

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 28, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

SHIPPING.

Mr. HALL: In this morning's *Advertiser* an article headed "Shipping Line Plan Report" states:

Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited is negotiating with Japanese interests to establish a jointly owned overseas shipping line, says the *Age*. The Japanese interests involved are thought to be the huge Mitsui industrial complex which has interests in Western Australian iron ore prospects, in the Moura coalfield in Queensland and in a proposed fertilizer plant in New South Wales.

Although the emphasis is on the establishment of a shipping line, can the Premier say whether he is aware of this article, and whether further industrial activity may result in South Australia because of the construction of plant and shipping if the negotiations are successful?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Any views I express may have been influenced by what I was told when overseas. I have already told the House that salt deposits in the north of this State may be developed by Japanese interests, as in Japan ships of 150,000 tons are at present being constructed. Salt from Mexico is delivered to Japan because of the large tonnages available, as speed of delivery is not essential, but bigger ships are available to carry the large quantities of salt. To the best of my knowledge when the tanker for Ampol Limited was constructed at Whyalla, a fairly large subsidy was granted by the Commonwealth Government, with the knowledge of what was happening in the Japanese ship-building industry. People overseas were surprised to know that a 43,000-ton ship could be built in this State, but that was a small tonnage compared with the size of ship that could be constructed by Japanese interests. I shall try to ascertain whether the B.H.P. Company Limited intends to build more ships.

GLOSSOP HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Education say whether a tender for the construction of a boys craft centre at the Glossop High School has been let and when that work is expected to be commenced?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Buildings Department reports that a contract for the erection of a boys craft centre at

Glossop High School was let to Slade Construction Company Limited some time ago and that it is expected that the builder will be on the site to start work next Monday (August 1).

WANILLA-EDILLILIE WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Negotiations concerning the extension of a water supply to Wanilla and Edillilie were commenced by me with the Engineering and Water Supply Department some time ago, and subsequently with the Minister who, during my absence overseas, was good enough to receive the President of the Returned Servicemen's League to discuss the matter, and who has subsequently kindly handed me copies of the correspondence relating to that interview. After giving some detail of the proposed scheme, the letter states:

The scheme is estimated at \$260,000 and, following the completion of the estimated revenue return now being prepared, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief will forward his report and recommendation. However, in view of the estimated cost, the scheme will require investigation by the Public Works Standing Committee.

Can the Minister of Works say what stage the investigation has reached and whether the matter has been referred to the Public Works Committee? If it has not, can he say when it may be referred to the committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, following a visit by the President of the South Australian Branch of the R.S.L. we considered it reasonable to notify the honourable member (who represents the district in which the work is to be undertaken) of the facts that we had supplied to Brigadier Eastick. Although I am not clear as to exactly what stage negotiations have reached, my most recent talks with the department have revealed that the department intends to refer the scheme to the Public Works Committee as soon as possible. I shall have an investigation made, and let the honourable member have any further information that is available on the matter.

CHEMISTS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Last December the Government passed legislation giving Friendly Society chemists the right to expand into new areas, the first new chemist shop being officially opened at Modbury on April 6 last. Since that date, however, I have received complaints from constituents who are not members of the society concerning the inconvenience they have been caused through the refusal by this chemist shop to dispense Government prescriptions to them. That is

the correct situation, as in 1964 the Commonwealth Government made it illegal for the society to dispense Government prescriptions to people other than its own members from any more than the 26 pharmacies then controlled in South Australia. As this is a Commonwealth Government matter, I asked Senator Cavanagh to make representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Health, requesting that the five newly approved Friendly Society dispensaries be approved under the National Health Act for the purpose of supplying pharmaceutical commodities to the general public as well as to their own members. Having made those representations, Senator Cavanagh received a reply from the Commonwealth Minister for Health (Dr. Forbes) on July 6 last, portion of which states:

At the outset I would like to explain that the National Health Act limits the number of friendly society dispensaries in a State which may be approved to supply pharmaceutical benefits to the general public to the number of such dispensaries in existence in that State as at April 23, 1964. Any new dispensary in excess of that number may only be approved to supply pharmaceutical benefits to its own members. In order that you may understand the position, I feel I should outline the background to the present situation in regard to approval of friendly society dispensaries to supply pharmaceutical benefits. Prior to April 23, 1964, there existed two categories of friendly society dispensaries, those holding "full" approval which enabled them to supply pharmaceutical benefits to the general public in addition to their own members, and those that held "limited" approval under which they could only supply pharmaceutical benefits to their own members. The National Health Act at that time pegged the number of friendly society dispensaries operating with full approval to the number in existence at August 1, 1945. This number was then 117, throughout the Commonwealth.

The above situation was altered as a result of legislation introduced by the Government in April of 1964. This legislation made it a condition of approval of friendly society dispensaries that they do not offer rebates on the 5s. fee payable on the supply of a pharmaceutical benefit except to members who were members at April 23, 1964 and their dependents. At the same time legislation was introduced to extend full approvals to all those dispensaries operating at that time with limited approvals. As a result, the number of full approvals throughout the Commonwealth increased from 117 to 140. However, the total number of full-approval friendly society dispensaries in a State was then pegged at the number in existence in the State as at April 23, 1964. In the case of South Australia, there were 18 full and nine limited approvals which became 27 full approvals in April, 1964. As there are already—

The SPEAKER: Order! Although the honourable member sought leave to read from the letter, and leave was given, I think that she is only in order in giving sufficient information to make the question understood. I ask her to co-operate in that way.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In effect, the Commonwealth Minister of Health states that it will be realized that the Minister is precluded by the existing legislation from granting other than a limited approval to any other new Friendly Society dispensary in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As you objected to the document's being read, is the honourable member in order in reading from the document after your ruling?

The SPEAKER: I did not know that she was continuing to read from the document. I ask the honourable member to put her question to the Premier. She must do that.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am of the opinion that residents in the Modbury area—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not express opinions in asking a question.

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to take up this matter on a State level with the Commonwealth Minister for Health with a view to approval being granted under the National Health Act for the five newly established society dispensaries to be able to supply pharmaceutical benefits to the general public as well as to their own members?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am willing to take up the matter with the Prime Minister.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CUMBE: Did the Premier see a recent press report, which purported to emanate from a decision of the Municipal Association of South Australia, to the effect that a recommendation was made to the Government suggesting that a Department of Local Government be set up in South Australia? Can the Premier say whether such representations have been made to the Government and, if they have, whether the suggestion has been considered?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I recollect that the Minister of Local Government mentioned this matter to me. All I can say at this stage is that no opportunities would present themselves to accede to the request that was mentioned.

Later:

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that, following a proposal put forward by the Burnside council at the last meeting of the South Australian Local Government Association, that organization has seriously considered the proposal that there should be set up a Local Government Department. To this end the association appointed a deputation, comprising the President and Secretary of the association and the Mayor of Burnside, to wait on and discuss this matter with the Minister of Local Government. Similar departments in Victoria and New South Wales operate under a specific Secretary of Local Government. Attached to the department are professional officers who advise on matters relating to engineering, building, valuations, administration and accounting techniques. This service is of great benefit, particularly to councils that employ only small staffs. Such departments function not only for the benefit of local government authorities but also to the advantage of ratepayers. I believe that the Secretary of the Municipal Association of Victoria has pointed out to the South Australian organization the great advantages that accrue to councils' having access to technical assistance and guidance from the departments that operate in the two States I have mentioned. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Local Government to consider this proposal favourably, and let me have a reply in due course?

The SPEAKER: I think I must rule that that question has already been answered today.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to take up this matter for the honourable member, Mr. Speaker.

MARGARINE.

Mr. SHANNON: According to an astounding press report, the Manager of the Marriekville Margarine Company has announced that it is intended to ignore the recent decision of the Privy Council on table margarine quotas. Can the Minister of Lands, in the unavoidable absence of the Minister of Agriculture, say what steps it is within the power of his Government to take to see that margarine quotas in South Australia are observed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take this matter up with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PINES.

Mr. RODDA: A constituent of mine who lives in the Struan district inquired about purchasing from the Woods and Forests Department's nursery 200 Aleppo or *pinus halepensis* two-year-old trees and was given to understand that the price was 5c each. When he arranged to purchase 200 of these two-year-old trees, he was told by the department that the price was \$25 for 100. He forthwith cancelled that order and was able to procure identical trees for \$18 for 200. As this price of \$25 for 100 trees seems extraordinarily high, can the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Forests, say whether a mistake was made in the price or whether \$25 for 100 trees is the price being charged for trees from the forest?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer this matter to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member. It is most unfortunate that that has happened.

GLENELG SUNSHINE CLUB.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report on page 7 of this morning's *Advertiser* indicates that the member for Glenelg and some other gentlemen waited on a Commonwealth Minister with the object of having action taken on the Glenelg Sunshine Club. As the department of the Minister concerned provides a subsidy for clubs and similar activities in South Australia, can the honourable member say whether the purpose of the deputation was to have the club's subsidy discontinued? If it was not, what was the purpose of the deputation?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member desire to reply?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of the deputation was to put before the Commonwealth Minister for Social Services certain matters, which he said he would investigate. The matter of the subsidy received by the club in 1961 and in 1963 would not be in question unless the club had not followed the terms and conditions laid down in respect of that original subsidy. Section 8 of the Commonwealth Aged Persons Homes Act, 1954-57, gives the Commonwealth Government power to lay down certain terms and conditions relating to the granting of Commonwealth subsidies for this purpose. I am unable to give the member for Gumeracha further information.

NORTH UNLEY CREEK.

Mr. LANGLEY: Reference has often been made to the overflowing and flooding of the North Unley creek, and the creek has flooded again. Everyone is pleased with the recent heavy rains in the metropolitan area which have benefited all districts. As a metropolitan drainage board will consider drainage problems, will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Local Government whether meetings have been held to consider solving future drainage problems?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague.

EUDUNDA-KAPUNDA ROAD.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A "stop" sign stands at a rail crossing about a mile from Kapunda on the Eudunda-Kapunda road. As the crossing is open, with little public risk involved, several representations have been made to me that the "stop" sign should be removed, as it contributes more to public irritation in the area than to public safety. As this matter concerns the Railways Department rather than the Highways Department, will the Premier consult the Minister of Transport to see whether this "stop" sign can be removed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer is "No". I have strongly advocated that "stop" signs should be erected at all level crossings where no warning device exists.

Mr. Freebairn: You have just earned me another 100 votes, thank you.

Mr. Clark: You'll need them.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not interested in Party politics when I reply to a question in this House. I want it understood, in the interests of public safety, that more accidents occur at level crossings that are used infrequently than at those with substantial traffic movements because, generally, the public, taking things for granted, takes a chance in these circumstances. If there is one thing I respect in this world that is entirely divorced from politics it is human life. The answer is "No".

PENSIONERS.

Mr. McKEE: At present, many pensioners have to travel long distances to Adelaide from country centres to obtain spectacles and dentures. This travel inconveniences sick and elderly people who, because of this, continue to put up with unsuitable spectacles and dentures. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether relief can be given to these people?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will consult the Chief Secretary to see what can be done.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 19 about a water supply for the Carribie Basin on southern Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Mines reports that the field investigation of this fresh water basin is complete and computations from the pump tests are in progress. It is apparent that the basin comprises two sub-basins of small areas. The basin is only 14ft. above sea level, and carefully controlled development will be necessary to prevent access by sea water. Not more than 1,000,000 gallons a day should be withdrawn from the basin for prolonged periods.

Mr. FERGUSON: On July 19, I asked the Minister of Works whether investigations had been completed concerning the water supply in the Carribie Basin, and, if they had, whether the Government considered the supply was available for further water reticulation on southern Yorke Peninsula. The last part of my question was not answered. Can the Minister answer it now and, if he cannot, will he get a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that the latter part of the question has obviously been missed by the department. I will certainly take up the matter for the honourable gentleman, and let him have a reply as soon as possible.

KIDMAN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the construction of the new Kidman Park Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that the construction of the Kidman Park Primary School is proceeding according to schedule. The school is due for completion at the end of October, 1966.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On July 14, I asked a question of the Premier relating to Roseworthy Agricultural College, which *Hansard* included as an addendum to a question asked by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). As the member for Rocky River has received a reply to his question, has the Premier a reply to mine?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At the moment no plans exist for increasing the

intake of students. The additional buildings will provide facilities for existing students, and before any increased intake could be contemplated many other factors would have to be considered. The college's status is being gradually uplifted; the entrance standard has become higher, and it is expected that the college will acquire higher status soon.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say what progress is taking place in the provision by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of toilet facilities for the public at the South Para reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I know that this matter has been investigated and that certain work has been done, I am unable to say what stage the project has reached, but I shall notify the honourable member as soon as further information is to hand.

WATER RATES.

Mr. HALL: This morning's *Advertiser* reports the Premier as having given so much attention to the distribution of water in South Australia that one wonders whether this is a softening-up process and a prelude to an increase in water rates. Can the Premier say whether that is so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although I cannot be responsible for any suspicions in the Leader's mind, the Government has no intention in that regard. I deliberately gave certain information over ADS Channel 7 last night in the interests of the community, so that people would know exactly what the Government had achieved in the last 12 months, particularly in relation to Loan works.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. CURREN: Salinity in the Murray River is causing grave concern to fruitgrowers in my district and in other areas where the river is used for irrigation purposes. Although I realize that the only way to solve the problem of salinity is to increase the river's flow, has the Minister of Irrigation a statement that may clarify matters for the benefit of the general public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have said earlier, I have been in constant contact with departmental officers on this matter, as well as with the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) who has been good enough to supply me with the following report:

Irrigators along the Murray River and their representative bodies have recently expressed concern at the relatively high salinity of the Murray water, accentuated by the unauthorized breaching of the embankment of the Block E (Renmark) seepage water evaporating basin. Fortunately, this did not occur at the height of the irrigation season but, nonetheless, it has caused anxiety and inconvenience, as special winter irrigations have been in progress in certain areas. Following the dry winter and spring in the Upper Murray catchment area last year Hume reservoir reached a maximum storage of 1,869,000 acre feet on December, 15 compared with its capacity of 2,500,000 acre feet. After assessing the total water resources available for distribution between the three States the River Murray Commission decided that restrictions would be applied, involving a reduction in diversions by New South Wales and Victoria and a reduction in the monthly flow to South Australia. Despite this reduction in flow the maximum salinity (chlorides) recorded at Lock 6 was 205 parts per million which was identical with the maximum in the previous year. This lock is above all of the South Australian irrigation areas.

Prior to the recent breaching of the Block E evaporation basin embankment the maximum reached at Berri this year was 333 parts per million (p.p.m.) compared with a maximum of 422 p.p.m. in the previous year. The maximum recorded at Morgan this year has been 416 p.p.m. compared with a maximum of 544 p.p.m. in the previous year. Speaking generally, it may be stated that ever since the River Murray Commission locking and storage system was completed the salinity of the water entering South Australia has been satisfactory. However, natural drain-back from land abutting the river coupled with some uncontrollable drainage from irrigation areas and towns causes a rise in salinity as the water passes through South Australia. The lower the flow the greater the rise in salinity as there is less fresh water to dilute the saline water entering the river. When the Block E embankment was breached a wave of highly-saline water passed down Ral Ral Creek into the Murray River, and some of this water has now reached Loxton. On Thursday, July 21, the salinity was 420 p.p.m. below Renmark and 620 p.p.m. at Berri. However, the position will progressively improve at Berri as the salt water passes downstream, although a temporary rise in salinity can be expected at Loxton, Cobdogla, Waikerie and places further downstream. South Australia's entitlement under the River Murray Waters Agreement is 47,000 acre feet in July and 94,000 in August. Therefore the discharge from Lake Victoria will be increased as from August 1, and this will have the effect of reducing the salinity by the time general irrigations commence. However, it will be necessary to exercise care in the use of water as at this stage the prospects for the coming irrigation season are far from promising.

Experience during the last two years has emphasized the necessity to construct Chowilla dam to provide a greater reserve for dry years,

thereby allowing larger flows to dilute the saline water entering the river in South Australia.

MINI MOKE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yesterday, I spoke to the Premier about the definition of the vehicle known as the Mini Moke which, designed by the British Motor Corporation, is a front-wheel drive commercial vehicle of the jeep type. I received the following letter from a constituent:

Recently we bought a Mini Moke for the farm, and when we went to register it we received the attached letter back from the Registrar.

The attached letter states:

Morris Mini Moke vehicles were inspected when they first came onto the market and they have been classified as tourers. We cannot regard them as commercial vehicles and, as the reduced rates allowed to primary producers can be allowed only for commercial vehicles, we regret to inform you that you will not be able to obtain the reduced rates for your Morris Mini Moke.

I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that these vehicles were designed for a particular purpose. Many of these vehicles are now used in my district and have replaced more expensive four-wheel drive vehicles known as jeeps and land rovers, which are recognized as commercial vehicles. I point out that utilities, which can be used for purposes other than farm work, are listed as commercial vehicles. As I believe that the distinction made against the Mini Moke is unjust, will the Premier have the matter reviewed to see whether the Mini Moke cannot be regarded as a commercial vehicle under the Act for the purposes of registration and sales tax exemption?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no objection whatever to taking up the question of the Mini Moke with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. However, with regard to a sales tax exemption (and this matter is most important) I would have to correspond with the Prime Minister. I believe I should delay any representation to the Prime Minister until the Commonwealth Budget has been presented, when we will know where we are going.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

Mrs. STEELE: Much interest is being shown in the investigations currently being undertaken by the Local Government Act Revision Committee. As it has been stated that the work of this committee will probably not be completed in less than two years, will the Minister of Education ask the Minis-

ter of Local Government whether it would not be possible for the committee to issue an interim report so that the public might be informed of what is taking place at present in this field?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

MORGAN RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On June 30, I asked two questions in the House about the rail service to Morgan in my district. As it took me six months to get a reply from the Premier to the last question I asked on railways, can he say when I can expect a reply to my question about the Morgan rail service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have a reply here to a question asked by the member for Light, which I will read in case he has forgotten what his question was about. It concerns transport control and freight haulage. The report states:

The primary purpose of licensed passenger services is the carriage of passengers, and the board finds it necessary in the interests of passengers to limit the extent of freight haulage by such services. The passenger service referred to by the honourable member is allowed to cater for the undermentioned types of freight:

1. Any parcel up to 21 lb.
2. Urgent machinery parts up to 50 lb.
3. Perishable goods up to 50 lb.
4. Blood and blood serum.
5. Solutions for intravenous injections.
6. Pathological specimens for medical or veterinary research.
7. Her Majesty's mail.
8. Newspapers.
9. Ice cream.

(Unlimited weight for items 4 to 9 inclusive.)

In addition to the above listed goods, consideration is given to any request for a specific overweight package to be dispatched by the passenger service where justified by special circumstance. It may be possible to assist the Cadell electrical businessman referred to by the honourable member if details of the desired cartage are furnished to the board.

That is the only reply I have, and if it is not the correct one the honourable member may ask his question again.

HOVERCRAFT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Thursday I asked the Premier a question regarding the possibility of a hovercraft service across the gulf from Port Pirie to Whyalla. I understand that the Premier now has a reply to the question, and I ask him if he will give it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A report from the General Manager of the Harbors Board refers to a minute and correspondence from

Birdseye's Motor Service, and states that there have been no further developments since July 22. However, the Minister of Marine has informed me that an application for a licence was received on that day.

SITTINGS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I have to attend to some rather special matters this afternoon, I suggest that the House consider adjourning at, say, 4.15 or 4.20 p.m. today.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1964.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments, mainly of an administrative nature, to the principal Act. The effect of the amendment to section 13 of the principal Act contained in clause 3 is that the exemption from registration conferred by that section on tractors, bulldozers, graders and other like vehicles used for road work or for making firebreaks is removed and instead, by clause 4 (b) which adds a new paragraph to section 31 of the principal Act, it is provided that such vehicles may be registered without fee. This amendment is in accordance with the policy that as many vehicles as possible which use the roads should be registered and thus identified by number plates, whether or not any fee for registration is payable. Section 31 is also amended by clause 4 (a) which extends the privilege of free registration granted to consular officers to the personnel of foreign embassies. An office of the Netherlands Government Emigration Service is now established here, and it is possible that in the future other diplomatic offices will be established.

Section 30 of the principal Act provides that registration fees are to be calculated to the nearest shilling, but there is no such provision in section 55 relating to refunds. This section is amended by clause 5 to provide that refunds shall be calculated to the nearest mul-

tipile of 10c, any amount of 5c or less being disregarded. Section 60 of the principal Act provides that, where the buyer of a registered motor vehicle fails to apply for transfer of the registration within 14 days, the registration will be cancelled and there will be no refund. This provision has operated harshly in the past, and it is considered that voiding the registration in all cases is too severe. The amendments of this section made by paragraphs (a) and (c) of clause 6 will enable the Registrar, when he cancels the registration, to make a refund in respect of the unexpired portion of the registration less an amount of \$4. Paragraph (b) of this clause enables an application for transfer of ownership to be made by a transferee where the transferee in any previous transaction has omitted to do so.

Clause 7 inserts new section 71a in the principal Act. The new section recognizes an existing practice by empowering the Registrar to register motor vehicles in business names. Subsection (2) of the new section provides that upon such registration the provisions of the principal Act will apply to all persons carrying on the business, but it will be sufficient if any one of them complies therewith. The amendment of section 83 made by clause 8 is of a drafting order, the words inserted having previously been left out. The section as amended will provide for an appeal against the cancellation or suspension, as well as the refusal, of a driving instructor's licence. The purpose of clause 9 is to confer on inspectors appointed under the principal Act and those under the Road Traffic Act power to require the production of a driving licence for the purpose of identification. There is need for this power in view of the additional duties such inspectors may be called upon to discharge under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963.

Section 98a of the principal Act requires that all driving instructors be licensed. Many public authorities, such as the Electricity Trust and the Municipal Tramways Trust, have their own instructors and it is considered unnecessary that such instructors should be required to undergo a test by the Registrar and to be licensed by him. The amendment contained in clause 10 will exempt employees of public authorities who are approved by the Registrar from the requirements of section 98a so long as those employees are acting in the normal course of

their employment. Clause 11 makes two unconnected amendments to section 102 of the principal Act. The first amendment (paragraph (a)) provides that the fixed minimum penalties provided by the section will not apply in respect of an uninsured trailer. The minimum penalty prescribed is a fine of not less than \$40 and disqualification from driving for not less than three months, unless there are special reasons for reducing it. There has, however, been judicial criticism that the minimum penalty has operated too harshly in many instances, particularly if the offence relates to an uninsured trailer. Clause 11 (b) inserts three new subsections in section 102 relating to a resident of another State, who is temporarily driving in this State and whose third-party policy is granted by an insurer in the other State. The driver at present commits an offence against section 102 because he would be driving here without an insurance policy granted by "an approved insurer" within the meaning of section 104 of the principal Act. New subsection (4) of section 102 provides that he will not commit an offence here if the vehicle is registered in a proclaimed State and he has a policy, corresponding with our third-party insurance, which extends to his driving in this State. As the other States now have legislation comparable with ours, they may be proclaimed for this purpose. New subsections (5) and (6) are normal machinery provisions.

Clause 12 inserts new section 111a in the principal Act providing that where a person is killed by negligence in the use of an insured motor vehicle and he, leaving no surviving relatives as frequently happens, is buried at public expense, the Treasurer may recover the cost of the burial from the third-party insurance company. Clause 13 is consequential on clause 11 (b) and excludes from the definition of "uninsured motor vehicle" in section 116 (1) any vehicle which is temporarily within the State as mentioned in new subsection (4) of section 102. The effect of this is that no action may be brought against the nominal defendant if any such vehicle is involved in an accident. Clause 14 is consequential on clause 7 and provides that registration of a motor vehicle in a business name will be *prima facie* evidence that any person carrying on the business is the owner of the vehicle.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Section 11 (3) of the Police Regulation Act provides that appointments to any rank in the detective police or any rank above Senior Constable shall be subject to the approval of the Chief Secretary. Grades within the detective police have been abolished for some time, and their seniority is similar to seniority of other members of the Police Force. Accordingly the reference to the detective police is being removed from the principal Act. Provision has recently been made by amendments to the Regulations for two grades of Senior Constable, namely, Senior Constables who have qualified by examination for promotion to the rank of Sergeant, Third Grade, and those who have not. Accordingly, the new rank of Senior Constable First Grade has been provided for. The Bill provides that promotion to any rank above Senior Constable First Grade is to be subject to the Chief Secretary's approval. Both amendments are merely machinery amendments and are made by clause 3.

Mr. FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 27. Page 739.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): Last night I dealt with the general incidence of taxation and the increase in the assessment in various parts of the State. In the city of Adelaide it had increased by about 20 per cent, by 45 per cent in the country, and in suburban areas by as much as 85 per cent. Discussing the effect of these assessments and the application of the rate, I pointed out that the total taxation to be collected this year was 37 per cent above last year's total. I turn to exemptions for small holdings. The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) said how a great stress was being placed on small primary-producing industries, particularly in the Murray irrigation areas and in the metropolitan area where owners of small properties, because of the reduced price of their products and other problems, had experienced difficulty (and in some cases hardship) while living on narrow margins, if any margin at all.

The previous Government, having considered the problems of these people, increased the exemption applying to small properties so that some properties of small unimproved value were excluded from land tax. From a higher exemption figure, which was then fixed to exclude some of these properties, a progressive rate was struck, but at about an unimproved value of \$12,000 the concession was overtaken and the normal rate applied. With the substantial increase in assessment, many properties exempted by the previous Government will come within the scope of the tax, so that economic problems, which have existed and still do, will be re-imposed on people holding small primary-producing properties. This is an important aspect, and the Opposition will make certain proposals about it. It seems that, *pro rata* with the increase in assessment, the exemption figure should be increased. No objection can be taken to this as a matter of either policy or principle, and I hope that proper consideration will be given to this suggestion. Although land tax is necessary, it is purely a revenue tax, for the Government does not offer direct services in return for it. It affects the inevitable cost of services for education, law and order, health, and so on, which do not return revenue to the Treasury, and this is necessary. Because this tax is available to the Treasurer, it is unreal and almost improper for this avenue of taxation to carry the major part of the Government's need and requirement for additional revenue.

The Treasurer has seen fit to exempt local government from land tax, and seemed rather pleased to remark to the House (I think yesterday) that that action had been received with much enthusiasm by local government. Indeed, I imagine it had, for anybody would be pleased to be exempted from tax. I am not querying the Government's action in this matter: as the Treasurer said, local government is a public institution, acting in the public interest. It is not unreasonable to exempt it from this form of taxation, particularly because of the inter-relationships that exist between the Government and local government in the ratability of property and the liability of the State Government to pay local government rates, and matters of that kind.

Last year, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) moved a motion requesting, in effect, that the Government also exempt certain properties from various sorts of taxation, including church properties, such as church schools, etc., which were valuable because of

their locality, size in terms of acreage, and the buildings situated thereon. It is unnecessary for me to reiterate what was said during that debate, but I suggest that when the Treasurer was exempting such organizations as local government at this time, he might well have considered the matters raised by members during the debate on church properties last session. I believe a strong case was made out for considering such properties, over and above the consideration they presently enjoy. Church organizations that provide educational facilities are non-profit making, and play an important part in contributing towards the total educational facilities afforded to people in this State.

I regret that the Treasurer, while in the mood for and in the act of making some exemptions, did not recall the discussions that took place on this matter, and did not see fit to exempt those institutions. After all, he pointed out that the exemption of local government did not represent a large sum, and I think it was established during the debate on the motion regarding church properties last session that the cost of exempting such organizations was also not great. If it was a good argument in one case it should have been good in another. I know that many people, in endeavouring to keep these facilities for the benefit of their organizations and institutions, do so at considerable personal cost. Some of the schools in the metropolitan area today are established purely through the financial support of many thousands of citizens. Westminster School which is in the Treasurer's district has raised and spent almost \$1,000,000 on buildings and general land improvements since its inception a few years ago, almost exclusively through the supporters of that institution and friends of the school.

Similarly, another school has recently finalized an appeal to its old scholars and parents of students, which has resulted in the collection of about \$425,000. That is real money and shows that the people concerned are trying to and do, indeed, help themselves. I believe they will be disappointed now to find that, at the cost of perhaps \$25,000 or \$30,000, the Treasurer has regrettably neglected the pleas for exemption of taxation made to him in this place last session. The Opposition is definitely of the opinion that some small increase in land tax this year was probably inevitable and justified. The quinquennial assessment takes place regardless of any other Government action, and it was obvious that,

with the declining values of money, that assessment would show some upward trend. Indeed, it has shown a steep upward trend, and the Government has seen fit to adjust its rates because of the sharp increase in the quinquennial assessment. Nevertheless, in spite of the Government's apparent magnanimity, it intends today to collect an additional 37 per cent on last year's collection (which, in itself, was a steep increase on the previous year).

We say that that is too much and unjustified, and that it is not reasonable or proper to load tax on to land so heavily, in order to meet the Government's mounting deficits in other directions. We protest about the matter and intend to protest in practical fashion when the Bill reaches Committee. We re-affirm that the holders of small primary-producing properties should continue to enjoy in the present circumstances the same assistance and exemptions as they have enjoyed in the past, and we intend also to move in that direction. I hope the Government will lend an ear to our requests in this matter and that it will accept at least one or two of the amendments that we intend to move. I do not say I oppose the Bill, because I realize the necessity to have land tax and to have the appropriate machinery for it. However, I strongly oppose the terms of the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): In rising to speak to this measure, I believe it is interesting to recall the incidence of land tax since it was introduced by the Fisher Government in 1910 and, of course, abolished on a Commonwealth basis by the Menzies Government in 1952. Although the scales of tax have been presented to us, the rates to be applied are a little misleading as to what would at first blush seem to be concessions. The progressive scales that we see today do not tend to give a correct picture, bearing in mind the progression of land values that has occurred over the years. As land values have increased from year to year, especially over the quinquennial period, we find that, because of the natural processes of development, land values have gone from one scaling up to the next. This often occurs. The Treasurer presented tables, which appear in *Hansard*, of each valuation. At first sight it appears that there is some reduction or little, if any, increase in tax on many properties, but it is a fact of life that, since the last quinquennial assessment was made, the value of many properties has increased. To give an example, the lowest classification that attracts tax is the \$10,000 range. In the last five years many properties

have gone over that mark, with the result that they immediately attract the higher rate. A person not looking at the scales closely would think there had been little increase, but it must be considered that many properties have jumped into the next classification whereupon they immediately attract a higher tax rate. This applies in the same way as increased income taxation affects most people, whether they receive \$2 a week rise or a rise similar to that received by members of Parliament. Most of us attract higher taxation, to our dismay, and this fact often seems to be overlooked.

Land tax was originally designed as a progressive tax to cause subdivision of large rural holdings. The announced intention of the Fisher Government was to introduce land tax to break up large holdings into smaller settlements. Today we find that there are not as many large holdings, and land tax has become a substantial revenue-producing tax which, in many cases, inflicts a severe penalty on developing businesses, whether large or small, apart from the penalty it inflicts on a householder who improves his property. The tax has tended to no longer achieve the purpose for which it was designed: no longer is it a punitive tax designed to split up large holdings. In some instances it tends to be a penalty on a developing business that is gradually acquiring land or other assets. As the tax has become a growing burden on businesses, the House should examine this aspect closely.

Some reference has been made in the debate to the impact of land tax on properties in the city of Adelaide. I refer to this aspect again because the city of Adelaide incorporates North Adelaide, which is part of the district of Torrens. Of course, the other part of Adelaide is well represented by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who represents many large holdings which, I am sure, he represents admirably. More than 50 per cent of the land tax collected in South Australia comes from the city of Adelaide which, I reiterate, includes North Adelaide. I went to the trouble of examining figures which show that the State Government has, in recent years (and I presume it will again this year), attracted more land tax from ratepayers in the city of Adelaide than the city council collects in its rates, which go towards the development of the city in the way of roads, traffic control and so on. When put this way, a rather startling position arises. To illustrate this position, I have the following figures for the

year 1964-65: land tax collected in the city of Adelaide (including North Adelaide) was about \$2,430,000; and council rates collected for the same period were \$2,308,482. Therefore, it can be seen that the council collects less in rates from residents and property holders in Adelaide than the State collects in land tax. This position may become more marked this year, although at the moment it is impossible to ascertain what the figures will be.

The Treasurer pointed out that increases in valuations throughout the State varied considerably. He rightly stated that within the city of Adelaide, where there are many highly assessed properties, the increase had been only 20 per cent on the previous assessment, whereas in the metropolitan area the increase had been considerably more. I believe that is a true indication of the position because there are many properties within the city of Adelaide that have been offered for sale and cannot be sold at the moment. I invite any member to walk west along Waymouth Street from King William Street: he would be amazed at the number of substantial properties in front of which are erected "For Sale" signs. However, some of these premises have been for sale for many years and it has not been possible to sell them. In the past, the severity of increased tax might not have affected metropolitan ratepayers in the same way as it affected city ratepayers, but I believe that in future this position will change somewhat because properties situated in the choicer suburban areas have not, in the past, been assessed at as high a level as those in the city. This position might change; this was indicated by the Treasurer when he said that values in the city had increased by only 20 per cent whereas values in the metropolitan area had increased by about 65 per cent.

I know that many business houses are seriously considering moving from the city of Adelaide to the metropolitan area. There are two reasons for this: one is land tax, water rates and council assessments, and the other is the parking problem. Honourable members know that many businesses have moved out of the city of Adelaide. I believe there will be less difference between rating in the city and in the metropolitan area in the future. The House should consider this aspect from the points of view of both the city and the metropolitan area, because, whatever we do, we must not tend to create what could be called the dead heart of Adelaide. This must be avoided at all costs. The fact that so many

unsold properties can be seen in Adelaide supports the view that some fairly solid taxation rates have been levied on premises there. Last year, when talking about the effect of land tax on city properties, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) suggested that property owners there would obtain the benefit of higher land values by being able to sell out at a healthy profit and invest somewhere else. However, this is not happening now because of the difficulty of selling many of these properties to which I have referred. In my view, taxation should not force any person to leave any particular section of the State, whether it be the city, the metropolitan area, or the country, and I believe that the high incidence of taxation (particularly land tax) in the city has forced some people to leave that area.

In North Adelaide, which is part of the District of Torrens, we see a rather unusual occurrence at present. The ordinary resident is leaving parts of North Adelaide to go to live in another part of the metropolitan area because the land tax is fairly solid, the council rating is high, and the water rate assessment is also high. On the other hand, many commercial premises are being erected in North Adelaide, particularly in Lower North Adelaide, and Melbourne Street has undergone a complete change in the last three or four years. This also occurs in the medical field. Many specialists with very large practices have now vacated their former premises on North Terrace, which of course had the reputation for many years of being the Harley Street of Adelaide. Many of those medical men are now in Palmer Place, Brougham Place, and similar locations. At present a large three-storey block of consulting rooms is being built where once stood the old Prospect House on Pennington Terrace. The doctors are moving out from the city square mile into North Adelaide because, although the council works on the same basis of assessment for North Adelaide as it does for the square mile, there is a certain reduction out there and a certain advantage, not the least of which is the availability of parking space.

Mr. Casey: Wouldn't they have been renting properties on North Terrace when they were consulting there?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but, as the honourable member probably knows, in many large buildings on North Terrace the tenant is required by his lease to pay a monthly rental that often includes a loading for taxation, whether it be

for council rates, water rates or land tax, all of which have been mounting over the years. Many of these doctors are good businessmen who have obviously found it a better proposition to move to North Adelaide, especially as their patients can park their cars there.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is probably the major reason.

Mr. COUMBE: Quite. However, I point out that this change is occurring in North Adelaide and that many private citizens are moving to other suburban areas. It is fair to say that in the past many suburban properties have been far more conservatively assessed than have many city properties; I do not think there is any argument about that. Although that may have been the case in the past, however, I believe that this situation is now changing. The fact that the Treasurer referred to 20 per cent and 65 per cent increases illustrates this point. I repeat that land tax should not be a tax used to drive people out of one locality into another. I believe, further, that high taxes will certainly discourage, if not prohibit, many people such as small warehousemen or people with motor industries, parking stations and smaller hotels from setting up in the city of Adelaide or prevent their flourishing there.

It is interesting to note over recent years how the land tax receipts levied in this State have compared with total receipts from all State taxation levied by the former Treasurer and the present Treasurer. They show a remarkable consistency. In 1956-57, when I came into this House, the percentage of land tax to the total revenue from State taxation was 15 per cent, whereas last year (so far as I can estimate from the figures that I have worked out) it was 14.8 per cent. Before the rate was altered last year the percentage was 14.2 per cent. I am unable to comment on the current year because the Treasurer has not yet introduced the Estimates, but it will be interesting to work out the figure in the light of the \$2,000,000 increase which, it has been estimated, will come from this avenue of taxation.

What is probably one of the first exemptions in land tax for a number of years has been introduced in this Bill, namely, the one dealing with local government properties, and this is an exemption that I wholeheartedly support. Most members of this House have served in local government at one time or another and know the work done by local government, including the splendid voluntary efforts by councillors, aldermen, chairmen and

mayors. If a local government authority finds that it is being heavily hit with land tax commitments, the only thing it can do in order to continue its volume of work is to increase council rates. Therefore, nobody really benefits. The person who suffers in the long run is the one who always gets it in the neck—the taxpayer or ratepayer, and he is usually the same person. Therefore, I welcome this exemption to preclude certain local government properties and activities from the incidence of land tax.

Having read that amendment, I was fortified and I read on in the hope that I would see a further exemption. However, I did not find one. Seeing that the Government is in an amenable mood in introducing one exemption, I am sure it will carefully consider another suggestion of mine.

Mr. Millhouse: It might consider it.

Mr. COUMBE: Members will recall that last year I spoke at some length on my motion that the Government should consider exempting certain church properties from the incidence of land tax, water rates, and possibly council rates. At this moment I am suggesting this avenue in connection with land tax only, and do not intend to pursue it in respect of water rating which we have just been considering. I say deliberately that, if my suggestions were agreed to, in the aggregate the State would collect probably only a few hundred dollars a year less than the \$2,000,000 that has been suggested, and, after all, this is not a very large amount. I am sure it would be welcome. I make this plea because the Ligertwood committee that was set up to consider property valuation methods for land tax, water rates, council rates and probate duty made certain recommendations to this House on October 1, 1964, one of which, in regard to land tax, was set out very clearly. I have suggested to the Government that it consider this matter. The committee, in its report, stated:

In relation to properties owned and used by churches, the general effect of the legislation is that buildings used exclusively for public worship are exempted from rates and taxes but there is no exemption for ministers' residences or for vacant lands which are held for future erection of places of public worship. In all other States, both ministers' residences and vacant lands held for the erection of future churches are exempted, and it was strongly submitted that South Australia should step into line in this respect and that there should be no disability on account of State boundaries. I hoped that the Government would consider this suggestion. Under the Act, land used

for worship is exempt from tax, but if a church buys property anywhere for future use it has to pay full land tax. However, when a church is built on the property no tax is payable. It is necessary for churches to buy properties in growing communities to avoid the land being purchased by land developers. Later, the church will have to pay an exorbitant price or the choice sites may not be available. The Government should provide for these circumstances, as the Act provides that if any exempt body sells land for profit the exemption is withdrawn and tax is payable for the whole period. If my suggestion were accepted, out of a proposed increase of \$2,000,000, the cost would be only a few hundred dollars a year. This principle is applied in other States, and in Committee I shall probably move a motion on these lines.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I agree that this is a revenue measure, but I was surprised to hear the member for Torrens say that the Fisher Government introduced land tax and the Menzies Government abolished it. Basically that is true, but that is in the Commonwealth sphere. In South Australia, land tax has applied since 1844, and I hope the member for Torrens realizes that his reference has no significance in this State. No State Government can afford to abolish this tax because it is limited in its revenue-raising fields, and this is one means of doing that. Quinquennial assessments were introduced in this State by the previous Government, and no doubt they will continue to be used. It is an excellent way of assessing land, and I know of no better. Opposition members have taken an unusual attitude to this measure. As an Opposition, it must oppose measures introduced by the Government, but some vicious attacks have been made on this Bill.

Mr. Hudson: Others have been irresponsible.

Mr. CASEY: Yes; Opposition members should realize that we are dealing with the welfare of the people of this State. Before every sitting, the Speaker reads a prayer in which he uses the phrase "the welfare of the people of this State". The Leader of the Opposition is reported to have said that this legislation was another nail in the coffin of the Government, and apparently that term has been used on numerous occasions. No doubt the member for Burra has used it, but not in the same way as the Leader.

Mr. Quirke: I am a bit superstitious about that.

Mr. CASEY: I was disappointed with the Leader's contribution to this debate. I realize that he has much to learn, although he has an able teacher in the former Leader. He said that because the Labor Party was in power it would bleed the people by this 37 per cent increase in land tax and that money would be taken from them. Under the previous Government in 1950-51 and 1951-52 there was an increase of 40 per cent in land tax, and in 1955-56 and 1956-57 the increase was 150 per cent. Can Opposition members complain that an increase of 37 per cent is as vicious as it was in those years?

Mr. McAnaney: You are comparing different money values.

Mr. CASEY: In 1960-61 and 1961-62 an increase of 70 per cent occurred.

Mr. Ryan: Under a Liberal Government!

Mr. CASEY: Members opposite profess to be fair and to take stock of the present position, yet they are decrying an increase of 37 per cent.

Mr. Hudson: It hasn't done its homework.

Mr. CASEY: It is using vicious and most unusual methods. We have witnessed an emotional outburst from the member for Stirling, but I do not think he understands the Bill's implications.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you?

Mr. CASEY: Yes. I have been paying land tax for years. The member for Albert is in the same position as I.

Mr. Freebairn: You're a wealthy man.

Mr. CASEY: If I were as wealthy as the member for Light and his family, I do not think I would be sitting in the Chamber today. For the information of the member for Light, I shall tell him what land tax I have paid over the years up to the present. That may satisfy him once and for all (although I doubt whether that is possible).

Mr. Hudson: The outstanding thing about the member for Light is that he does not absorb light; nor does he reflect it.

Mr. CASEY: For the benefit of the member for Light (and I hope he sees the light), in 1955—

Mr. Freebairn: You have only 20 minutes, you know.

Mr. CASEY:—I paid a total of \$29.22 in land tax; in 1960 I paid \$24.55. (Of course, it was in pounds, shillings and pence in those days, and I have had to convert the figures to decimal currency for the benefit of the member for Light): Primary producers received a special rate, and a slight reduction occurred in my case, but the tax on my property was

assessed in 1965 (and I am happy to pay it) at \$34.32. I do not think any member, as a landholder, can complain about the small increase that has occurred. I shall again quote some average figures relating to farming properties situated throughout South Australia.

The unimproved value of a dairy farm in the Adelaide Hills, for example, in 1955 was \$6,576, and the tax was \$20.55. The same property's unimproved value in 1960 was assessed at \$9,960, and the tax was \$25.82. In 1965-66 its unimproved value and tax were the same; the unimproved value rose sharply in 1966-67 by nearly \$3,000 to \$12,440, the tax increasing to a reasonable \$29.60. In 1955 the unimproved value of a Virginia market garden was \$548 and the tax, \$1.71; in 1960 its unimproved value was \$2,304 and the tax nil. Today, its unimproved value has risen slightly to \$3,000, and the tax is still nil. The unimproved value of a fruit block on the Murray River in 1955 was \$1,648, and the tax was \$5.15; in 1961-62 its unimproved value was \$2,064 and tax, nil; and in 1965-66 its unimproved value was the same, with still no tax. Today, its unimproved value has risen to \$4,100, and the tax is still nil.

I do not know why honourable members are complaining. The unimproved value of a large cereal-growing property in the district of Owen (the member for Light's territory) in 1955 was \$26,272, and the tax was \$159.08. In 1961-62 the unimproved value of that same property rose considerably to \$32,112, and its tax rose correspondingly to \$173.85. The same unimproved value applied in 1965-66, and the tax rose only slightly to \$213.90. However, that property's unimproved value today has risen to \$45,960, and I do not think its present tax of \$259.60 is excessive. The unimproved value of a small grazing property in my district in 1955 was about \$7,464, with a tax of \$23.32; it was the same unimproved value in 1960, and the tax was lowered, pursuant to the new Act, to \$12.82. Its unimproved value and tax were the same in 1965-66, but today the unimproved value has risen by nearly \$2,000 to \$9,280, and the tax to \$14.26.

The unimproved value of a large grazing property in Carrieton in 1955 was \$12,540, its tax being \$47.12; in 1960 its unimproved value was the same, its tax having dropped (as a result of the Act) to \$41.85. In 1960 the unimproved value was still the same but the tax was slightly more, \$47.15. In the 1966 assessment the value increased to \$18,750 but the tax has not increased appreciably: it is

only \$55. I think this gives members some idea of how this land tax will affect people on the land.

Of course, we must realize that land values are influenced by the volume of real estate activity, building activity and production. I am sure the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) will agree that another factor that influences land values, particularly in relation to land used for primary production in South Australia at present, is the availability of ready cash.

This is probably the predominant reason why the holdings of primary producers are becoming larger each year. I am sure the member for Stirling realizes that, because I know that is happening in the North every day of the week. I can give many examples to show that property could be bought five years ago for much less than its price today. One property was purchased four years ago for \$48 an acre. That property is not in the Upper North, but about 140 miles north of Adelaide. A few months ago the person who had bought it was offered \$80 an acre for it. That is the type of increase that can be likened to a dog chasing its tail, and it is difficult to arrive at a just solution.

Of course, the Commissioner of Land Tax is responsible for making the assessment, and I remind members that the assessment is open to challenge by anyone not satisfied with it. This dissatisfaction is voiced before a tribunal and, in my opinion, the members of that tribunal are capable men.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And the method of assessment was used by the former Government for many years.

Mr. CASEY: That is the whole point. The former Government appointed these people to the tribunal and, for the benefit of members, I should like to name them. First, the Chairman is Mr. L. F. Johnston, S.M. The other member who sits with him on all boards of valuation is Mr. C. R. Sutton, O.B.E., F.C.I.V., and I understand that he is an extremely capable man. The third member of the tribunal is determined according to the particular district concerned. For example, in the metropolitan district it is Mr. R. R. Bullock, F.C.I.V. On Eyre Peninsula, it is Mr. J. K. Schramm, of Ungarra, who I understand is a primary producer. In the northern district the member is Mr. H. T. Harslett, F.C.I.V., of Gladstone, who is a land agent. In the southern district, which I take to be the hills district, the third member is Mr. J. H. Sneyd, of Mount Compass, who is a primary producer. In the Murray

lands, the member is Mr. J. F. Sharley, of Renmark, while the member in the South-East is Mr. H. B. Schinckel, of Naracoorte.

I understand that all these men are competent to sit on these tribunals and hear the cases. Strangely enough, although the Opposition Party has tried to stir up agitation amongst landholders throughout the State regarding this new assessment and the rate struck by the present Government, it has dismally failed to increase the number of objections lodged with the Land Tax Department. In 1960, there were 3,400 objections out of a total of 290,000 assessments, or 1.2 per cent. In 1965, 4,800 objections were lodged, but there were 335,000 assessments. The objections represented 1.4 per cent, and those figures show that the Opposition failed dismally.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) referred to the movement of doctors from North Terrace to North Adelaide. I do not claim to be completely knowledgeable on land values in the metropolitan area but I give full credit to the honourable member for what he said on that matter, because he lives in the area and he is a business man. I accept in all sincerity what he says. However, most of the doctors concerned who were practising on North Terrace have changed their attitude to their patients considerably over the past few years. Although doctors were happy about occupying one or two rooms on North Terrace, more and more clinics are opening every year and groups of four or five doctors are going into partnership in clinics. I know many of these doctors who are operating clinics and they have found that the only place that they can get suitable accommodation is the North Adelaide area.

Many doctors are purchasing properties and either demolishing and rebuilding them or renovating them. They must have suitable quarters to be able to operate efficiently in clinics. That is one reason why many of these land values are increasing, and this will continue. The people do not remain in one place. Everybody, particularly a man in the business world, tries to increase his business. A person who is a live-wire sees opportunities in other areas and starts the ball rolling. Then, other people want to follow the leader. Increased demand causes land values to increase and I think we get back to the simple economic principle, as the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) realizes, of supply and demand.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you think that the Bill will be a nail in anyone's coffin?

Mr. CASEY: Certainly not. All the people to whom I have spoken in my district, except

one, are completely satisfied that the increased land tax is caused by the quinquennial adjustment, and they are happy about that. If the Leader of the Opposition had stood out in the rain yesterday and been saturated, I am afraid that the lid of the coffin would have been buckled and the nail would have stood out. Whilst the Leader was speaking in the debate, I think the member for Torrens interjected that the Government had taken 19 steps to incorporate the taxable value in this Bill. I do not think this point is really worth worrying about, because this is a more equitable way of determining land tax overall.

I commend the Government, because this is the first time a Government in this State has reduced tax on properties with values assessed at less than \$10,000. It is high time this was done. Since 1950-51, these properties have been taxed on the same basis as have other properties. For example, the tax payable on land valued at \$8,000 was \$25 and on land valued at \$10,000 it was \$30.41. Under the new system in the Bill, tax will be charged at 2c for every \$10 or part thereof, which means that tax on a property valued at \$8,000 will be \$16 instead of \$25, and on a property valued at \$10,000 it will be \$20 instead of \$30.41. Owners of properties of these values who cried out for years for relief were ignored by the previous Government. I commend the Government for its action. The Bill is not a nail in the Government's coffin, but rather a feather in its cap. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Because one honourable member said that, although we had previously paid \$5,750,000 and were now going to pay \$7,750,000 in tax, there was no tax at all, I ask leave to continue my remarks so that I may have the weekend to think over that proposition.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 27. Page 721.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) moved:

That this debate be further adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Jennings. No—Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.
Motion thus carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for Tuesday next.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), 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, Clark,

Corcoran, Curren, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Teusner. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: I give the member for Mitcham the opportunity to move for the resumption of the debate on some day other than Tuesday next.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a matter of very great importance to this State and must come on as soon as possible. I therefore move:

That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 2, at 2 p.m.