration and ordinary ton-mile tax, the Government is imposing an additional 2s. to 2s. 6d. a mile, or about half of the present operating charge.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is the maximum.

Mr. HALL: Yes. Government members mentioned Whyalla to justify this levy, but, if ever there was a cooked-up political arrangement, that was it. How the measure will help Whyalla by decentralization has yet to be explained. Let us consider the individual operators and not Socialist theories. Personalities count with us even if they do not count with the Government, and we must do what we can to protect the public interest. The member for Chaffey said that he wholeheartedly supported the Bill, but he will not go out and explain it. What

effect will this tax have on the co-operative winery deliveries, the deliveries by the proprietary winemakers? Will it force them to other States? What effect will it have on the delivering of processed fruit by the canneries? That industry is today worth £1,500,000. I understand that the cannery products are now shipped through Port Adelaide. If a severe tax is put on them, they will not come to Port Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: I could not name a better place for them to come to.

Mr. HALL: They probably will not go to Port Adelaide but will support Mr. Bolte's Victoria. What will happen to the cartage of sugar and of cartons before they are assembled? What will happen to the timber shooks? What will happen to an industrial concern like Grant Engineering Pty. Ltd., a growing and progressive industry?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It employs 70 men.

Mr. HALL: What will the threat be to those 70 employees? We have to get timbers from the forests to make cases. This cloud hangs over the transport and other industries. We are told that we have baseless arguments and are using all sorts of tactics; yet this Bill is being forced through in one sitting of this House.

Mr. Ryan: You have not been gagged.

Mr. HALL: At least we have not been gagged but certainly we have been forced to debate this Bill in a manner not conducive to one thinking that the Government likes it. For all the reasons I have enumerated, I am sure the Government does not like it. We are political about this because our political beliefs lead us to protect the individual and foster the decentralization and development of this State. For these reasons, I reject this restrictive, hampering and dangerous legislation.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon (teller), and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. SHANNON: First, I should like to comment on the tactics that have been adopted in the debate.

The SPEAKER: As long as the honourable member does not reflect on the House.

Mr. SHANNON: I am only drawing the attention of the House to certain facets of the way this matter is being handled. I heard a comment when the *Advertiser* was brought in to the effect, "Oh, the Leader didn't get his name in the *Advertiser* this time." That gave me the key to what I perceive to be the Government's tactics. Obviously, the Government is worried about this legislation, and undoubtedly desires to receive the least publicity about it that can be arranged.

Mr. McKee: How idiotic can you get! It will be on the front page tomorrow.

Mr. SHANNON: I have heard boys in the scrub whistling to keep their courage up and, if the Government is not doing just that, I am no judge. Undoubtedly the Government has had a re-think since certain evidence was brought to it by some of its own members about the way the legislation was being received in the country. Because of that, many amendments are on the file and, in fact, they occupy about the same space on my file as does the original Bill. Government members have been keeping their ears to the ground and they have heard something. I believe that the attempt to avoid publicity, which they realized this Bill was going to receive because of the attitude of the Opposition, will back-fire and the publicity will probably be multiplied.

We have dealt with two complementary Bills on the transport problem since yesterday. Into the hands of one man has been placed the right to control the whole transport system. I am not sure whether that one man will, in fact, carry out the policy. I think he will be guided by Cabinet decision, and I have no doubt that Cabinet decisions with regard to policy will be guided by people outside this Chamber. However, in effect, we are giving one Minister the right to regulate all road and rail traffic. Periodically, off-shears sales are held at which many sheep are yarded. I do not think I would be exaggerating if I said that it was not unusual for the main firm (Elder Smith-Goldsbrough Mort) to have about 20,000 sheep on an off-shears sale. In many cases it is physically impossible to get those sheep trucked, and they could not be fitted into rail trucks probably until the following day. This disability has been overcome by road transport. Anyone who has been to these sales has seen

the string of road transports there. The sheep are loaded as they are sold, in many instances, and are on the road to the purchaser's property before the sale is concluded. That is the only way in which they can get large numbers of stock on to the road and travelling to their destination.

Mr. Ferguson: There is then no loss.

Mr. SHANNON: Losses do not occur when this method is used.

Mr. Ferguson: They are out of the purchaser's paddock and into the buyer's paddock on the same night.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. Of necessity, delays occur not only in the loading but also in the transport of stock by rail. Losses occur and no method could be adopted that would avoid those losses. People who own the stock pay for the losses. Both the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey suggested that the legislation would not interfere in any way with road users, but such a suggestion is simply denying the facts of life in this matter. I think the honourable member for Victoria quoted some figures in regard to the actual increased cost a head on sheep and cattle and those figures were startling enough to satisfy any thinking person that these stock can no longer be carted by road hauliers. That will effectively put the hauliers off the roads altogether, and it is obvious that this Bill is designed for that purpose. It is all very well to say that a licence will be granted for a small fee. The member for Gouger worked out the cost at about 8s. 6d. a mile.

Mr. Hall: They charge about 5s. 6d. to 6s. 6d., and the fee will be about 2s.

Mr. SHANNON: It is obvious that an attempt is being made to force road hauliers off the road. I am convinced that South Australia will be a steep loser in the South-East. At present, difficulty is experienced in that area in competing with Victoria in business. The Victorians bid up and offer all kinds of inducements for the business to go to Victoria or to Melbourne. Anyone who has been around the shops in Mount Gambier will have seen that Victorian goods are the only goods stocked by some shops. Melbourne Bitter can be purchased in every hotel I know of in Mount Gambier. That is largely because trade has been built up over the years by the Melbourne people.

We will lose much more of our South-Eastern business to Victoria, because there will be no let or hindrance as far as the interstate haulier is concerned. He will be happy to pay his ton-mile tax. I have been informed

that there are about 250 or 260 road hauliers' trucks in Mount Gambier itself, and there would also be some in Millicent, Naracoorte and Penola. These people will, of necessity, seek business where they can use their trucks profitably.

They will go to other States, and that will mean a loss to South Australia. Business houses will feel the pinch almost overnight and I do not see any value in the suggestion that people displaced by this legislation will be absorbed in Government jobs. On the contrary, I would rather see fewer civil servants than more. There is no extra grist contributed to the mill by people working for the Government. We have to get them into some type of productive activity to create wealth. To suggest that these people can be put into Government jobs is to show weakness. It is a sign of the times, that people who say this have no real knowledge of the way the economy of the country runs. In these days many commercial interests have harnessed their businesses to road transport. Of course, the man on the land will be hit immediately by this legislation, and the commercial people who have harnessed their businesses to road transport on the grounds of economy cannot change unless a burden is imposed on them. Such a change would have a bearing on the profitability of South Australian businesses.

Not only will people be discouraged from coming here and starting up business: some people here will see the writing on the wall and will move across the border, to New South Wales or to Victoria. They have all the reasons in the world to go to the Eastern seaboard because there they have ready-made markets, and that is a big drawback that we must answer. The only answer is to do as our former Premier did and keep South Australian costs at a minimum in order to encourage industries to establish themselves and remain here. I am afraid that with the extra burdens to be placed upon them from various angles—and this is only one such angle—we could not attract other industries. Had such a thing as this happened at the time General Motors-Holden's was being established at Woodville there is no doubt that we would have lost that industry because it would have gone to Geelong.

I am fearful that this legislation will have a far-reaching effect on the State's general economic condition, far more than most people appreciate. I know from talking to people in business in the metropolitan area how this

legislation will affect them. They are anticipating a steep rise in cartage costs as a result of it, and that cannot be denied. I do not think the Government is trying to avoid its stated policy as I think in its own crude way it is trying to make a bitter pill taste a little sweeter by suggesting that, for a small fee, road hauliers will be able to continue in business. Nothing could be further removed from reality. If that were so, the extra grist to the railways would not eventuate because the argument cannot be used both ways. To obtain the additional rail freights people must be driven off the roads. Otherwise, railway earnings will not be improved. Obviously the intention of the Bill is to get rid of the road hauliers.

I thoroughly endorse the comments of the member for Gouger about this section of our society. I consider that they are about the most heavily taxed section if all the taxes they pay are taken into account. A big contractor or truck owner pays a great deal in various forms of tax, and I am hoping that the Government will have another think about this legislation. I believe that if it had permitted this debate to be adjourned until tomorrow and had an opportunity of obtaining the reaction of the public there might have been a reconsideration of the type of legislation with which we are now dealing. Possibly we would have another spate of amendments that would relieve the situation. I am certain the Government does not want to make this an election issue. Possibly it thinks that people will have short memories and forget it if it is pushed through in this first session of this Parliament.

In my view, it is not possible to keep placing your hand in another fellow's pocket because he takes a long time to forget such an action. That is one of the things people understand best, and such an action means that those people do not remain your friends for long. They are lost as friends unless the action of placing a hand in the pocket is stopped, but that is not contemplated in this Bill. With my colleagues on this side of the House I am hoping that a saner approach will result through our strong objection to the legislation.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I rise to support the members on the Government side of the House, in the same way as the honourable member who has just resumed his seat supports the members on his side. We have seen during this session that members opposite have in every way possible tried to cause obstruction to the legislation that has been introduced. They rightly claim that they are the Opposition and

that they will oppose, and I do not deny them that right for that is their duty and their function. However, if they are complaining at this stage of the session about our trying to get legislation through, they have only themselves to blame. The *Hansard* for this year is the largest I have seen since I have been a member in this House. In fact, I would say that it would equal almost three normal sessions of Parliament. We on this side of the House have frequently been accused of not speaking to legislation before the House, and if that is true it means that the greater part of this year's *Hansard* is taken up by the speeches of members opposite.

The point I wish to emphasize is that throughout this session the Opposition has deliberately set out to frustrate in every possible way the legislation that this Government has introduced. Let us have a look at the space occupied in *Hansard* by the debate on the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill. Let us examine the tactics that were used in trying to ridicule the Government regarding that legislation, and then let us reflect on the result of the referendum last Saturday. What has the Opposition to say on this score now? What a shock the result must have been to the Opposition! I have not heard the subject of lotteries mentioned at all since the weekend, and in this debate that was practically the only subject that was not touched on. It is a sad story now. Members opposite must be fair on this. The Bill under discussion has been before this House now for a considerable time.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't you bring it on earlier?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The Opposition even opposed the Education Act Amendment Bill, although it was prepared by the Opposition when it was the Government last year.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. I remember the Minister saying that that legislation was prepared by the previous Government, yet now that it is in Opposition it opposes that legislation.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't you bring the present Bill forward earlier?

Mr. CASEY: Honourable members opposite should know how difficult that is for a Government in the circumstances that this Opposition has created to suit its own ends. It then tries to pin the blame on the Government. Honourable members opposite usually have one month's grace in which to prepare for this type of legislation. We were in Opposition long enough to know that we had to be prepared in that way. I can remember the member for Adelaide rising on

one occasion and telling the Government that he was going to speak to a motion, but the Government refused him permission and said that he could not introduce an amendment or debate the issue. This was the procedure adopted by the previous Government. However, the Labor Party guarantees free speech, although this was denied to it in the past when it was the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was the Workmen's Compensation Act, and we were told that if we talked or introduce an amendment the Bill would go out. That is what the present Leader of the Opposition said and that is the sort of thing he used to say to us.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable members know that interjections are out of order, and Opposition members are not interjecting one at a time but *en bloc*. I know it has been a long sitting, but I hope members will try to restrain themselves. The honourable member for Frome may continue.

Mr. Bockelberg: Can you tell us something about the Bill we are discussing?

Mr. CASEY: A little over two years ago we had a measure before the House that was similar in some respects to the measure we are debating now. It was the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You don't call that similar?

Mr. Quirke: The only thing similar was that it was about roads.

Mr. CASEY: The Bill was introduced by the present Leader, and in his second reading explanation he said:

The Government desires all road users shall pay for the upkeep of the road and the principal object of the Bill, which is based on and follows closely the form of legislation in the Eastern States, is to impose a charge for road maintenance on the owners of commercial goods vehicles.

This is precisely the same thing as the Bill we now have before us. It imposes a charge on commercial goods vehicles and on people who are carrying goods on the roads. What the Leader said a couple of years ago about his legislation following closely that of the Eastern States was completely wrong, because it did not. In the November issue of the *Transport Journal of Australia* an address by Mr. W. P. Egan, Manager of the Australian Transport and Storage Division of Mayne Nickless Ltd., stated:

The regulating bodies controlling the promotion of State legislation governing our activities are the Transport Regulation Board and the Country Roads Board in Victoria, who

in their administration are extremely fair and sympathetic with our problems. There is no doubt that the role of the Transport Regulation Board is to ensure that our State-owned railway revenue is protected.

That is a fair statement. These people realized that the railway system is owned by the State and that it has to be protected, because we all own the railway system. The article continues:

Recent powers conferred under the Decentralizing of Industries Act indicate that there is a broadening of attitude in relation to the 25-mile radius limitation, and the future will see, I believe, even greater relaxation of the Licensing Act and greater scope for road transport to service decentralized industries.

He is talking about 25 miles: here in South Australia we go further than that to 50 miles, a 25 miles radius. Under our legislation we are being particularly fair to road transport. I point out that there are five methods of transportation today. Not all five are incorporated in South Australia but they can be at one stage or another in the transportation of goods. There is transportation by sea, transportation by air, transportation by rail, transportation by road, and the latest one is transportation by pipeline, which is being used commonly in America now and will be used commonly in Australia in years to come. Mr. Egan continues:

Because of the geographical location of our various industries, raw materials and markets for many years until volume catches up, we will be faced with transport's greatest enemy, namely, unequal traffic diversities. Nevertheless, there is a place for every form of transport to operate to its greatest degree of efficiency. There will always be the commodity which, for a variety of reasons, will require a speedy specialized type of transport requiring minimum handling, and in the same way as industry is prepared to pay premium rates for luxury services, in the same manner they will be prepared to pay for specialization.

Mr. Quirke: That is not right.

Mr. CASEY: I am quoting from Mr. Egan, who is the Manager of the Australian Transport and Storage Division, Mayne Nickless Ltd. He is one of the top men in the road transport game in Australia, and he agrees that there is a place for all transportation in this country. I agree with him and will go so far as to say that much of the nonsense spoken here tonight by members opposite does not hold water. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) got up and bellowed that store stock could not be moved by anything other than road transport. I was absolutely stunned by his remarks. In 1959 (and the member for Burra knows this well because he had much

strife in his area in that year about store stock, and the member for Alexandra should know about it, if he is wide awake, because he was Minister of Agriculture at the time) we were in dire straits in South Australia with our store stock, particularly sheep. There were two markets left for us, one in Western Australia and one in New South Wales. I hear no dissentient voice from the Opposition, so they must agree with me. Who transported the majority of this stock? Again, I hear no dissentient voice from the Opposition.

Mr. Nankivell: The road transporters shifted most of it.

Mr. CASEY: I agree that road transport did help to shift it.

Mr. Nankivell: It was not organized then like it is now.

Mr. CASEY: The Railways Department shifted the greater percentage of stock out of South Australia in 1959, when the need was greatest. It was said on that occasion (and it will be said again), not by me and not by other graziers in the area, but by the stock agents, "Without the railway service we would have been in real strife. Thank God for the railways." That was said many times. Road transportation cannot compete with the railway service over long hauls. The most economical distance over which road transport can function is about 200 miles.

Mr. Nankivell: What about unloading and transhipping?

Mr. CASEY: Through matters beyond the present Government's control we have three railway gauges in South Australia, a problem that does not exist to the same extent in other States. About four years ago a pastoralist in my district decided to send some stock to his property in the South-East. He asked the Railways Department whether it could shift a truckload of stock from his northern pastoral property to the southern property, and was informed that it could and that a special train would be provided. The Railways Department was prepared to do that, and that is what I call a typical example of co-ordination of transport. The gentleman concerned lived near a small railway town in the North-East, where the Railways Department had provided excellent facilities for loading. (In fact, right throughout South Australia the Railways Department has facilities for the loading of stock that are second to none.) The yards are in excellent condition, and the department has gone out of its way to satisfy all the pastoralists in the area. They have been asked by departmental officers in the area to



submit suggestions, many of which have been put into effect. The gentleman loaded his stock on the special train, which set off for the South-East. Several months later he approached me and said, "I have a complaint to make about the Railways Department's transportation of stock." I said, "I am sorry to hear that. What is your trouble?" He replied, "I transported some of my stock from the North-East to the South-East, and the department was beating about the bush. It wanted to unload the stock at Dry Creek to spell them, but I said 'No, they are ewes; I want to get them to the South-East as quickly as I can.' I did not want to take the chance of unloading them, because I might have lost some. I wasn't happy with the way the Railways Department handled it." I thought something must be wrong somewhere so I telephoned the Railways Department and spoke to the chief officer. Strangely enough, he happened to know all about the case, as he had received a letter from the grazier only two or three days before I talked to him, congratulating the Railways Department on the magnificent way in which it had moved his sheep from the North-East to the South-East, and saying that it had been done in record time. This type of thing crops up periodically; people openly criticize something yet they know that their criticism is untrue. That is what Opposition members are doing in this case. They know road transport can absorb the road tax imposed on it in the Bill, because this has been proved in other States. No-one will deny that it is costly to maintain a semi-trailer on the road, and I can give approximate figures of just what it costs. However, it can be done in other States and, therefore, it can be done here.

Under the Bill every aspect of the railways system throughout the State has been considered. The Commonwealth Government controls two of the main routes in South Australia, which are money spinners for a railway system. I refer to the Commonwealth lines to Western Australia and the Far-North. Road transport will not be taxed when in competition with the Commonwealth Railways, because its lines are not part of the South Australian system. Road transport can operate anywhere parallel to the Commonwealth Railways without being taxed. This confines considerably the area in which tax will be paid. The member for Onkaparinga referred to off-shears markets. In my area the four main off-shears markets are at Snowtown, Peterborough, Yelta and Burra. Before road transport began operating in the State as it does today, these places were big

centres for off-shears sales, and the stock was taken away by rail. There was a great disadvantage, because the stock had to be transferred at Gladstone or Terowie, but it was done. At some off-shears sales stock numbering between 29,000 to 32,000 was sold.

Mr. Nankivell: But the railway system had no competition.

Mr. CASEY: I said that this was before road transport began operating. I have to discount Yelta for this purpose because it is on the New South Wales border, is isolated and must be served by road transport. However, Yelta did not come into being until road transport operated in this State in conjunction with New South Wales. Since road transport has come in, it has played a part and will continue to play a part in regard to off-shears sales in South Australia. I agree with Mr. Egan that every mode of transport has a place. They can all operate efficiently if there is co-ordination of transport, and that is the whole principle behind this Bill.

Mr. McKee: Honourable members opposite do not want to accept that.

Mr. CASEY: They have to accept it. Opposition members are privileged to oppose, and we do not deny them that privilege. We do not deny free speech, and it is the privilege and duty of the Opposition to oppose. However, it is completely false for them to accuse us of trying to force legislation through. The proof of the pudding in that regard is in *Hansard*.

Advantages must be gained by increasing the efficiency of our railways. There is no denying anybody the choice of transport and, no doubt, many people will still use road transport as against rail transport. In fact, legislation introduced by the previous Government, particularly in regard to the cartage of wool, did nothing to help the railways, particularly in the Northern Division. In order to entice the southern woolgrowers to send their wool to Adelaide, a concession freight rate was granted.

The honourable member for Victoria would have been affected, and would have been granted a concession rate in respect of his wool. When the late Mr. O'Halloran, my predecessor as member for Frome, was Leader of the Opposition, he tried to have the same concessions extended to the North, but this was denied. What was sauce for the goose should have been sauce for the gander at that time. We are all South Australians. Why should the growers in the South-East have been privileged? After all, the people of the North were responsible for opening up this State, but that

is the handout they got from the previous Government. I give full marks to the people of the North. They built up that area; the people of the South-East did not. I think the member for Rocky River will agree with that.

Road transport has been able to compete favourably with the railways in the North-East, because the railways are disadvantaged by the break of gauge. I do not understand why the 5ft. 3in. gauge stopped at Terowie, instead of being extended about 15 miles to Peterborough, which was the biggest stock market outside Adelaide. When it was necessary to load stock on trains, they had to be taken 15 miles by road and transhipped. There was never anything more stupid, yet that was the policy of the Liberal Government in those days. It was the kind of thing that people do not realize, or are inclined to forget: that nothing was done to help transportation, particularly the railways. The most efficient way of enabling the railways to compete on favourable terms with road transport is no doubt by standardization. I do not think the present Commonwealth Government realizes this, but the last Commonwealth Labor Government realized it and I give it full marks on its realization that rail standardization was essential for Australia.

Take it a step further, and it will be found that under the Chifley Government the 4ft. 8½in. line was put through to Marree and, at that stage, a sum of between £12,000,000 and £17,000,000 remained to continue the line to Alice Springs. However, when the Government was changed the line did not proceed beyond Marree. I do not know what happened to the funds that were earmarked to standardize the line between Marree and Alice Springs. That is the type of thing that is hamstringing the economy of this State. I give this Government full marks for introducing this legislation because I think it took a lot of guts to bring it in, the same as it took guts to bring in the Lotteries Bill that was so vigorously opposed by members opposite.

Mr. Heaslip: Not only by members opposite.

Mr. CASEY: Well, by people who opposed it on the grounds of conscience. I have no disagreement with that but when it is brought into the political sphere, as honourable members are attempting to do with this Bill, then I draw the line. I can remember, when the member for Mitcham spoke on the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting, he said that this was the biggest political hot potato—

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to keep to the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was diverted from my course, but I get some unusual interjections and it takes concentration to regain a line of thought because the interjections are so haphazard and I cannot fit them in with this Bill. Nevertheless, I say that our railway system is essential to this State. I do not know whether the member for Rocky River agrees with this because, when a similar measure came before the House, he wanted to close all railways. I was trying to locate this in *Hansard*, but I did not have time to pick it up although I think my comment is correct.

That is the kind of thing we cannot let happen in this State. The railways helped to build this State and with this legislation they will still be a force to reckon with in future. We cannot do without them. Oversea countries have proved this, especially in the United States of America, which is probably the most go-ahead country in the western world today. They thought at one stage that railways were finished and that road transport would take over, but the contrary is the case today and railways fulfil an important function in modern transportation. I think we will see the same thing happen in this State. The railways should be protected, because they are a Government instrumentality, they are owned by the people of this State, and they are one of the biggest employers in this State. I do not deny that more efficiency is needed. However, the railways should not be subject to unfair competition from road hauliers. I still maintain that what I said two years ago when the road maintenance legislation was introduced was true then, that it would have applied today, and that it would have created chaos similar to that which has been evidenced amongst members opposite since we introduced this measure. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Bill. We are getting some new sayings such as "Live better with Labor" and "Standards go down with Socialism", and I suppose those sayings will live through the years. An old saying is that one does not throw good money after bad, and that one sometimes has to cut one's losses. There has been no successful business organization in this country that has not been prepared to accept these statements as axioms. Whenever you find that something is unsuccessful or is

not paying its way you cut your losses or reorganize the show, and that is what is needed with the railways in this State.

I quite agree that some of the longer rail hauls are essential for the development of this country. However, I maintain that an examination should be made of where the railways are losing money and where they are making money. In fact, the whole system needs reorganizing. If any honourable member looks through the accounts he will see that some lines pay. It is the introduction of modern methods and co-ordination in the railways (not elimination of road transport, as is suggested in this Bill) that is desirable. The member for Frome could not make his point in that regard. He said the Government was not out to eliminate road transport. However, in his second reading explanation the Premier said he did not expect to get much revenue on the controlled routes but that he was going to get all the money for the railways, and if that is not an elimination of private transport where the routes are going to be controlled, I do not know what it is. I say it is definitely elimination.

Let us examine the position regarding the shorter hauls on the railways. For instance, the total income for the Milang line is about £3,000 a year. The officer stationed down there probably costs the railways £1,000 a year. A railcar runs down there three or four times a week, and I have been told that the driver sets his rabbit traps on the way down and examines them on the way back to see how many rabbits he has caught. I understand that he does not run to any particular time table. That line is in such a bad state of repair that it can take only one truck at a time, and that is hauled behind a railcar. Despite the fact that the Railways Department has only that small income and it is making a big loss on that line, it is at present putting down new sleepers. I do not know whether that is being done in the anticipation of private transport down that way being eliminated, but it seems to me that this action could be economic for the railways only if people were forced to use that line. Why should this be done, because it is uneconomical unless elimination of road transport is to be undertaken? I cannot understand this Act. What is meant by the road mileage and the exemption if the mileage is 50 per cent of the joint road and rail transport? Would that apply to Strathalbyn which is 50½ miles by rail and 34½ miles by road from Adelaide. If my

interpretation is correct, apparently a family living half a mile north of the Strathalbyn railway station is exempt.

Mr. Curren: To what destination?

Mr. McANANEY: To Adelaide. I cannot understand some of these amendments.

Mr. Curren: Why not study them before you criticize?

Mr. McANANEY: They are like the amendments to the Succession Duties Act, vague and irresponsible. The language in this Bill should be simple so it can be understood by an ordinary layman. In fact, these further amendments should not be needed. This is poor legislation, as the language cannot easily be understood. At Goolwa two men are employed on the railways and the revenue there last year was £3,200. These employees exist in a tin shed, but after my request, the Railways Commissioner put in a fan. He said that he could not afford to do anything more because the line was not paying. Many minor lines exist that are uneconomical, and it is about time we cut our losses. The capital investment is there, but it is not of economic value to the community. Some lines pay, but we should do what was done in Great Britain recently where uneconomic lines were closed and the good ones remained open, with co-ordination of road transport. Co-ordination also includes the Railways Department carting goods on long hauls and delivering them. I used to have much trouble when my superphosphate came by rail to the Strathalbyn railway station, but I had no difficulty when it was brought by road carrier to my property. If the railway employees could lift it off the train and put it on to a road truck, we could get somewhere, but we shall get nowhere by persisting with these antiquated methods. If we send away grain, a man will come and pick it up, load it and put it on the stacker for 5d. a bushel.

It is only 35 miles from Strathalbyn to Adelaide by road, yet the Railways Department charges 10d. a bushel for that area, and we have to pay somebody else to put the wheat on the stacker, the railway employees not handling it at all. That type of service is detrimental to the community. If manpower is being wasted in handling goods twice, that lowers our standard of living. Efficiency raises living standards. Everybody benefits from lower costs and prices. Where necessary, we must cut our losses; we must not compel people to use something that is wasteful of labour. Some railway lines are uneconomic and consideration should be given to closing them or

adopting modern methods whereby manpower and labour are not wasted.

It is said that much money is tied up in the Railways Department; but more is tied up in the roads. I think the Railways Department has net assets totalling £58,000,000, and £11,000,000 has been transferred from the Redemption Fund to the Railways Department. That process has to be continued. That asset has gone and cannot be brought back. We have to use the railways. What does a farm pay now towards the roads? I think my rates bill is £250 a year, which I pay to provide roads so that my goods may be taken away. Then there is the petrol tax, amounting to another £100 or £150 a year; so I am paying £400 a year to use the roads, apart from other taxes. Then it is said, "You can't use the roads; you have to use our railway services because we cannot make them pay, although we have not adopted any business principles in managing them or trying to bring them up to date." That is the position we are being told to face. I oppose it. This Bill means elimination of road transport. I have already stated in my speech on the Address in Reply:

Co-ordination of transport was referred to in the Address in Reply speeches. I did not properly understand this word, as I am a simple country boy, so I looked it up in the dictionary. The definition is, "of the same order; equal in rank, degree or importance; or a number of actions".

Do we call this "co-ordination" because we are depriving private industry of a reasonable chance to compete and are imposing a tax of 1s. 9d. a mile for an eight-ton load, which is something we cannot pay, so we have to use the railways? It is a wasteful method of transportation, and results in cruelty to dumb animals. However, stock will continue to be transported by road, and the tax will be paid. Superphosphate will have to be transported by rail, creating double handling and a waste of power, which will be to the detriment of the State. We hear statements to the effect that we are ahead of the rest of the world with our social services, and yet we are running backwards on the things that really count—the production of goods and the raising of our living standards.

I strongly oppose the handing over of power to the Minister. The old Transport Control Board was bad enough. I once came home from Melbourne to find fluke in my sheep, and it was necessary for me to send them to the abattoirs. I telephoned the board but was refused a permit to cart the sheep to the abattoirs. On telephoning the then Premier,

I was told to telephone the Chairman of the board the following day, and that he would speak to me. A rail truck was finally obtained (there being one in Strathalbyn at the time). The Chairman said he had a difficult Act to administer, but it was at least definite legislation. This vague Bill can be interpreted in any way, the Minister can vary the effect of it during the Parliamentary recess, and we shall not know where things stand. Anomalies will arise; some people will be paying 2d. a ton-mile under this Bill while others in similar circumstances will pay nothing. The Bill discriminates between various people and seeks to eliminate private transport. I strongly oppose it, because it is a backward step.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): Many and varied have been my experiences during some of my nightly escapades. I have worked in the field throughout the night, and I have danced all night, but little did I think that I would sit through a Parliamentary debate that lasted all night and then commence my contribution towards it at 7.10 a.m. However, when there are things to be said I do not mind saying them at 7.10 a.m. or 7.10 p.m. I will say many things that have been said before but I believe they have to be said to get the Government to realize that the Bill before the House can be detrimental to commerce and to the efficient transport system now operating in South Australia. The member for Frome commenced his speech by saying that Opposition members had obstructed legislation introduced by the Government this session. From time to time members opposite hold up the *Hansard* volume for this session and say that it is the Opposition's work. I believe we can be proud of the fact that, because of constructive criticism made by the Opposition, many amendments have been made to Bills before the House. Therefore, Opposition members do not believe they have obstructed legislation before the House this session. When speaking on the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Bill some time ago the present Premier said:

Let me say at the outset that I have always firmly expressed the view that the owners of our heavy transports have no wish to evade their responsibility towards making their fair and reasonable contribution towards the up-keep costs of our roads and highways.

The owners of heavy transport do not object to making some contribution towards the up-keep and maintenance of roads but they do object to paying tax to bolster up the railways system of the State. In another debate, the member for Frome, who is a champion of

the railways system in this debate, talked about primary producers and about how they would have to market their produce. He said that the most effective way that a primary producer could do this was by using the roads.

The Bill imposes a restriction on road transport, which will have to operate in competition with the railways despite the added tax burden. I believe that people have no confidence in the Railways Department's handling of goods. From time to time we hear how the railway system is not competent to cart goods and that often, because of double handling, breakages occur with the consequent added cost. The honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) referred to the cartage of sheep and to the big markets held in the State. He said that all the stock from those markets could not be got on to the railway system. I consider that many of the purchasers of sheep at these sales do not want to put them on rail; they prefer to have them transported by road.

We know that in many of our country markets sheep are taken from the paddock the day before the sale and to the market on the morning of the sale. Often, they do not reach the purchasers' properties for some days after that. This applies in my district. When primary producers want to replenish their stocks, they go to the Peterborough or Burra market; these markets are usually held on Thursdays. If stock sold at these sales is transported by rail, it is not off-loaded at Kadina until the following Sunday morning. In such circumstances the stock arrives in worse condition than would be the case if it were transported from the market to the purchaser's farm on the same day.

One of the worst features of this Bill is that road transport control will be brought back into operation. Primary producers and the users of road transport worked for years to have road transport control dispensed with, because they considered that it was not operating in the best interests of primary producers or road transport. Not only will this control come back into operation but the Minister will make the final decision on the working of the Transport Control Board.

A very efficient road transport industry has been built up on Yorke Peninsula to meet the needs of that area. It has come to our aid and transported grain when no other facilities to move it have been available. If this road transport fleet is to be denied some of the business it now has, some of the operators will have to go out of the business, because it is

necessary for road transport operating on licensed routes on Yorke Peninsula to make a full journey if the proposition is to be payable. If the transports were to operate only from the railway at Melton down through the Peninsula, the proposition would not be payable and some of these operators would be denied the jobs that they now have.

I do not think this Bill will give us co-ordination of road and railway transport. I think the measure has been introduced to tax road transport to provide a fund that will supplement the finances of the Railways Department. I hope that this measure will not be carried. We oppose it as strenuously as we can, and as we have not sufficient numbers in this House to defeat it I hope that when it reaches another place it will be dealt with severely. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I, too, oppose the Bill. I have been in this House for seven years and I have heard of debates continuing throughout the night until breakfast time and beyond, but I did not believe that such a thing could happen. Now I know it can happen. I wish to make it clear at the outset that from questions I have asked and inquiries I have made of railway personnel on North Terrace and throughout my district it should be clear that my interest is in promoting the railway system wherever possible with a view to improving its services and making it more efficient. I believe the first move in the drive to reduce deficits should have been to find ways and means to improve the efficiency of operation. I am still awaiting a reply from the Premier to a question I asked regarding kangaroo pick-a-back trucks; that is the type of thing that should have been examined. I agree with honourable members that when it comes to long haulage the Railways Department should be able to put the road hauliers off the roads, because a diesel engine operating on set tracks and pulling hundreds of tons should put the road haulier out of business. The diesel engines are capable of pulling 100 or 150 times the load of a road transport.

Mr. Quirke: They have pulled 2,000 tons.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Well, that would be 100 times the load, and that makes the economics of the matter more favourable to the railway system. Early in the debate the member for Port Pirie asked where we got the idea that this legislation was the responsibility of the faceless men. I do not know who those men are, and I am not concerned about them, but some of the men who framed this

legislation are faceless as far as this Parliament is concerned. I have an up-to-date edition of this little grey book, although I had to wait until after the election to get it, but I paid my 5s. and received my copy.

Mr. Freebairn: The faceless men are a tough bunch.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I agree that the faceless men must be tough when I look at this legislation. I will now read portion of what this little book contains as regards transport.

The SPEAKER: You must link it with this Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do link it with this Bill. It says:

(1) The co-ordinating of all transport services under a Minister of Transport responsible to Parliament with all the necessary amending legislation to provide: Subject to the direction of the Minister, railways and tramways to be managed by boards on which the employees shall have representation.

Of course, this is something that I cannot link with the Bill. I do not know how this reconciles itself with the unions, but so far there has been no indication that there will be a board to control the railways and that there will be employee representation on it. To continue:

(2) The proper co-ordinating of road transport as an auxiliary of public transport. I do not believe the intention of this Bill is to make it an auxiliary. I have had the temerity to call it "subordination" of transport rather than co-ordination of transport, because I believe that is what will result from this Bill. We often hear about decentralization of industry. I understand that a conservative estimate of the investment in road transport in this State is £100,000,000, and a large percentage of this is decentralized in the country. This must be carefully examined, because this Bill is intended to reduce the movement on roads and to increase the movement on railways. It can have only one effect; it must mean that it will be more difficult for those trucks to operate, and therefore inevitably some of them will go off the road. More particularly it will be the small operator, the one Government members are allegedly so interested in protecting, that will be forced off the road, because the big operator is able to spread his overheads over more units, and therefore his costs are reduced and he can operate more economically than can the small operator.

The member for Frome referred to the drought of 1959. I do not think anyone would

deny that at that time the Railways Department did a magnificent job, but that does not mean that they have been able to continue doing so. Perhaps their effort was superior to that of road transport, but at that time road transport was not organized to the pitch that it is today, when we have the option of selecting either road or rail transport. I think it was the member for Gouger who referred to the fact that clerks in the railways went around the markets canvassing for loading. I have no objection to using the railways, but some difficulties are associated with rail transport, as has been pointed out by the member for Yorke Peninsula. For instance, I may want to buy sheep in the Burra market, but I cannot get a through connection by rail. Therefore, the sheep have to be held overnight and loaded the next day, and some time the following day they arrive at their destination. That is a long delay for sheep that have been carted to market and detained there without necessarily being paddocked. Often it would be some time since they had been fed, so when one takes them off the train one has to watch that they do not get too much of something that they should not eat. The alternative to this is to put them on road transport, in which case they can get to their destination on the same day, and that is a service that the Railways Department just cannot offer.

I hope that some consideration will be given to this matter under this Bill. I realize that the Minister has power to give exemptions and to grant concessional fees for certain movements. I believe there is room in the Bill for these things to be coped with, but I know that people fear they will not be coped with. A difficulty arises through the necessity to tranship from one line to another. It is not only a question of changing to a different gauge but of making connections between different railway movements. Sheep can be held up for half a day or even a day because they have arrived at, say, Tailem Bend too late to be put on a connecting train and it is necessary to wait until the next morning. The chances are that the stock firm that has handled the sale will offload them, but this is all additional handling that does not occur when the sheep are moved by stock transport. The member for Frome also quoted a certain Mr. Egan. I cannot remember that gentleman's capacity.

Mr. Coumbe: He is with Mayne Nickless Limited.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am indebted to my friend for that information. Mayne Nickless Limited is a big transport firm that operates between the States, and it has branches here. He said that it was nice to have a certain easing of controls within the 25-mile radius. He was saying how pleased they were to have it in Victoria, but the analogy cannot be taken further because they know they cannot get controls taken off. No-one has asked them to choose between controls and no controls. There cannot be an analogy between those conditions and this legislation, which is a complete reversal. If it were moved as an amendment it would be ruled out because it is a direct negative. This is the case quoted by the member for Frome. He said that Mr. Egan was not opposed to rail transport and that his company appreciated that the railways should be supported and maintained. What do our people say who do not have those conditions? They make it abundantly clear that they do not want controls. I am soon to receive another petition, similar to that which other members are receiving. It is all very well for Government members to say, as the Minister for Transport has said, that these things are the result of an uninformed public expressing opposition. Who is informed on this Bill?

Mr. Freebairn: Is there going to be any public meeting in the district of Albert?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Are we informed on this Bill? We have had a second reading explanation but find that half of what was said then is not in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There are more amendments than there is Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I believe that we have had to carry the Bill through the night so that it could be withdrawn before going into the Committee stage, and so that it could be reprinted before being reintroduced and passed through both Houses before the end of the session. What sort of legislation is this? The Opposition is accused that the delay is its work, but we are not ashamed of that. Members on this side have not filibustered, because most of our objections are valid.

Mrs. Steele: Most of them have been endorsed by the people.

Mr. NANKIVELL: They have also been endorsed by the Government, which now realizes that this legislation is not what it wanted and that it is not properly drafted.

This legislation should be withdrawn but we cannot do it, as it is the Government's legislation. The Opposition should point out deficiencies and ask that they be remedied, yet we are told that we are holding up the processes of the House. It has taken many words to make the Government recognize that some of these things are important to this legislation. Half of the present Bill comprises amendments, and it is too complex and complicated to consider these amendments separately. Every time that we say that a certain district will be affected by this legislation, a Government member rises and says that it does not apply to that district. Yet we had an interesting statement in the policy speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition (as he then was), now the Premier. I heard him make it at Westbourne Park. I enjoyed the performance and have never seen him perform so well. It was a magnificent stage production, and the chairman of the meeting (the member for Semaphore) will agree with that statement. I will not repeat what he said to me by way of warning, but he said:

I see certain members of the Government Party in the House. I hope it is not their intention to interrupt the meeting.

We did not go there with that intention; we went there to hear at first hand the policy of the then Opposition, now the Government. I can still see that magnificent performance by the Premier. I hardly recognized him. Dressed up and made up, he really looked the part. He said, "Railway rates must be increased. I say very deliberately"—and he repeated "deliberately"—"that under our proposal of a co-ordinated service we can look forward to the Railways Department earning at least another £1,000,000 a year, and during the third year these earnings will be increased." I heard that with my own ears. There is a deliberate statement of policy announcing that railway revenues will be increased by £1,000,000. Members opposite say that this measure will not affect this haulier or that haulier, this district or that district; that it will not put anybody off the road while it will earn £1,000,000 or more in the first year and also £200,000 in fees, it is estimated.

The Minister of Transport took offence that the Government was being accused of raising £1,200,000 revenue from this source. He said: "This is not so. We are raising only £200,000 in extra taxes, 4s. a head tax." He says that the balance is not tax—it is only increased revenue from the railways. What stupidity! It is a tax coming from the road transport and business that now goes by road; and road

transport, in addition to being asked to subsidize the cost of roads, is asked to subsidize railway deficits—an open system. It is wide open to all possible criticism and abuse under a bureaucracy. Permits, fees, restrictions: all these things have brought out one factor—it is increasing the revenue of a department that is not operating efficiently at present. I know this because I am interested in the railways.

Mr. McKee: They will operate efficiently after this Bill is passed.

Mr. NANKIVELL: They will not operate more efficiently.

Mr. McKee: You wait and see!

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Railways Department has never been more efficient than in the last 12 months when in direct competition with the roads.

Mr. McKee: It was never efficient, but the arrangement is being altered now.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It shows that there is plenty of room for improvement within the present scheme. The railways have improved. They run efficiently and the department is far more co-operative and more reasonable to deal with, and its prices are more competitive, only because they have been up against competition, which is now to be removed. Where do we go from here? I can now get bales of wool carted by rail for 9s. or 10s. a bale. What did it cost me by rail before road transport came in?—21s. a bale. That is the result of competition, and the Railways Department was forced to compete. I can get a contractor to come to my shed and pick up the wool and the same day I get a receipt for the wool. I know it is there and all he charges is 12s. a bale. When it goes by rail we have to put it on our own truck and take it to the siding. We have to order a van and manhandle every bale into position in that van, and then it moves off.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And then there is demurrage.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, if we do not fill it in time. We are never sure when that wool will reach its destination. In some cases it has been almost a week before acknowledgment has been received that the wool has arrived at the store. The people in the country are interested in these things, and not merely in the costs involved. It is not only the efficiency of handling that counts but also the smooth movement of goods once they are on the railway. The Railways Department cannot handle any more movements on the Melbourne line than it is handling at present.

Business with the other States has now reached tremendous proportions. The profitable avenues of rail transport should be expanded, but the Bill will not help much in that regard. It requires electrical signalling devices (an expensive item) and further passing sidings along the line. Otherwise, a complete siding has to be set up; staff houses have to be supplied, etc. There is a long movement from Coonalpyn to Tintinara and from Tintinara to Keith (taking in each case about three-quarters of an hour either way). Because of the necessity to return the staff before the next train from Tintinara can move out, there is a 1½-hour delay between each movement on the section.

We cannot handle a high load, because the tunnel clearance is not sufficient. I asked whether the tunnels could be raised, but that was refused. Drop-centre trucks should be used, and I am still waiting to hear whether they can be used. We all know that semi-trailers can be carried on trains, and by using primemovers either end a movement of 200 miles could probably be undertaken more cheaply and efficiently on the railway, if the department was organized accordingly, but it is not, and it cannot cope with the situation. It is all very well to say that an extra £1,500,000 in revenue will be obtained, but, as it appears that there is very little hope of carrying more freight than at present, it would appear that the only way of obtaining this revenue would be to increase freight rates.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is the ultimate object of the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. I am not interested in the filibustering tactics, merely for the sake of delaying the Bill. People in my district are concerned.

Mr. Freebairn: Are they having any protest meetings?

Mr. NANKIVELL: There are protest meetings taking place throughout the district but the Bill will be through before the protest meetings take place. The protest has to be here and I am voicing it here. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): If the Government thought that it would intimidate Opposition members by sitting all night I think it now realizes that this was not a good move, because I believe Opposition members have done themselves credit both by the way they have addressed themselves to the Bill and by the material they have brought forward.



I believe members on this side have demonstrated that they really know their subject and have enlightened everybody on all the details involved in the transport industry, both road and rail. The real facts are that the Government is aware that the countryside is aflame on this matter. It sought to avoid publicity which would have inevitably resulted from a daytime debate on the Bill. Therefore, it commenced the discussion at midnight in order to avoid a full press report. This reminds me of Charles Wolfe's poem, *The Burial of Sir John Moore at Corunna*:

We buried him darkly at dead of night,  
The sods with our bayonets turning,  
By the struggling moonbeam's misty light  
And the lanthorn dimly burning.

Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note,  
As his corse to the rampart we hurried;  
Not a soldier discharged his farewell shot  
O'er the grave where our hero we buried.

I do not know that we are burying a hero! I should like to be burying him, but he is certainly not a hero and does not deserve much lamentation if he is buried. I believe this is the worst Bill that has come into Parliament since I have been a member. It is the worst Bill from the point of view of the way in which it was presented to the House, which almost savoured of contempt. The Bill introduced was a skeleton with many vital parts of the skeleton missing.

Mr. Shannon: They left the teeth in.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, there were teeth in it and plenty of them, but many of the vital and identifiable parts of the skeleton were missing. On this flimsy skeleton the Premier proceeded to hang a drape of explanation, and his explanations were many and varied. The press accepted the Premier's second reading explanation to the House as being, in fact, the real interpretation of the Bill. Sir, it was nothing of the kind. All the important features have been inserted since, most of them by amendment, and they were not in the Bill originally brought before the House. It was presented to the House and to the public and the explanation went forth into the countryside as if all these things were assured, but they were not in the Bill at all.

I am not so much concerned about what the Premier said about the Bill, but about what is said in the Bill. Unless it is said in the Bill it does not cut any ice. It is not a question of what we think a Bill means or what somebody says it means; rather it is a question of how the Bill will stand up in law. As I said, from the point of view of its presentation this was the worst Bill I have ever seen come into the House.

It would be easily the worst because never in the history of the previous Government did we attempt to bring in a Bill which left so much out. The history of road transport in this State is interesting, as is the history of the restrictions on road transport. When this legislation was first enacted in 1930, as honourable members will remember, we were in the depths of a depression. Our State finances had run down. We were unable to pay the salaries of our public servants without outside assistance. Everything was run down. The prices of our commodities were hopeless and we were in serious straits from every point of view.

It was not surprising that under the stress of circumstances, various means should have been devised to meet the situation. One of the remedies that were devised was the Road and Railway Transport Act and it was then thought, for reasons that I may explain presently, that the right way to rehabilitate railway finances that had gone so seriously bad was to compel people to use the railways. At that stage, there was little road transport of an effective nature. Motor trucks first operated in significant numbers about 1926 or 1927, but they did not develop rapidly for several years.

In 1930, in the light of the circumstances then extant and faced with the possibility of the development of road transport, the Government in its wisdom brought in this measure. After that, road transport developed rapidly and it was not long before the isolated and disconnected services became welded in associations. The fierce competition among sporadic operators was recognized as futile and these operators began to get together. In so doing, they developed a cohesive organization that was able to provide a substantial and satisfactory service.

One of the first of these associations to develop was the Yorke Peninsula Carriers Association, which was able to render a service that developed in the years during and after the Second World War as a most efficient organization, and many other organizations have grown up as a result of the experience gained by that association. Every amendment to the Road and Railway Transport Act since its enactment in 1930 was directed towards an amelioration of the original Act in some shape or form. During 1962 and 1963 we did almost wind up the operations of the Transport Control Board as they applied to the transport and carriage of goods for hire over the roads of South Australia.

Now, to the dismay of all far-sighted people, people who really understand the importance of the transport industry in this State (the industrial people, the chambers of commerce, the people in the country towns, the people in rural industries, who really understand what it means and what messing about with it entails) have with one voice joined in alarm and despondency in opposition to this Bill. The reason for this Bill is allegedly that, as the railway system is a public asset that is losing money every year, we should protect it in order to protect the State's finance. I believe it was the honourable member for Stirling who drew attention to the fallacy of this kind of contention. After all, the Premier in his second reading explanation said that about £60,000,000 was involved in the railways. I do not know if this is correct, and I have not checked it. Just how much has been spent out of the Highways Fund, apart from ancillary expenditure on roads?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We spend nearly £15,000,000 a year through the Highways Fund.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The total would be more than that, and it would need only four years at that rate to equal the capital investment on the railway system. What nonsense it is to rob the roads to pay the railway system, but that is what this Bill proposes. The roads we have built have been paid for by the people who use them, and by nobody else. Surely, if that premise is correct, is it fair to say now or any other time that we must restrict the movement of goods over our roads, which the motoring and carrying public has paid for and is continuing to pay for in both construction and maintenance, so that we can dredge off revenue from road transport to back the railways account? This is not equity; it is not even good finance, and it is unnecessary, because this Bill is not the remedy for the problem. It is not even a remedy, and certainly it is not the remedy because it is obvious that if the Railways Commissioner had exercised over the last 10 years some of the acumen he began to display in the last two years—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Since the monopoly went.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Exactly. If he had done that, his finances would have been in better shape. Since the monopoly has been reduced, his efficiency and energy in getting business have increased. That gives the lie direct to the interjection of the member for Port Pirie that the Railways Department

will get really efficient after this Bill is passed. Just the opposite will occur, because anything which is protected and from which the hard competitive aspect is removed tends to get flabby, lazy and inefficient. For far too long the Railways Commissioner has been complaining in his annual report to Parliament that we have not afforded him sufficient protection. As I have said previously in this House and outside, I have the highest regard for the Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fargher) as an administrator. He is probably without parallel in Australia in the day-to-day running of his trains, in the administration of the department, and in the handling of his finances. But, Sir, I have always said, and I say again, that the Commissioner is not and has not been as assiduous as he well might have been in pursuing the business side of his enterprise, and the result of his operations has therefore not been as good as it ought to have been.

I do not say this merely in a general way; I shall be specific. Several years ago I noted (and I could not help noting it) that on Eyre Peninsula practically the whole of the fuel distributed from Port Lincoln to points as far north even as Ceduna and beyond was going up along the centre road through Cummins, Yeelanna, Lock and on up the line to Kyancutta, Minnipa, Poochera, Wurrulla and so on, and for 120 miles those road vehicles were driving within sight of the Commissioner's railway line. In fact, for most of the way they were within a stone's throw of the line. I approached the fuel companies and asked them why they did that. They were going up those long hauls with heavy trucks and semi-trailers during winter months on unmade roads, cutting them to pieces and getting bogged until the local people got sick of having to pull them out. Those companies were battling on to cart their fuel up the line. Without exception their reply to my question was, "For the simple reason that the Commissioner will not give us a service." When I asked them what sort of service they wanted, they said, "He won't go into our depots with his trains; he won't pick up our empty drums and bring them back expeditiously; we cannot get a site in his siding for our local depot at a reasonable rental", and so on. They pointed out that they did not want to take all their fuel up there by road, but that they had to give service to their customers, and these were the reasons why they were doing that.

At the township of Cummins the Stock Salesmen's Association was quite happy to

move its saleyards from its position in the centre of the town and quite close to the area school (the Local Board of Health had objected to its being there) to a point outside the town. The association approached the Commissioner on one of his visits over there to ask him whether he would service the new site with a rail link. The Commissioner said he would not do that, despite the fact that it was a responsible deputation of people from the Stock Salesmen's Association, the district council, and the Local Board of Health. On being informed that if he did not do it there would not be any stock business by rail from that centre, he said, "Well, I could not care less." My friend, the member for Eyre, knows that what I say is true, because he was aware of the circumstances at that time.

When weighbridges began to replace the old type bag scales, groups of farmers formed themselves into co-operatives and established weighbridges at their local sidings. Of course, they had to be established at some point, and the natural point was the railway yard. I was at that time the Chairman of the Cockaleeche Weighbridge Association, and I naturally came to the then Minister of Railways (Sir Malcolm McIntosh) and said that I wanted to make arrangements for a site in the yard for a weighbridge. I was informed that we could have a site there for a rental of £12 a year. Mr. Speaker, this was back in 1947, when £12 was the same as £25 is now. We would have had to install the weighbridge at our own cost, yet we were putting it there simply to deliver wheat and barley to the Commissioner's siding so that he could cart it away. It was put there for no other reason than to bring business to the Commissioner. I said that surely the Commissioner could do a little better than that, because only a year or two before he had increased the rental for these sites from £10 to £12 a year, and there was no guarantee that it would not go up to £20 in the following year. We would not commit ourselves to such a proposition, and this information was conveyed to the Commissioner. He then asked what the association intended to do, and I told him that that was our business but I thought we would carry the grain by road, as we could get a 20-year lease from the council at £1 a year. I asked Sir Malcolm to convey that message to the Commissioner with my compliments. He did, and later informed me that the Commissioner would not reduce the rental for the lease of the sites despite the fact that he knew he would not get any more.

He was prepared to hang on to what he had and let additional business go overboard.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: How much was the business worth?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Within a year or two, at least six weighbridges were installed. This would have meant £72 a year, but all the produce was put on the road because people would not pay those charges. This was done throughout Eyre Peninsula and probably in many other places in the State. It showed a lack of imagination by the Commissioner, who had the opportunity to get business, and the goodwill that generates more business. Unfortunately, it was the attitude of the departmental mind to a business proposition, and these things do not seem to marry. Yesterday, we considered a Bill to amend the Railways Commissioner's Act. I did not oppose it, because I had these things in mind. I admire the Commissioner as a man, a gentleman and an administrator of the department, but I could not oppose a change in the Act. Although Mr. Fargher is retiring, it would be a good thing if closer control over policy could be exercised. No-one is saying that the railway system has had its day. We said that once, but now we are saying that it has its place which, as the member for Frome said, is for long hauls with heavy loads. The Railways Department can make a good living out of this haulage as there is plenty of it to be carted. Railway systems in the United States, whether they like it or not, have to live or die by their efforts in getting business, and, although many are going out of passenger business as fast as they can, they still operate profitably, in the main, in the freight business.

The Minister has complained that this Bill has been subjected to much uninformed criticism; that it is not as bad as it is represented to be; that it has many safeguards in it; and so on. He complained that some people were silly enough to suggest that empty running would be taxable, but that was what the Bill provides. The journey is there and back, and it is futile for the Minister to complain of uninformed criticism when there is nothing in the Bill to guide people. I know the Minister has been busy drafting amendments, but that only proves my point: the Bill as it came to us was a mere skeleton on which the Premier attempted to drape some clothing to make it look like a complete object. When the public understand that it is the Bill that counts and not what is promised about it, criticism can

well be understood. No rates or exemptions were set out in the Bill. An attempt has been made to estimate them.

Mr. Quirke: They are very sketchy.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and the present Bill is a pathetic sort of attempt. In his alleged explanation of the Bill (really a statement on matters not in the Bill) the Premier said:

This State is now the only State which does not exercise control over transport.

If that is true, I am proud of it. This proves that we do not have to control road transport; in fact, it proves admirably that we are better off without controlling it. Therefore, going back on our previous legislation in this manner can only be described as a retrograde step in our history. This point emerges, too, that for the first time in South Australia's history it is intended under this Bill to take in the ancillary carrier or the owner carrying his own goods. We have never before done that in this State; it is an entirely new angle. The Premier made these interesting remarks:

The Government knows that the previous system of road transport was not popular in South Australia. The unpopularity did not arise from any question of the integrity of the members of the Transport Control Board at any time, but from the application of the Act whereby licences for operation on controlled routes were issued on a restricted basis, and only the licensed carrier could operate on the controlled route for which he was licensed. This, together with directions that goods should be carried by rail where a rail service was available, apparently—

and I want honourable members to note this—came up against the Australian desire of freedom of choice—theoretically a good thing, but not necessarily so in practice.

Are these the words of a great Australian democrat? I cannot link them with the Premier. I do not think that is the Premier at all, but that is what he said. A little later, he said:

After mature consideration and after considering methods of control in other States, it has been decided that what I shall call an "open" system—based on readily-available permits associated with the payment of a ton-mile fee, calculated on carrying capacity, when competing with the railways—is the one most suitable to this State.

If this is an open system, one must have a long pocket to turn the key because I do not know how costly this will be; nor do I think that anybody knows, at this point. We are told that the maximum will be 2c a ton-mile but we do not know the scale of variations for other goods. The second serious problem presented by this Bill is the weight of responsibility it

throws onto the Minister. This legislation, as drafted, imposes an obligation on the Minister to exercise discretion and authority, which is improper. I have a little knowledge of administration of a Cabinet portfolio, but if I were the Minister of Transport and were offered the administration of this Bill, I would not accept it. The integrity of the present Minister of Transport is absolutely beyond question, but if he can survive the charges that will be levelled against him in the administration of this Bill, and remain sane, he will surprise everybody. Because he has the responsibility of issuing a licence to Brown and of withdrawing one from Jones, or of applying one policy to Millicent and another one to Naracoorte—

Mr. Freebairn: Or something else to Berri!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON:—and because he is obliged to make decisions daily and in detail, I do not think this proposition should be fairly placed on any Minister's shoulders. From that point of view alone, the Bill is extremely bad and onerous in respect of the Minister in charge of it. In addition, all sorts of anomalies arise under the Bill. For example, if a person is 50 miles or less from Port Lincoln he can cart his goods without let or hindrance; if he lives at Cummins he does not have to obtain a permit from anybody to do anything. However, if he lives a mile or two north of Yeelanna he is taxable, that is, if the route is controlled. I understand, for example, that south of Adelaide a person at Mount Compass could cart into Adelaide without any problems, whereas if he were at Strathalbyn he would be liable for tax.

Taking Eyre Peninsula geography into account, under the provision, if a person carted goods along a road, any point of which was within 20 miles of a railway, and that point was more than 50 miles from the terminal destination, he would be taxable. Wheat being carted from the silo at Cowell to the Port Lincoln terminal would be taxable, because at various points along the way the road is less than 20 miles from a railway line at a point that would be more than 50 miles north of Port Lincoln. At Arno Bay the road is within 17 miles of the railway at Verran or Rudall, and at Port Neill the road is only 14 miles from Wharminda, each of these points being more than 50 miles north of Port Lincoln. The service operating on the Flinders Highway from Port Lincoln to Ceduna traverses just over 220 miles. From the time a person leaves Port Lincoln and reaches Ceduna he has not at any time been within

20 miles of the railway line, except at Mount Hope. Does this mean that, because there is a spur line from Yeelanna to Kapinnie, which is not more than seven miles from Mount Hope, the whole of the journey between Port Lincoln and Ceduna is taxable? What nonsense! The Bill is not the answer to the Railways Department's problems. The answer is to go out and to find business. I have been saying that for years; it can be done. The Railways Department has combined with road hauliers on the private pick-a-back services and bogie exchange services, which are real examples of road and railway co-ordination. At Mile End the Railways Commissioner wants to take land away from the Public Buildings Department to increase facilities for interstate operators in the Mile End yard. That is the proper way to do things. It is not necessary to compel people to co-ordinate; it is better to attract them. The Bill was apparently devised because of a desperate need for revenue. In searching around the Government has obviously adopted the good, well-tried Socialist approach to devise a negative remedy, not a positive one. It says that if people want to avoid paying road tax they should use the railway system, but that is not the answer.

The Premier has said that, in due course, having co-ordinated services, he will proceed to withdraw the concession freights which the Railways Commissioner has provided for many years in respect of certain goods. If withdrawing that concession is not increasing freights, I do not know what is. The Premier said in his second reading explanation that he would not raise freights, but he is withdrawing the concession. I cannot tell the difference. People have told me they are thinking of selling their trucks and so on. I have told them that I do not think that is the answer because presently, when the road is tied up, rail freights will go up so that trucks will be needed to help out with the costs. This is a retrograde Bill, a bad Bill, and it is dangerous to the South Australian economy. It is retrograde in concept, costly to all sections of the community and a threat to many thriving manufacturing industries. We cannot afford this luxury and I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): During the night much recrimination has taken place about the responsibility for this sitting. I remind honourable members that the Government called this Bill on at some time between midnight and 1 a.m. and, on five occasions since, Opposition members have moved that the debate be adjourned and on each occasion

that motion has been defeated by the Government. Therefore, the responsibility for this all-night sitting must rest fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Government. An all-night sitting like this does not worry me personally. I will sit as long as the Government wants to sit, and perhaps a bit longer. I have already telephoned home and woken up the family and sung "Happy Birthday" to my small daughter. The only thing I begrudge is missing my exercises, run, and cold shower. However, I point out to members opposite that this sort of thing reduces Parliament in the eyes of the community. It is undignified, ridiculous, and totally unnecessary, and it should not have occurred. Of course, the reason for it is perfectly plain.

Mr. Hudson: It is because you have wasted so much time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will deal with that in a minute. Road and railway transport control, which we have in this Bill, is politically a hot issue and it was to the Government's advantage that this Bill should go through with the least possible publicity. That was the reason why it was brought on in the middle of the night, to get it over with early. Of course, there will be publicity about the all-night sitting, and this will be adverse to the institution of Parliament, but the publicity about the sitting itself, the Government hopes, will overshadow the arguments advanced against the Bill by members on this side.

Mr. Casey: There is nothing radically wrong with sitting through. They do it in other places.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They are trying to stifle criticism of the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course they are. This is adverse to Parliament. People outside Parliament will not regard this as a good thing, and they will be right. Because of the tactics adopted by the Premier it will be obvious to the people outside that the Government is frightened of this issue; let any honourable member opposite deny it. The Premier is responsible for these tactics and he has made a mistake. He should have adjourned the debate after the Leader spoke. He could have stifled him early in the night. There would not have been any publicity about our late sitting and the Premier would have denied the Leader the publicity to which he is entitled.

The Premier has made many mistakes during his tenure of office, and this is one more. I regret that the Government has resorted to tactics of this nature to try to get through with the least possible publicity a measure that

it knows is politically unpopular. A moment ago the honourable member for Glenelg started to complain about the Opposition, and this is not the first time he and his mentor, the Attorney-General, have complained about the Opposition. On many occasions in the last few months they have complained about our doing our job. What I should like to point out to members opposite is that this is the first session since I have been in this House when there has been an Opposition that has been alive to its job. When the Australian Labor Party was in Opposition it was nearly always asleep, and hardly ever did its job. Now the members of that Party complain that we are alert to oppose when opposition is warranted, and we are doing no more and no less than our duty.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is no excuse for all the ridiculous repetition that goes on in this place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General is nettled, and I do not blame him. He has had a bad night. We can all see that. He is never repetitious—indeed! I have sat and listened to him and, in fairness to him, I should exclude him from the charge of having been asleep when in Opposition. He at least, of all members on that side, did maintain wakefulness most of the time. He is the only exception in the Party opposite to what I have said about the Australian Labor Party in Opposition.

We have seen a greater volume of contentious and badly drafted legislation brought into this House this session than we have ever seen before. Does the Government expect us not to bother to debate it? Does it think we should not debate these things? The Government is in charge of the business of this House. It is in charge of the volume of legislation that it places before members. It is responsible for the form in which that legislation is when it comes before the House. These are the things that have caused the lengthy sittings in this place during the present session.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is nonsense.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is easy enough for the Attorney-General to say that it is nonsense.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The time wasting that has gone on here is an utter disgrace to the Opposition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What utter nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: See what the public thinks about the way you are going on. See what they thought last Saturday at the referendum!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are just waiting for an opportunity to see what they think about Bills like this, the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill, and so on.

Mr. Hurst: What about the referendum?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are prepared to stand up to that, and let the Government and the Attorney-General not make any mistake about it! Now, I suggest that this Bill is almost the perfect exercise in Socialism. The railways of this State belong to the State; the State has invested £60,000,000-odd in them and because of that the Government says that the railways must be protected, whatever the result may be.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: If a person is forced off the road he can work for the railways!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. That was one of the illuminating interjections we had in the small hours this morning. Those interjections have not gone unnoticed in the House or outside in the community. The Government looks no further than the protection of its investment in the railways and I suggest that if it maintains this practice of looking no further than the end of its nose it will lead to the ossification of the economy because progress involves changes and changes may endanger the assets in the community, whether they are publicly or privately owned. To the Government any change of this kind, if it threatens its asset, has to be stopped, and that is what it is trying to do by this Bill. The investment in the railways was made before the development of road transport and now the Government considers that the railways must be protected, regardless of progress, efficiency or convenience, and this Bill is the supreme folly of the Government, for it is apparently regardless of the political danger to the members for Frome, Chaffey, Mount Gambier and Millicent, to name just four of the most vulnerable electorates.

What about the Bill itself? I have already said we have had during this session a lot of ill-considered and hasty legislation. I do not know how many members on the Government side have tried, as we on this side of the House have tried, to make sense of this Bill, to try to put together the amendments that the Bill makes and the amendments on the amendments. This is an utterly impossible task. It is impossible to understand what this Bill is meant to do. All one can say is that it seems to give a blank cheque to reorganize completely the transport industry of the State.

Let us look, for example, at the amendments to section 24 of the Act. I have done my best to note these amendments in a copy of the principal Act. Section 24—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not debate the amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only debating the Bill that contains the amendments. Section 24 is, I think, and as far as I can follow, the key section because of the amendments on the amendments. It is the section dealing with special terms and it, by virtue of the amendments on the amendments, will give the Minister unfettered power and discretion to charge what he likes.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And charge whom he likes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. This is the most iniquitous thing, and is something that should not be done. It can lead to all kinds of unfairness, putting it at its least.

Mr. Freebairn: Differential rates for Chaffey.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and for anywhere at all. How on earth it can do this and try to collect the £1,000,000 that they want to squeeze out of the country areas of this State I do not know. We have heard much in the past few years about decentralization of industry in South Australia. You, Sir, and I were both members of the special committee that was appointed to inquire into decentralization, and if anything became obvious during that long inquiry it was that in the absence of some natural advantage in the country the only way to decentralize was to subsidize the country, to make special concessions in country areas to encourage decentralization. This Bill is the precise opposite of that in its effect, for it will take away from the country, on the Government's calculations, another £1,000,000 a year. Is this decentralization? Is this what the Government wants to do in order to put its vaunted policy of decentralization into effect? It is truly absurd if it is analysed in this way.

I come back now to section 24 of the Act and the amendments. I do not believe we should allow the Minister to have the discretion which he does have, even though the maximum rates have to be fixed by regulation. There is an escape under the amendments in this Bill to that, and I do not believe there should be. I believe that any regulations pursuant to section 24 should be laid on the table of this House before they come into effect. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying during the last two or three hours to draft something to that effect, and I have been rather handicapped

because we have not had the Parliamentary Draftsman on hand to help us with amendments. This is something which is the responsibility of the learned Attorney-General, to whom the Parliamentary Draftsman is responsible. I do not know why the Parliamentary Draftsman has not been here to draft amendments for members; he is not even here now, and it is nearly nine o'clock in the morning. Sir, why, if the Government insists on our sitting all night, does it not provide us with the proper facilities to do our job?

Mr. Hudson: We are not in the Committee stages.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What on earth is the use of having the Draftsman here only when we get into the Committee stages? Hasn't the member for Glenelg been here long enough to know that a member must have his amendments ready before the Committee stages are reached, or is he just so tired that he does not know what he is talking about? It is absurd for him to make that suggestion. Why is the Draftsman not here to do his job, the job that we require of him?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He has been available to you at the proper time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The proper time is when the House is sitting.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Now that the atmosphere has calmed somewhat, the honourable member for Mitcham may continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I repeat that when the House is sitting is the proper time for the Draftsman to be here. He should be here, and I complain at his absence.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Attorney-General is here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the Attorney-General would be very willing to draft my amendments, and in any event I think I would prefer to draft them myself, as I have done. The point I mention is the crux of this Bill. I do not believe we should allow any Minister the discretion that is contained in it. I may say that even if we took this discretion away I would still be opposed to the Bill as it stands. I think the whole principle of the thing is rotten, and other members on this side of the House have already debated that. I know that even members opposite in their heart of hearts know that it is rotten, and that this is an issue that will do them immense harm. It has already done them immense harm in the electorate; we know that from their actions, from what they have said, and from the obvious resentment

they have shown to our debating this at all. They hoped it would not be debated, but it has been, and I can assure them, as other members on this side have assured them, that these things will not go unnoticed in the community, for their intentions and their actions will be noted to their detriment. I oppose the second reading of this Bill, which I hope is not carried.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (Eyre): I oppose this Bill, and confess that I do not know much about it, although I am sure that no other member can explain it any better than I can. I do not know which is the Bill and which are the amendments. Much has been said since the member for Rocky River drew our attention to the time at about three o'clock this morning. When the road maintenance tax was discussed, several members of the Government who were in Opposition at that time went to Eyre Peninsula and shed crocodile tears. They said they were sorry for the farmer who had to pay road maintenance tax and that they would remove it if they became the Government. However, we have heard nothing since.

Eyre Peninsula is isolated from the mainland. The railway system from Ceduna to Port Lincoln and Kimba to Port Lincoln is used as much as possible by local people. When we want to bring stock to the mainland, under this Bill we will be forced to off-load at Port Pirie. Those who have had experience with sheep know that the loading and unloading is the worst part of the trip. Under this Bill, the Minister will have power to issue permits, and that makes him a dictator in his own right; he can issue permits to whomsoever he wishes. The railway system on Eyre Peninsula is running at a loss because of its poor state. As the train passes, the line jumps up and waves it farewell. It is no wonder that people use road transport. The department's officials have asked the settlers on Eyre Peninsula to take part of their superphosphate during the summer months so that a heavy freight traffic will not be imposed on the railway system during seeding time. A young man farming on his own may receive a phone call from the department's officers in the middle of harvest to inform him that his superphosphate is at the siding, and if he does not take it away he will be charged demurrage. That is the type of courtesy we receive from the Railways Department! It is this lack of courtesy and co-operation that causes people not to use the railway system. I am referring not to the men working at railway stations

but to those higher up. If these people were more courteous and co-operative, things would be better.

No-one can make sense of this Bill at present: it is not what was intended to be in the Bill but what is in it that the law considers, as the Attorney-General knows. The member for Flinders referred to weighbridges. That incident indicates that co-operation was lacking by officials of the Railways Department although it meant business for the department.

Mr. Lawn: What a rotten Administration you must have had over the years!

Mr. BOCKELBERG: The member for Flinders referred to the railway yard at Cummins, where the Commissioner would not put in a short spur line to keep the business, so the carriers took it away. We have not had time to organize meetings on Eyre Peninsula, but I do not support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It is about time that a city member had something to say about this. The member for Mitcham has just covered this matter adequately, but most members who have spoken have been country members.

Mr. Freebairn: I think the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) will speak presently.

Mr. COUMBE: We have been eagerly awaiting that all night. If I knew that this would happen, I would sit down at once. We on this side are members of a free Party and can speak whenever we wish to. The big contrast this year is in the number of speeches made by members of the Liberal Party and those made by members of the Labor Party now they are in Government. What a contrast that is! This Bill affects everyone in the State. Already, this rather stupid and irresponsible attitude by the Government towards this Bill has been canvassed by speakers on this side of the House. The effects of the Bill on the country have been well dealt with by speaker after speaker, and its inadequacies have been pointed out. I turn now to the specific provisions of the Bill and the principle behind it. An interesting comment was made by the Treasurer when introducing the Budget earlier this year. This is a priceless gem:

Rather than adopting the method of prohibiting competitive operations, it is proposed in general to permit them to continue as far as practicable, but to require the competitive services to make an appropriate payment for the privilege.



That word "privilege" really caught my eye. Whoever thought of that phrase had a vivid imagination—the privilege of carrying on one's business, the privilege of earning one's own livelihood? What does this "privilege" mean—that one can carry on earning one's livelihood without let or hindrance, that one can take a vehicle on the Queen's Highway, on the roads of the State? The word "privilege" used in this connection is a complete travesty of the true meaning of the word and of justice. Let me consider this in regard to the person who lives and operates a business in the city. I refer in particular to the exemptions in the Bill as it is proposed to be amended. There are five main sets of exemptions, and I refer now to exemption (e), which reads as follows:

Journeys within the 25-mile radius of the G.P.O. will be exempt except in respect of any goods which may as a result of a board order be restricted to rail transport only.

Most of the remarks that have been made have been to the effect that, within a 25-mile radius of the G.P.O., everything will be exempt, but that is far from the case. This really means that a person can carry out journeys with certain goods within the 25-mile radius, but the board at its own discretion and whim can completely control any particular goods or commodities it wishes to control in an area within the 25-mile radius of the G.P.O. That means that in relation to any goods that have to be delivered, say, from Adelaide to Port Adelaide, Prospect, Unley, Burnside or anywhere where a rail service exists (or where a rail service is adjacent), the board may well decide that those goods will have to go by rail. That is a complete and utter reversal of what was expected. Look how silly it will be in practice!

If the board decides that certain goods manufactured by a factory in Adelaide, which have to go, say, to Brighton, should go by rail, the factory (which may be situated in Sturt Street) would have to obtain a motor lorry to load the goods at the factory door, take them down to the Mile End or Adelaide station, and send them by rail to Brighton, where they would be loaded on to another lorry and delivered, say, to the seafront. Unfortunately, discrimination creeps into the matter. One particular manufacturer may easily be discriminated against by the board. This applies not only to goods coming out of Adelaide into a suburb but also to goods coming from a suburb to Adelaide. Goods may have to be loaded at Belair (which I understand is in the metropolitan area) for delivery to North Adelaide. This illustrates the stupidity of the

scheme. It is estimated that these provisions will net the Government £1,000,000 additional revenue in one year, half of which will be sheer profit. That is extraordinary. The purpose of the Bill is to bring in revenue to the State in general and to the Railways Department in particular. How it can be estimated that half the additional revenue will be sheer profit is beyond me. I assume that the charges will be high.

I now refer to the last clause of the Bill, which directs where the increased revenue shall be applied. Of course, honourable members know it will go to a railway improvement fund. In his second reading explanation the Premier said that the revenue derived from the issue of permits would, after the deduction of administrative costs, be paid into a railway improvement fund to be used either for meeting railway deficits or for capital investments. I emphasize his phrasing when he said, "either for meeting railway deficits or for capital investments"; that means either for running costs or for capital improvements. These fees will be mulcted or deducted from road users, and if this money were to go to road improvements there might be some merit in it because this has been the basis of most road taxes in the past. However, in this case the road users will contribute directly to something which they do not use themselves and, furthermore, they will be contributing directly to their competitors. How would it be in commercial life if one undertaking were taxed directly to assist its competitor? That would be a sorry state of affairs and yet that is what is happening under the Bill. Of course, this is a sectional tax. The road users are being taxed to support their competitor, the railway system. Also, only one section of the community will be paying this tax.

Mr. Lawn: What about the Indenture Acts for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and the oil companies?

Mr. COURCE: That is not at all relevant in this connection.

Mr. Lawn: You would give preference to private enterprise but not to State-owned railways?

Mr. COURCE: If the honourable member will let me continue he may be able to follow me.

Mr. Lawn: I'd always be miles ahead of you, mate.

Mr. COURCE: That would be the day. Road users will be asked to provide moneys to meet deficits in the railway system, which is the direct competitor, whereas now revenue

for the railways comes from the general taxpayers of the State. In other words, the burden of raising money to keep the railway system running, apart from money from passengers and other users of the railway system, must be born by the general taxpayers. This has been the board principle. Now, however, the Government will derive money from one section of the community only, and this money will go directly to the railway system. Therefore, it appears that rail deficits are to be paid off directly by road users and not by the general taxpayers. The principle in the Bill is bad, its presentation is bad, and, as has been admitted by most members, its drafting leaves much to be desired. In conclusion, I utterly oppose the Bill and hope it is tossed out.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): There have been many famous nights in history but I am sure this one will go down in South Australia as being the one on which the Government felt it had put the Opposition at a definite disadvantage, but on which, instead of that, members on this side have turned that reverse into a victory. Not only this, but the net result of this night's work has been that the Government has again discredited itself in the eyes of the public of South Australia.

I am the last speaker on this side and the only member of the city triumvirate sitting on this bench who has not spoken. I consider that, as a city member, I should also say how I regard the Bill. Country people realize that they depend on city people, and city people feel the same way about people in the country. Our destinies are woven together by the fact that we have a road transport system that has contributed greatly to the development of the State. The object of this legislation is to throw a thriving industry to the wolves. To my way of thinking, it is more than unfortunate legislation: it is disgraceful legislation. I cannot stress too strongly how much I oppose this Bill.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I feel that, as the House has been delayed this long, I should speak for a few minutes. After hearing the member for Burnside voice her brief protest against the Bill, I thought I should rise to congratulate the Government on introducing it, because it will improve transport services throughout the State, both road and rail. Of course, I do not blame the Opposition for opposing this legislation so vigorously, because the Bill is so good that members opposite know that it will benefit the State, and that is their main objection to it.

When this legislation and other measures that the Government is introducing, and intends to introduce, take effect, members will start disappearing from the benches opposite. It is obvious from their actions in this Chamber that they are endeavouring to balk sensible legislation in an attempt to retard the progress and development of the State. In fact, they are like dying men clutching at straws to save their political skins at the expense of the economy and development of South Australia. That is no idle boast, and I shall say it inside or outside this House.

Honourable members opposite have set out with one purpose in mind: to make some political gain by exaggerating this issue and by making misleading statements in the House and outside. There has not been one atom of truth in what they have said regarding the Bill. This is obvious from the way they have misled the chamber of commerce by this campaign of misrepresentation into lending support to the campaign of opposition. This is borne out by the fact that in most cases where protests have been lodged by various people action was taken by the Opposition, and opposition to the Bill was voiced before the introduction of the Bill was even finalized. It commenced at the mere mention of this Bill. Most of the opposition that has come from people outside has stemmed from the fear that this Bill will introduce the old type of unsatisfactory transport control administered by the previous Government. This measure is different, although the Opposition is trying to make people believe that it is similar to other measures administered by the Playford Government.

Under this Bill the Board will be given power through the Minister and it will not be able to refuse licences as the previous Government did. I have often heard the member for Gouger protest against refusals by the previous transport control authority to give permits to move sheep, which he said had a disease and which he said could not otherwise be got out of the district. Issuing officers will be stationed throughout the State for the convenience of people wishing to apply for licences. I support the Bill because its purpose is to stimulate the railway system and to improve the activities of transport generally throughout the State.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Coreoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Rodda, and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Noes—Messrs. Shannon and Teusner.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Bill be amended *pro forma*.

The carrying of this motion will mean that there will be no further proceedings on the Bill in the present Committee. The Bill will be reprinted to incorporate the Government's amendments, and the reprinted Bill will be recommitted on a future date and considered in Committee as if it had been committed for the first time, and will be subject to the usual scrutiny and admission of further amendments. It is thought that this procedure will be most helpful to all members and to the Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I do not oppose the Premier's motion. In fact, the Bill is in such a horrible mess that it would be impossible for the Committee to consider it in any other way than in the way suggested. I tried earlier in the evening to get some intelligent explanation of some of the amendments to the amendments of the original Bill, and I found that it was completely impossible to get anything out of it at present. Therefore, I support what the Premier has said. However, in doing so I want it to be clearly understood that the Opposition does not in principle in any way at all accept some of the provisions in the amendments as being desirable. We know they are undesirable amendments, but we agree to the Premier's suggestion as it is the only

feasible way to have this Bill considered intelligently in Committee. With that reservation, I accept the Premier's proposal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support this motion, but I have one question to ask of you, Mr. Chairman. I refer to my experience earlier in the debate when I tried to put on file amendments that I drew while the debate was proceeding, but found from the Clerk at the table that it was literally impossible to do so. I take it that the Bill, as it will be reprinted, will simply contain the amendments to the amendments already on file. If this is so, I ask you, Sir, how can I get my amendments on file, and how soon I can put them on file?

The CHAIRMAN: As soon as the Bill is reprinted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do I have to wait for the Bill to be reprinted before mine can be printed?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the usual procedure be followed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But this is not the usual procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been ruled that one should not refer to the Parliamentary Draftsman here, but I inform the honourable member that the usual procedure is to consult the Parliamentary Draftsman to have the amendments prepared.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have prepared the amendments myself, but it is a matter of getting them on file.

The CHAIRMAN: You should consult the Parliamentary Draftsman, or draft your own amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When can I put them on file?

The CHAIRMAN: You can circulate them once the Bill is available.

Motion carried.

Bill reported with amendments *pro forma*.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.19 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 24, at 2 p.m.