

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 5, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

HOUSING.

Mr. QUIRKE: In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Need for Low Interest Funds for Housing", an article, quoting from the Housing Trust report, states:

"Scarcely a week passes without the Housing Trust having to rescue a family which, through illness or unemployment, has to yield to the unequal struggle of buying a house." The trust makes this observation in its annual report to Parliament, commenting on the high rates of interest charged for the "deposit gap" on second mortgage. The trust sees real difficulties in continuing to provide balanced housing development.

"This rather gloomy forecast is made not because the industry cannot be expanded, but because it seems that finance at the appropriate rates of interest will be the limiting factor," the trust says. Unless the volume of low interest money increases substantially, the trust will not be able to provide rental or rental purchase houses which will be demanded by young couples as the marriage rate increases in the next few years. The trust will not be able to increase the supply of rental houses so necessary for industrial growth, especially in the country.

Nothing I say now can be construed as having any political bias, and I divorce my remarks from any such sentiment. There is nothing new in what I have read: it has been inevitable since 1927 when the Financial Agreement first operated. This agreement has been detrimental to States' interests, and is the main feature responsible for the alarming debt structure of the States.

The SPEAKER: Order! Much as I like to hear the honourable member, I think he realizes that Standing Orders preclude comment and expression of opinion in explaining questions. I do not know how the honourable member can get around that, but I have to administer Standing Orders as they are.

Mr. QUIRKE: I did not expect you, Sir, to get around it, but I thought I might. The States are weight-carrying hacks for the Commonwealth authorities, and the trust's report shows that a shortage of cheap money is responsible for this dilemma and the gloomy forecast. Therefore, will the Treasurer enlist the support of other State Treasurers in seeking an inquiry, with the Commonwealth Government, with the fixed objective of

recasting the Financial Agreement so that cheap money may be obtained, particularly for housing and all developmental works necessary for the assured progress of this State and Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer must obviously be "Yes". I am willing to have this matter included on the agenda to be considered when the Loan Council next meets, seeking a system of providing cheaper money, particularly for housing and developmental works. In fact, I believe that when the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement was introduced a reasonable chance existed of solving many problems now confronting us, but with the current high rates of interest the housing situation has been adversely affected.

RESERVOIRS.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the saving on pumping costs as a result of the recent increase in water storages?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The total storage in the metropolitan reservoirs at 8.30 a.m. today was 20,237,000,000 gallons, compared with 16,456,000,000 gallons at this time last year. Millbrook and Hope Valley reservoirs are full. Natural intakes of the metropolitan reservoirs during September totalled 4,950,000,000 gallons. This represents a saving of \$230,000 in power costs, with the consequent reduction in pumping from the Murray River.

COUNTRY ELECTRICITY.

Mr. HEASLIP: I heard this morning that the extension of electricity supplies throughout the country to be undertaken in the next 12 months has now been postponed until 1968-69. Although I realize that this may be only a rumour, and that a reply may not be possible at this stage, will the Premier ascertain whether there is any truth in what I have heard? If the extensions are to be delayed, will the Premier ascertain the reason and investigate whether they can be restored to the normal schedule?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although this is normally a matter to be considered by the Minister of Works, I am prepared to obtain a report which, I hope, will be more substantial than a rumour. Rumours are neither positive nor reliable, and I should have thought that the honourable member could obtain more factual evidence on such a matter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Electricity Trust whether it

still intends to construct the Parilla single wire earth return line this financial year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Frankly, I have no knowledge of the trust's curtailing work. I have called for reports on individual items, and I have been informed that work is being carried out on schedule and that the expected completion date for those works will be achieved. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and inform him when it is to hand.

HIGHWAYS FUND.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the report of the Highways Commissioner which was tabled in this House yesterday and which discloses that the Commissioner will have \$3,000,000 less to spend in the current year than is considered necessary to keep up with the desirable road programme. This prompted my recollection of remarks made by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement in which he referred to the relatively much more difficult financial problems facing the Revenue Account than those facing the Highways Fund at present. He said that it was intended this year to require the Highways Fund to repay to the Treasury \$1,000,000 which was provided for it as long ago as 1952-53.

Mr. McKee: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer then went on to say—

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that the cost of the Morphett Street bridge—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Apparently members opposite—

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of the report of the Highways Commissioner, which has just been tabled, in view of the difficulties to which he points in his report, and in view of the shortage of funds available to him, does the Government still intend to require repayment of the \$1,000,000 referred to by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement, and does it intend to saddle the Highways Fund with the whole of the cost of the Morphett Street bridge programme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, as the report in this morning's *Advertiser* takes out of context part of the Highways Commissioner's report, it makes much different reading from the contents of the Commissioner's report. Some of the conclusions that can be arrived at from the press report would be

entirely different if the Commissioner's report were considered in its entirety. I do not wish to comment or reflect upon those responsible for the press report: all I ask is that they assist by presenting accounts that have regard to the whole of reports rather than taking extracts out of context. The facts relating to the Morphett Street bridge have already been presented to the House. The Government's share of finance for this project will be derived from the Highways Fund rather than from other Government sources, and the Adelaide City Council will pay its share of the cost of the project directly into the Highways Fund.

With regard to the \$1,000,000, as far as I know about \$33,000,000 is involved in this year's expenditure. This sum is an increase of \$3,000,000 on last year's figure, and is the highest allocation ever. There is a history associated with the repayment of the \$1,000,000. It was necessary for the Government of the day to provide out of Loan funds certain sums so that Commonwealth grants could be matched from the Highways Fund. The Highways Fund's condition depends on added amounts of finance received by the Motor Vehicles Department from registrations and other business associated with that department. The Highways Fund, which has been very bouyant, can meet all matching grants without special money being made available. It would be reasonable to expect that the Highways Fund would be able to repay some of that Loan money. If the press statements are read in the context of the Highways Commissioner's report they would give a different impression from the statement made out of context and the press comment on it. Too often a writer seizes on an extract from a report and then takes the opportunity to write something different about it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the course of his answer to my question, the Treasurer used the word "misrepresentation" several times and "taking things out of context", and so on.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I didn't use the word "misrepresentation".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: "Taking things out of context", then; I think the Treasurer will agree that he used that term several times, and the implication is the same, anyway. That has made me most anxious to look at the Highways Commissioner's report. Having already asked for a copy of it, I was told by the messenger that the only copy was in the hands of the member for Glenelg, who said he had not

finished with it. This means that I cannot look at the report to see the implication—

Mr. LAWN: We couldn't look at it yesterday because the press had it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —of what the Treasurer has said, although I may wish to ask a further question. This again raises the point that we apparently receive only one copy of each of these reports, and such copies are not available to more than one member at a time. It is often many weeks before they are printed and on the file, and by that time they are getting stale. Would it be possible for you, Mr. Speaker, to arrange for more than one copy of a report such as this to be tabled, so that at least one copy was available to members of the Opposition from the time that reports were tabled?

The SPEAKER: I cannot answer the honourable member's question until I make investigations. I shall have the matter investigated and give an answer in due course.

Mr. CLARK: I have every sympathy with the member for Mitcham, and I regret he is denied the right of having the first look at each report. Could you, Mr. Speaker, investigate the possibility of having a special copy of each report made available especially for the member for Mitcham to help him in respect of his questions in this House?

Mr. HUDSON: In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a report dealing with the Highways Commissioner's report. In view of the press report, I took the trouble to commence to read—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. COUMBE: Touché!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: In view of the statement in the Highways Commissioner's report that the substantial increase in expenditure on road-works from State sources has resulted in South Australia's qualifying for the full Commonwealth matching grant without requiring an allocation of Loan funds, and in view of the increase for this financial year from \$30,000,000 to \$33,000,000 in road expenditure, can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether the State will be spending sufficient this financial year to be able to match fully the Commonwealth grants?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Most decidedly, yes.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. CLARK: For some time I have been perturbed by the unemployment situation at Elizabeth and surrounding areas brought about largely by the dismissal of employees from the plant of General Motors-Holdens. The position is accentuated by the fact that most people who have lost employment there are comparative newcomers to South Australia who are not yet fully established here and who have more commitments than people who have been in South Australia for some time. Because of these commitments these people are suffering hardship, particularly if they have families. I have found that the Housing Trust is most considerate in such cases and that hire-purchase companies have generally been most helpful. However, where there are families, the Commonwealth unemployment benefits are simply not enough. Because many people are newcomers to this State they are not aware of the assistance they could obtain from the Social Welfare Department. Will the Minister of Social Welfare say what benefits can be obtained from the department in such cases and what is the best way for people in this area to obtain such assistance? I trust that in the interests of the people in this area the Minister's reply will be given as much publicity as possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In giving assistance to families who would qualify for public relief, the allowable income standard is fixed according to the size of the family, and the difference between the total money income of the family and the allowable income level is paid by the department, so that the amount varies according to the size of the family. There are, on the income standards fixed by the previous Government, differences between the allowable income standard of people who are on Commonwealth pensions and allowances, and the standard of those who are not. This whole matter is at present under review by the Social Welfare Advisory Committee. Since the recent increases in Commonwealth benefits, I have directed that such increases should not result in a reduction of the amount paid by the department, and in consequence it may well be that numbers of families in Elizabeth who have not so far applied for public relief can qualify for this kind of assistance. The Social Welfare Department has at Elizabeth an officer who will receive applications for public relief assistance and will give every assistance he can to families in distress.

ROAD TAX APPEAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I heard a report over the air a few days ago that the Attorney-General was going to Great Britain to attend a meeting of the Privy Council in connection with a New South Wales transport case. Can the Attorney say when this expedition is to take place and who the members of the expedition will be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is pending before the Privy Council at the moment an appeal by a company having transports registered both in South Australia and New South Wales, and the basis of this appeal is an attack on road maintenance contribution charges of all States having legislation similar to that enacted in Victoria and found valid by the High Court. The basis of the attack is that the legislation is contrary to section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and the possible effects of success will be not only that the legislation will end but that claims may be made, conceivably, for the return of all taxes so far paid to the States. In view of the fact that special leave to appeal has been given by the Privy Council, and in view of what was said during that particular hearing, this matter is regarded with the utmost seriousness by all States concerned. I understand that the Solicitors-General of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria will go to England, and that Victoria and Queensland will have their Solicitors-General seeking to intervene on behalf of their States. This State has no Solicitor-General, but, in view of the extreme seriousness to this State and its finances of the possible consequences of the decision by the Judicial Committee, it was considered that the only Law Officer in this State should appear on behalf of this State before the Privy Council, and in those circumstances the Government has directed that I should appear on behalf of this State. I shall be accompanied by Mr. Wells, Q.C., in going to London to seek to intervene before the Privy Council, and he will appear with me.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION.

Mrs. BYRNE: The junction of the Main North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill, is a dangerous intersection because five roads, including Valiant Road, meet at this junction, and accidents have occurred there. Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report from the Minister of Roads about any plans the Highways Department may have for making this junction safe?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

LIBRARIES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about the decrease in the provision for contingencies for the Libraries Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In the Budget review, Cabinet, in allocating funds to departments, determined that the maximum which could be made available for the services of the Libraries Department (excluding the requirements of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act) was \$673,000, or about \$30,000 more than actual expenditure last year. The Libraries Board considered how the available funds should best be used. As the board considered that an additional \$48,000 should be allocated to salaries and wages, it followed that some other items had to be reduced. One of the decreases was \$14,372 in the transfer to the board for purchase of books and general running expenses. This will mean that a firm control of all running costs will be necessary.

TROTTING.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Premier say whether the Wayville trotting authorities contemplate increasing admission fees or bookmakers' fees for the coming season?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have received information that the South Australian Trotting Club has notified bookmakers that it intends to increase bookmakers' permit fees in the grandstand from \$9.40 to \$10, and in the flat from \$4.70 to \$5. I submitted this matter to the Betting Control Board, requesting that a conference be held between the South Australian Bookmakers' League and the trotting club, and I understand that a meeting was arranged but I do not know the result. I also recommended that the matter should be arbitrated as it was when a proposition was placed before the previous Government. However, I do not know the present result or how far it has gone. In the 1965-66 season the charge for admittance to the grandstand was 85c for men and in the flat it was 45c for men and women, but the charge for women admitted them to all parts of the ground including the grandstand. The charge was 10c for children between the ages of six and 14 years, and this enabled them to go to any part of the ground including the grandstand. For the 1966-67 season, which opens next Saturday evening, it is intended to increase the charge for the admission of men to the grandstand to \$1, with no alteration to any other charges. This means an increase

of 15c in the charge for men in the grandstand. I understand that there will be an increase of 5c in the cost of the *Trotting Guide* sold at trotting meetings.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to bring down legislation to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act to permit the South Australian Trotting Club to conduct trotting meetings on Saturday afternoons at its new track at Bolivar?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No. I informed the club that the Government did not intend to introduce such legislation this session and reminded it that I could not see how it could hold meetings on Saturday afternoons in conjunction with a totalizer because the horse-racing fraternity met then.

Mr. Lawn: It could have a totalizer there and no bookmakers.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If backbenchers desire to do something about bookmakers and totalizers, I point out that a Bill concerning a totalizer agency board was recently introduced and that it could be amended to suit their wishes.

SEATON SCHOOL.

Mr. HURST: In November, 1965, I asked the Minister of Works a question about filling the playing area at Seaton Boys Technical High School. The Minister had been given a complete report of progress (if it can be called that) at the school. In January, the Minister told me that he had approved expenditure for survey work to commence. Later, I spoke to the Minister of Education about the playing area at the adjacent school, the Seaton Primary School, and was given to understand that the filling work would be completed in September to enable the seeding of the playing area in the spring. As I am informed that the work has not commenced, will the Minister of Works ascertain the reason for the delay and indicate when the filling and top dressing will be completed at this playing area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I notice that the honourable member said that he had been "given to understand", and not that he had been given a definite assurance. I will inquire about this matter and inform the honourable member accordingly.

THEVENARD SINKING.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Marine a report on the sinking of the *Eleni K* at Thevenard, and has he a further statement to make concerning this disaster?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's statement, last Thursday, about a navigation licence not being granted, I have been informed that this is not correct. As I understand it, the vessel was not to be issued with a navigation licence until repairs had been carried out. They were carried out at Port Adelaide and a licence was granted before the vessel was partly loaded at Thevenard. Because of the Commonwealth authority's inquiry, I shall not comment further, as one's remarks might prejudice the inquiry and give a wrong impression to those taking part in it. When a full report is received I shall make it available.

LIFE JACKETS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Marine an answer to my recent question about the wearing of life jackets by people using small craft in coastal waters?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I previously stated, a committee is inquiring into the desirability, or otherwise, of registering small craft. If registration is recommended, of course, all matters associated with such registration will be part and parcel of the committee's recommendations. However, it would be wrong for me to make a forecast; I must keep an open mind on the matter, having appointed a committee of inquiry, which has been in progress for a considerable time. Committee members having agreed to act voluntarily, I commend them for the time they have given to the inquiry. However, I have not the slightest idea of what the committee's report will be, and it would be improper for me to intervene at this stage. After further inquiries have been made in other States, a report will be made available which I shall be able to present to the House.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate concerning the delay in rebuilding the Hackney Bridge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the remedial work necessary to correct the unsatisfactory steel in the Hackney Road bridge girders has been completed. The work of completing the fabrication of the 12 girders required for this bridge was practically completed when a crack developed in one of the welds on the top flange of a girder. This crack was caused by a faulty welding technique and can be readily corrected by cutting out the faulty

weld and re-working. However, the department is now checking all similar welds in the other girders, in order that any other faults can be detected and corrected. This has caused two months' delay in the erection of the girders and it is now anticipated that the bridge will be placed in service in February, 1967. The specification for the bridge is considered to be satisfactory. The delays occasioned by the laminated steel and faulty welding have been the only basic departure from the specification and the department does not intend to accept any financial liability in this regard.

GOODWOOD SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Many years ago a two-storey building was mooted for the Goodwood Boys Technical High School. As I was recently asked by members of the school committee whether any buildings or improvements were contemplated soon, will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

FORESTRY.

Mr. RODDA: I believe that a "benefit cost" report was recently compiled by the Forestry and Timber Bureau for the Australian Forestry Council which would be of inestimable value as a guide in deciding a softwood planting programme. As this is of immense public interest in this State as well as in other States, will the Minister of Forests ascertain whether the report to which I have referred can be published and made available to people interested in this field?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As any reports to the Forestry Council would be made direct to the Minister for National Development, I shall ascertain whether the report can be made available.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the submission the Premier made to the Prime Minister a few days ago regarding the pipeline from the northern part of this State to Adelaide, reference was made to the fact that only a limited number of holes had been drilled at the Moomba field and that more holes would have to be drilled before the field could be considered proved and an accurate assessment of the quantity of gas available from it known. Can the Premier say whether steps are being taken at present to drill the additional holes? If they are not, can he say when the additional work is expected to be undertaken, as that work appears to be a prerequisite to the establishment of the pipeline?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In my talks with the Prime Minister, the point was made that, provided the State Government could finance this project to the extent of \$40,000,000, the Commonwealth would give the green light for the work to proceed. However, no pipeline can be started until the company concerned has drilled another three or four holes to prove the field, and at present the company is drilling in Queensland. I believe it would hardly be appropriate at this stage to say exactly what should be done until the economics of the proposition are known. Also, any increase in the cost of borrowing would have a decided effect on the economics of the pipeline. Naturally, the Government would have to know the likely expenditure, particularly interest charges. I have every confidence at this stage that the Commonwealth Government will make money available for this important project. As soon as the full economics of the pipeline are known, the Government will ascertain all requirements involved in developing this field.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In view of the very great industrial importance of Wallaroo, Whyalla, Port Pirie, and Port Augusta, will the Premier have alternative costs to those in the proposed report taken out in connection with the proposed route of the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide to see whether it would be feasible to supply these great industrial towns with industrial gas as soon as possible?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The member for Gumeracha has had every opportunity of reading the reports submitted. If ever natural gas is to be used in South Australia, it is vital and essential that it be made available to coincide with the requirements of the Electricity Trust. If the trust is unable to purchase gas at an economic price, gas will not be used in the trust's furnaces and it will certainly not be made available to the rest of South Australia, unless it is as a result of a complete review of the requirements of industry. Regarding the alleged knowledge of the member for Gumeracha on this subject, he had ample opportunity, when he was Premier, to learn some of the economic aspects associated with this proposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did he use those opportunities?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Apparently not, and it appears that he knows full well that natural gas must be delivered at a cost that will be economic to the industry concerned.

The Bechtel Pacific Corporation was asked to submit a proposition on what would be the nearest practicable route from Gidgealpa and Moomba to Adelaide; it has now given a decision on this matter and has stated that, if it is found to be economic to supply other places with gas, it may be necessary to put the gas pipeline on a different route. A land speculator who visited this country and took options on land in Wallaroo has now exercised his right and purchased the land. He would be a competent businessman in his own country. If he could sell a story to speculators in his country they could take action associated with fertilizers produced with power made from gas and he would be sitting fairly comfortably if he had sufficient land, provided the gas were available.

It would be a question of whether an 18in. pipeline would be needed. A smaller pipe might be needed to take the gas from the main pipeline to Wallaroo: it would depend on the quantity needed. There is also a provision made for a line to go to Port Pirie if it is needed. There has been no guarantee that it will go to Wallaroo because it is not known whether it is needed. If it is an economic proposition to deliver gas to Wallaroo, Port Pirie or Whyalla, gas will be sent there when the main trunk line is delivering gas to Adelaide. Also, if the people of Broken Hill determine that they need natural gas, a subsidiary line will be taken there. All these matters are associated with the economics of the proposition.

I have no doubt that the member for Gumeracha is fully aware of these matters. Of course, the use of natural gas depends on its availability, and the establishment of this fertilizer business in Wallaroo or the establishment of an industry in any other town will depend upon the cost of delivery. The present proposition is for an 18in. pipeline to be constructed to deliver natural gas from the Gidgealpa and Moomba areas to Adelaide, for this is considered the most economic proposition. The exact route of the pipeline has not been finalized. I understand that the construction cost will be about \$90,000 a mile, so I would not think we would want to go 50 miles out of our way to deliver gas to some place that could not guarantee that it would use certain quantities. However, if we were assured of a certain usage we could lay a subsidiary line almost anywhere. Once natural gas is delivered to Adelaide, any town

such as Wallaroo that can come forward with a proposition for a supply of gas will be considered.

DIECASTERS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Premier say whether the property at Elizabeth operated by Diecasters was, in fact, provided through the Housing Trust (in other words, a semi-Government property) and, if it was, whether efforts are being made to find another industry to occupy these premises?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know negotiations have taken place but, as I do not know the full extent of them, I will inquire, and bring down a reply.

M.T.T. FARES.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question concerning Municipal Tramways Trust Fares?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The suggestion is made by the Leader that over a period of 18 years the four-section fare charged by the Tramways Trust has increased from 4d. to 20c, whilst the six-section fare has increased from 1s. to 20c. This is obvious nonsense, for the six-section fare was never three times the four-section fare. In fact, 18 years ago the respective fares were 6d. and 8d. not 4d. and 1s. Also, 19 years ago the respective fares were 5d. and 7d. and they remained at those figures for the previous 18 years. I have secured a table showing every change in M.T.T. adult fares over the past 37 years, and also a table comparing the present adult fares for each Australian capital city. I point out that increases have been made during the past seven weeks in all cities other than Brisbane and Hobart and I believe these are under review at present, though I cannot say whether an early change in those cities is likely. The cost for travelling six sections was increased in 1957 from 1s. 1d. to 1s. 3d. under the old currency, and in 1959 it was increased to 1s. 6d. It remained at that amount until 1964, when there was an increase in other fares, and it has now been increased to 2s. In Melbourne the cost for travelling the same distance is 25c, in Sydney 20c, Brisbane 15c (but likely to increase soon), Adelaide and Perth 20c and Hobart 18c. I have a schedule of increases in the trust's fare scales since 1929 but, as it is too lengthy to read in full, I ask that I have leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

THE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, ADELAIDE.
 SCHEDULE OF INCREASES IN THE TRUST'S FARE SCALES SINCE 1929.

Adult Cash Fares.

Sections.	3/11/29	2/2/48	30/4/50	15/4/51	13/1/52	3/4/55	21/7/57	2/8/59	5/7/64	29/8/65	2/10/66
	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
1	0 2	0 3	0 3	0 4	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 6	0 6	0 6	0 6
2	0 3	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 6	0 7	0 9	0 9	1 0	1 0	1 0
3	0 4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	0 9	1 0	1 0	1 6	1 6
4	0 5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	0 11	1 0	1 3	1 6	1 6	2 0
5	0 6	0 7	0 8	0 9	0 10	1 0	1 0	1 3	1 6	1 6	2 0
6	0 7	0 8	0 9	0 10	0 11	1 1	1 3	1 6	1 6	2 0	2 0
7	0 8	0 9	0 10	0 11	1 0	1 2	1 3	1 6	1 6	2 0	2 0
8	0 9	0 10	0 11	1 0	1 1	1 3	1 6	1 9	2 0	2 0	2 6
9	0 10	0 11	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 4	1 6	1 9	2 0	2 0	2 6
10	0 11	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 5	1 9	2 0	2 0	2 6	2 6
11	1 0	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 4	1 6	1 9	2 0	2 0	2 6	2 6
12	1 1	1 2	1 3	1 4	1 5	1 7	2 0	2 3	2 6	2 6	2 6

AUSTRALIAN TRAM AND BUS ADULT FARES—OCTOBER, 1966.

Sections.	Sydney.	Melbourne.	Brisbane.	Adelaide.	Perth.	Hobart.
	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>
1	5	7	5	5	6	6
2	10	12	10	10	12	10
3	15	17	15	15	15	12
4	15	22	15	20	15	15
5	15	22	15	20	20	15
6	20	25	15	20	20	18
7	20	25	20	20	20	18
8	20	28	20	25 Max.	25	20 Max.
9	20	28	20		25	
10	25	30	20		25	
11	25	30	20		25	
12	25	35	25 Max.		25	
13	25	35			30	
14	30	40			30	
15	30	40			30	
16	30	45 Max.			35	

EDUCATION AID.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I notice that the Minister of Education is to address a meeting organized by the South Australian Institute of Teachers later this month. The other speaker will be Mr. H. P. Schoenheimer from the Monash University, and the object of the meeting is said to be the furtherance of the campaign by the institute for more Commonwealth aid for education. In view of the Minister's close association with Senator Gorton in Commonwealth-State educational matters, is not the Minister concerned with the apparent one-sidedness of the panel of speakers? Will he use his undoubted influence with the institute to invite Senator Gorton or his representative to address the meeting?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The meeting I am to address on October 24 is being arranged by the institute, which has a programme of awakening public opinion to the need for Commonwealth aid. It is entirely responsible for those arrangements. However, I will ask the institute whether it would care to invite Senator Gorton, but I must point out that the arrangements are entirely the institute's affair: I have merely been invited to speak.

STEELWORKS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding developmental works at the Whyalla steelworks, where amongst the developmental works mooted is an iron ore pelletizing plant. Can the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, say whether the pelletizing plant, when it comes to reality, will be of sufficient capacity to enable the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to enter the export field? My question is prompted by the fact that the Western Australian Government is now enjoying large revenues from the sale of iron ore in pellet form from that State. Can the Minister also say whether the Government is willing to give the B.H.P. Company every assistance to enter this export field with iron ore pellets?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall refer the question to my colleague and bring down a report.

DOG RACING CONTROL BILL.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to dog racing and matters incidental thereto; to repeal the Coursing Restriction Act, 1927; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I appreciate the co-operation of members in allowing me to proceed with this matter today. The main purpose of the Bill is to allow greyhounds to race behind a mechanical lure. The National Coursing Association and Greyhound Racing Clubs of South Australia have formed a Greyhound Racing Promotions Committee, and it is their desire that legislation be introduced which will enable them to race under similar conditions to those operating in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland. These rules give a very tight control over greyhound racing.

The National Coursing Association should be the only body to apply for licences for and on behalf of individual clubs, for they would thus be enabled to design the areas for greyhound racing in a way that would be to the best advantage for the greyhound fraternity. The National Coursing Association has stated that it would welcome the privilege of racing with a mechanical lure for the simple reason that it provides a safer and much more efficient method of conducting a race meeting than the present method of racing behind a pacemaker.

As I have previously stated, greyhound racing in all other parts of the world is conducted with a mechanical lure. In addition, people in the Eastern States, in making an intelligent approach to the problem, have decided that mechanical lure greyhound racing is far better than any other form of greyhound racing. I hope that members will support this Bill, as South Australia is the only State in which greyhound racing is restricted. I know that honourable members are aware that support for greyhound racing in this State is increasing rapidly and, as more migrants arrive, the demand will increase even more. Greyhound racing in the Eastern States is a popular sport, and the demand for it now in this State indicates that its popularity is rapidly increasing throughout the Commonwealth.

It has been asked whether mechanical lure racing encourages the term that has been used here in South Australia of bleeding the animals to encourage them to race. The answer is quite definitely "No", and this can be clearly substantiated by the results in Victoria. It would be fair to say that greyhounds are more apt to be given live animals under our present system of racing in South Australia with nothing but a pilot dog to chase and a box of rabbits placed past the winning post, than if greyhounds were chasing nothing but a

mechanical lure. The people connected with the control of greyhound racing in this State are keenly interested in immediately preventing any acts of cruelty connected with greyhound racing, as it would be in their best interests to do so. The introduction of this Bill will greatly assist them to control and promote dog racing in this State.

The Bill is quite simple and straightforward. Clause 2 repeals the Coursing Restriction Act. Clause 3 contains the necessary definitions. Clause 4 prohibits participation in the conduct of dog racing unless such dog racing is conducted by or on behalf of a licensed dog racing club. Clause 5 deals with the granting and revocation by the Minister of licences to dog racing clubs. I think the provisions of this clause are self-explanatory. Clause 6 enables the Minister to delegate his powers and functions under the legislation. Clause 7 empowers authorized persons (including members of the Police Force) to enter premises where dog racing is conducted and to take action to prevent the commission of any offence, and provides the necessary sanctions against preventing or hindering such persons from exercising such powers.

Clause 8 contains the necessary powers to make regulations complementary to the provisions in the Bill. Clause 9 contains the usual provision providing for the summary disposal of proceedings in respect of any offence. In supporting this Bill, honourable members will be giving to the interested people of this State an opportunity to enjoy the same social activities as those being enjoyed by similar sporting bodies in other States. I commend the Bill to the House, and hope that it will be accepted.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I do not intend to speak for any length on this matter, and I trust the House will facilitate the passage of this Bill, which is quite simple and straightforward, relating to dog racing and matters incidental thereto, repealing the Coursing Restriction Act, 1927, and for other purposes. The main object of the Bill is to legally permit the introduction of mechanical lure racing in South Australia, the same as is done in other States of Australia and in many overseas countries. This form of dog racing is a popular sport in England: it is something many English migrants coming to South Australia greatly miss. This is a measure many people throughout the State desire to see introduced.

As there is no legal objection to one dog racing behind a mechanical lure, the only pur-

pose of the 1927 Coursing Restriction Act was to stop racing and thus stop betting. It had nothing to do with cruelty at all, in fact, it is more likely to have increased the use of small animals to train and blood greyhounds in this State. We find that greyhound racing then took place by using a pilot dog to lead the field of dogs racing around the track to a cage of live rabbits. For a dog to win, it needed to be made keen enough to be first to the live rabbits. It was this type of racing at White City in Victoria in the early 1950's that led to the use of hundreds of rabbits and possums to train greyhounds, and this brought about the introduction of mechanical lure racing in Victoria in 1956. Since it has operated there have been few problems in this respect; in fact, over the past three years, over 4,000 greyhound owners in Victoria have evidently done the right thing, because only one case of cruelty has occurred, or in other words been detected, and these people have been properly dealt with both by the civil courts and the National Coursing Association.

I believe that clause 7 will take care of any act of cruelty that may be detected by the authorities or the police as it provides the necessary sanctions against preventing or hindering them from exercising such powers. During a previous debate, the Leader of the Opposition referred to live hare coursing. This Bill deals only with mechanical lure racing and does not in any way jeopardize the future of live hare enthusiasts wishing to follow this type of greyhound coursing. I believe this Bill provides a sound foundation on which mechanical lure racing can be introduced and, in consequence, I support the second reading.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately negotiate with the Commonwealth Government to have provisions of the Railways Standardization Agreement implemented, to provide a standard gauge railway connecting Port Pirie to Adelaide with the object of—

- (a) obtaining the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland; and
- (b) providing relief from unemployment in this State.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1889.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I should like to enlarge on what I was saying last week concerning the economic advantage that would accrue to the State from the establishment of the rail link between Adelaide, Port Pirie, and Broken Hill. I am speaking not about the financial advantage to the Railways Department but about the general economic advantage to this State. The Leader of the Opposition, when moving the motion, pointed out that at a time when many people were unemployed the work would maintain employment, and would enable those at present engaged on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie section to be further employed rather than to increase the already too large number of unemployed people in this State. In the last two or three days there have been reports of a change of policy by companies, which are now moving their activities from South Australia to another State.

Yesterday, the Premier said that the change did not arise from any Government policy, but because of the company's policy. That emphasizes strongly how important it is that we remove any disabilities under which manufacturers in this State operate, and grant compensation to enable them to maintain their activities, and even to increase their activities, in this State.

I was concerned some time ago when Diecasters Limited decided to move its project from South Australia. I believe, although I am not sure, that the organization has also taken its plant. I was indeed surprised to hear that it intended to concentrate its production in Victoria. Now, we see that other firms are also planning a withdrawal. Although they may be only small organizations (and I hope no large ones will follow suit), it indicates that the advantages previously held by this State over a period of years are no longer sufficient to compete with those being enjoyed by industry in New South Wales and Victoria.

I suppose no-one can deny that the big advantages for manufacturers in those States include proximity to markets; manufacturers do not have to meet the transportation charges that apply here. In those circumstances, it is apposite that the Leader's motion should deal with a question concerning one of our greatest disabilities. No project is more important, and I regret the apparent lack of interest from the Government side in arranging for this link to take place. I understand that in the last 18 months the whole project has been neglected, no action having taken place since the old Govern-

ment went out of office and the new Government came in. I should indeed be happy if the Minister representing the Railways Department in this House would say that the Government had been active in this important matter. However, if the Government has been active it has certainly escaped the notice of news writers in the press as well as a pronouncement in this House.

Mr. Shannon: That would be unusual!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We usually have an opportunity to hear what is happening, if indeed anything is happening, but in this case either the publicity department has slipped a cog or two or nothing is, in fact, happening. If the Minister can quote, chapter and verse, exactly what the Government is doing, the Leader and members on this side of the House will be delighted to hear about such progress. More than 18 months ago the Commonwealth Government made money available for a survey of our proposals by its own officers. At that time Commonwealth officers were conducting inquiries with the assistance of the Railways Commissioner and his staff in this State. Since then, however, nothing seems to have eventuated; no further statement has been made by the Commonwealth Government on the matter; the Commonwealth Budget has come and gone without any mention of further sums being appropriated for the work; and on examining the financial documents tabled by the Treasurer in this House I find no trace of any expenditure on the work.

Although I do not make a practice of criticizing the Government, I should like to hear that something materially important was taking place or that the project had not been allowed to lapse. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), who is at present engaged in the work of the Subordinate Legislation Committee (and doing a much better job lately, if I may say so) realizes, I think, the importance of this project and the effect it will have on decentralization, to Port Pirie's benefit. I shall be surprised if he does not presently rise to support the Leader of the Opposition in a matter that is so obviously important to his own district. If he is not to have a pipeline, he can at least have a railway line.

The motion, which is obviously a step towards improving the State's transportation system, seeks to create a great economic advantage to decentralization and to the development of an important and growing industrial area (which I hope will continue to grow) surrounding the northern part of Spencer Gulf. I support the motion and deplore the fact that it is necessary.

The Railways Department and the Minister concerned should have been seized with this matter—

Mr. McKee: It should have been done 20 years ago.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly! I knew the honourable member would come in. I am certain that, when the motion goes before the House, not only shall we have had an advocate for this project from the Government side but we shall also have his vote to ensure that the motion is carried. I obviously cannot bring you into this debate, Mr. Speaker, unless you prevail on the Chairman of Committees to take your place temporarily. I think Standing Orders permit you to stand down from the Chair and to advocate something in the interests of your district.

Mr. Hughes: You are doing your best to prevent an industry coming to Wallaroo.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe a precedent exists, Mr. Speaker. Mr. George Laffer once stood down from the Chair to speak in the House about something on which he had strong views. I am sure that if you stood down and spoke to this debate we would listen with great interest. I assure you, Sir, that while you were speaking we would observe the rulings of the Chairman of Committees and enable you to make a speech without interjections. We know that, just as we are keen about the development of the land bordering northern Spencer Gulf, you would also be keen to ensure that the development of this important area was not neglected and that it was able to obtain the necessary transportation and other public services necessary for its development.

Mr. Hughes: You are doing your best to kill them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope the motion will receive support from both sides and that, as a result, the Government will get busy and make some positive approaches to the Commonwealth Government to carry out this desirable work. The undertaking would maintain employment and improve economic conditions in the State, as well as giving immense value to Port Pirie, Wallaroo and Whyalla and, in due course, leading to considerable decentralization.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I rise with pleasure to support the motion which, in effect, asks the Government immediately to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government under the

terms of the Railways Standardization Agreement Act, which was passed in this House in 1949. The motion requests the Government to approach the Commonwealth to have work undertaken on the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie. In no way does the motion go into detail about where the connection should be made: it deals simply with the principle that a connection between Adelaide and Port Pirie should be undertaken as an urgent work. We believe this is a constructive suggestion to the Government on a really vital State capital work that should be undertaken because it is necessary to the State. Also, it will not cost the Government Loan funds.

In moving the motion, the Leader of the Opposition has outlined the position as it now exists under the terms of the agreement. He pointed out the advantages that would accrue to this State's trade and commerce from having a standard gauge rail link between Adelaide and Port Pirie. He also pointed out what a wonderful opportunity this would provide to relieve the present unemployment in this State. The member for Gumeracha gave an extended history of the agreement. He told how the agreement was reached between him, as Premier of this State, the Hon. J. B. Chifley, then Prime Minister, and the Hon. Eddie Ward, Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport. Of course, the result of those negotiations was the Railways Standardization Agreement Act of 1949.

I believe that this is a remarkable piece of legislation, for it contains a vital piece of legislative enactment on developmental work that is absolutely essential to South Australia. If members read the content of the agreement, contained as a schedule to the Act, they will be struck immediately by the verbiage used, by the lucid way in which the agreement is drawn, and by the all-embracing terms of the contract between the Commonwealth and State Governments. The member for Gumeracha went on to show what was involved in the agreement, what would be involved in this motion if it were carried, and the extent of the work to be undertaken. So that members will be *au fait* with the implications of the motion, I shall quote briefly from the schedule to the Act to show how all-embracing is the agreement. Clause 5 of Part II (Works for the Standardization of Railway Gauges) provides:

- (a) Conversion to standard gauge of the entire South Australian 5ft. 3in. gauge system and of the 3ft 6in. gauge lines of the South-Eastern Division. . . .

- (b) Conversion to standard gauge of the 3ft. 6in. gauge lines of the Peterborough Division.

Of course, this is a wide concept that I hope will eventually be carried out. Later in the schedule, clauses are inserted to provide when these works will be undertaken and what the priorities will be. It can be seen that the agreement covers the conversion of broad and narrow gauges to standard gauge. As a matter of history, we know that certain lines in the South-East that were narrow gauge have been converted to broad gauge with a view that one day they will be converted back to medium gauge. The House knows that the Western Division, on Eyre Peninsula, has narrow gauge lines and is completely excluded from the provisions of this agreement; likewise, it is outside the terms of this motion.

Some time ago, I asked the Premier a question about the possibility of a standard gauge line being built from Port Augusta to Whyalla. I believe that one day this line will have to be built. The Premier replied that he could not say what stage negotiations had reached. I believe that if this line were built and the line to Adelaide made standard, the State would have a fairly good network of standard gauge lines that would operate to its benefit. Lest there be concern about the other broad gauge lines that still exist in South Australia along and crossing the route between Adelaide and Port Pirie, I point out that there is a criss-crossing system; it would be simple to have a standard gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie and still operate these traversing lines. Members know that in the cutting up of the former sewage farm at Islington the Government, through the authority of the Railways Commissioner, has properly and wisely reserved a large section to be used as a marshalling yard and terminus for the standard gauge system when it extends from Adelaide to Port Pirie. Under the terms of the agreement, it is planned that this work will be done at some future time.

In this motion, we are urging that negotiations be re-opened with the Commonwealth immediately to have this work undertaken soon. The question of priorities is important in this respect. Clause 9 of Part II of the Act provides:

(1) Any question arising as to the order in which the standardization works shall be carried out shall be determined by agreement between the parties.

(2) Any question arising as to the time at which any standardization works shall be commenced by any party shall be determined by agreement between the parties.

Which line shall take precedence over another and when certain work shall commence are entirely matters for agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments. Either the Commonwealth Government or this Government can re-open negotiations at any time. Therefore, the motion encompasses this possibility, and the legislative permission is granted under the agreement for this to take place.

The advantages of this motion and the results that could emanate from it have been elaborated on to some extent by the Leader and by the member for Gumeracha. Let me summarize them in my own way. First, I shall deal with the importance of trade. Of course, at all costs we must avoid isolation. Before long the line now under construction between Cockburn and Port Pirie will be completed and the link with the Silverton Tramway Company will also be completed. Then we will have a continuous standard gauge line from Sydney to Fremantle. That line will branch to Melbourne and Brisbane. Goods consigned from Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane will therefore be able to go direct to Perth, or from Perth to those cities, without going through Adelaide. The danger is that if Adelaide is not connected by standard gauge, it could be isolated. Who will ship goods through Adelaide if it means two breaks of gauge and the transshipment of goods? We must realize it will be a great disadvantage to Adelaide if we have direct freight between the Eastern States and Western Australia and Adelaide is by-passed.

If Adelaide were connected to Port Pirie by a standard gauge it would tend to make Adelaide the centre of commercial and industrial trade with the other States because Adelaide is so centrally situated; it is much more central than any other capital city. As we found many years ago when air travel commenced, the quickest way to get airmail to any capital city from overseas was to fly it direct to Darwin and then to Adelaide because Adelaide was the most central city. If Adelaide were the centre of the rail system much trade could be developed in this region. Consider the goods coming into Adelaide from other States for processing or for sale. If we had the connection from Port Pirie to Adelaide we might get our goods at a cheaper rate. Surely it would be cheaper if goods consigned from Sydney to Adelaide were able to come *via* Broken Hill and Port Pirie on the one standard gauge, not only because of the actual route miles traversed but because there would be no transshipment because of the break of

gauge. On the other hand, if the same goods were sent to Adelaide *via* Melbourne, goods would have to be transhipped from the standard gauge to the broad gauge, which would add to their cost.

Mr. CASEY: How does the mileage from Sydney to Adelaide *via* Melbourne compare with the distance between Sydney and Adelaide *via* Port Pirie?

Mr. COUMBE: Possibly there is not much difference. I cannot answer the honourable member's question accurately because I have not taken out the figures. Ignoring route miles and distances travelled, the cost of transshipment is a significant factor. As the member for Frome has standardization work being carried out in his district, I know he will support the motion because he is vitally interested; many of the products of his district and the goods shipped to his district will have to be transhipped under the present system if the Port Pirie to Adelaide system is not standardized. I am fully aware that the proposal is to convert to broad gauge between Terowie and Peterborough, but that is only one part of the honourable member's district. Surely it would be of advantage to the people of his district if this standardization were carried out between Port Pirie and Adelaide.

I have already touched on the question of freight and the isolation of Adelaide on the one hand, and the fact that it could become a central point on the other, and the costs of goods coming into and going out of Adelaide. Looking at the road freight position, we have the advent of that horrible word which has now been coined—"containerization". When we move freight by road, sea, and air, the use of containers will develop enormously. It is absolutely vital for us in Adelaide and the southern part of South Australia to enjoy the lowest freight costs and rates possible. We must retain this freight differential to enable us to produce goods in Adelaide and the metropolitan area and other parts of the State, to deliver them, and still be able to compete on the market with goods from the Eastern States, where they have the large markets and the large population.

It is absolutely essential that we keep our freight costs to a minimum to enable us to sell on those markets successfully. One way of reducing costs is to have a completely standardized system of rail communication in this State, and communication to other States. This has added significance when we think of the supply of natural gas that will be here in a couple of years. We hope that the industries

in South Australia will make the utmost use of that commodity when it comes. We believe that many new industries will be established in South Australia and, if they are, they will want to sell their products in the large markets that are mainly located in the Eastern States. The only logical way of shipping their freight by rail is by a completely integrated standardized rail system.

I had an interesting conversation some years ago Mr. W. C. Wentworth, M.H.R., the member for Mackellar who was Chairman of the Government members' Rail Standardization Committee. He put forward some interesting suggestions on this question. I will admit however, that he was preoccupied with the standardization of the line between Albury and Melbourne, which eventually was carried out, but he was also interested in the connection between Broken Hill and Port Pirie and the link between Port Pirie and Adelaide. We discussed the difficulties of some of the South Australian systems, which are mainly narrow gauge. Mr. Wentworth has been a persistent advocate of rail standardization in Australia and it was largely due to his efforts that the rail link between Albury and Melbourne was standardized so soon. Possibly most of the members of this House have travelled over that system on the *Southern Aurora* more than once.

Mr. Wentworth is still active in this regard. The *Hansard* report of the debate in the House of Representatives on September 21 shows that he is still asking questions on this matter. I selected one question he asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Freeth) on that day. Mr. Freeth replied:

The honourable member also mentioned the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway and suggested that this line should be standardized in time to coincide with the 1968 programme. I cannot give him an undertaking that this will be done. The former Premier of South Australia asked us some time ago to have a look at this. At that time the estimated cost was \$12,000,000. More recently, I think, it has risen to \$17,000,000. This is currently being examined because the Commonwealth undertook to examine the feasibility of fitting this work into the whole programme. As I have said, at this stage I cannot give him any assurance as to when the work will be undertaken. Of course, if and when it is undertaken it will be part of the standardization programme which has a statutory basis relation to the South Australian Government.

We can see from that report that not only is Mr. Wentworth interested, but Mr. Freeth is too. He points out that investigations into this scheme have already been undertaken and

that the Commonwealth has taken some preliminary surveys of the proposed route.

So far we have discussed the need to negotiate and the advantages of doing this, and a few moments ago I canvassed the economic advantage to South Australia of such action. The motion says that this work should be undertaken to relieve unemployment in this State. Of course, this is a vital aspect of the whole question, because work of this nature involves many tradesmen and many more men who are not quite so skilled, and it is in this latter category in which we are finding today a large measure of unemployment. Therefore, not only should this work be undertaken from the point of view of economics but also as a direct means of overcoming the unemployment position and affording relief to so many people.

I make the plea that as the rail standardization scheme approaches Port Pirie and the end is in sight for that part of the scheme it would be logical to make the utmost use of the men, the contractors and the equipment employed upon that scheme so that continuity of employment would be provided in the standardizing of the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide. It is logical that this should be done, for the men will be available and by then they will have been trained in this sort of work. This is necessary in the same way as it is being urged that the men employed in the Snowy Mountains undertaking should at the appropriate time be used on some other national project of equal magnitude.

This motion was not put forward lightly, for the Opposition considered it very seriously from every aspect, including the financial aspect. Often when the Opposition puts forward a motion we are accused of either being highly critical of the Government or of putting forward a scheme that is not financially practicable. The Opposition is now asking that negotiations proceed immediately, as no cost would be involved in those negotiations. Even when the work commences, no capital cost to the State will be involved. My authority for saying that is the schedule to the agreement which sets out how these works shall be paid for. Under Part III (Finance), clause 14 (1) states:

Seven-tenths of the cost of the standardization works set out in clause 5 of this agreement shall be borne by the Commonwealth and three-tenths of such cost shall be borne by the State.

Clause 16 (2) states:

The State shall, in respect of so much of the expenditure by the Commonwealth under clause

14 of this agreement in any financial year . . . as is to be borne by the State, pay to the Commonwealth from revenue during the period of fifty years after the year of expenditure, equal annual contributions of such amounts as will liquidate the expenditure so to be borne by the State.

In other words, the Commonwealth will provide all the funds, and of those total funds seven-tenths will be a direct charge to the Commonwealth and the other three-tenths will be in the form of a loan to the State which it will pay back at normal interest rates over 50 years. This is a most generous scheme, and it is a pity we cannot get a few more schemes like it today. I believe we should take every advantage of the financial provisions which are written into this agreement and which are far more favourable than we could get today.

I point out that this is a work that the State could undertake, because no direct Loan funds are involved. All the State has to provide for is a sinking fund and repayment of the interest: no capital grants are required. All that is necessary, as set out in the agreement, is for the Commonwealth and the State to reach agreement, and it is simply a matter of our State Government and Treasury officers going to the Commonwealth Government and saying, "We want to re-open negotiations; we want to go on with this work."

We need to redevelop this State, and we should take every opportunity we can not only to develop the State and our natural resources but to facilitate trade and manufacture on every possible occasion between this State and the other States. The Opposition says that we should immediately negotiate to have the terms of this agreement implemented. The motion relates only to the standardization of the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide. The question of where the connection should be made with the other standardized line is a matter of detail to be worked out by the Government and its officers. However, we say it is vital and imperative to South Australia and its economy that this work should be undertaken, and that the Government should immediately negotiate to have this agreement carried out.

When members on this side of the House have pleaded with the Government to do something to relieve unemployment the Treasurer has pointed out that all his Loan funds have been committed and that he can do no more to outlay any moneys on other developmental work to overcome this position. Here is an opportunity for the Government to undertake capital work at no immediate cost. This work will create employment and will be to

the benefit of the State for all time. The Opposition moved this motion in a constructive manner, in the hope that the Government would agree to the proposition and in the hope that we would have a speech or two from members opposite in support of the motion. I am looking forward to hearing a supporting speech in sympathy from the member for Frome (Mr. Casey). The motion is genuinely put forward in the belief that the Government should immediately negotiate with the Commonwealth Government to have the provisions of this legislation carried out. We consider that this work should be undertaken as soon as possible, with the object of obtaining the full economic advantage of trade with other States. Adelaide could be isolated if this work were not undertaken.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I, too, support this motion, and no member of this Parliament should oppose it, as it is in the best interests of South Australia. Everyone in this State would support it because of the benefits to be derived. The Opposition is furthering the interests of South Australia in every way, and I believe that that is the aim of the Government, so that I do not expect anyone to object to this motion. Occasionally, the Opposition has been blamed for being critical without being constructive, but this motion contains a constructive suggestion that will benefit not only the northern towns, through which the railway line will pass, but also Adelaide, the capital of the State. The standardization of the line from Broken Hill to Fremantle being almost completed will benefit Broken Hill and Port Pirie. Port Pirie will continue to develop as the smelters will treat the ore from Broken Hill.

What about Adelaide and the industries in this city upon which people depend for employment? If the standardization link is not made from Port Pirie to Adelaide, this city will be isolated, and industries will not establish here. Recently, we heard of the removal of two more firms from this State. It is important that the Government face facts: we have lost Diecasters, Metal Manufactures Limited, Davies Coop Limited—

Mr. Ryan: And the Grosvenor!

Mr. HEASLIP: No, not that. However, this morning I met representatives of a firm from Sydney who informed me that the manufacturing of products by one of my companies in Adelaide (which were supplied to Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane) would be removed and centralized in Sydney. The distance from the centre of population and the fact that

goods could be produced more cheaply in Sydney than in Adelaide, were the two important factors in this decision. Employment is affected in this city: small industries leaving South Australia cause greater unemployment. In this case, only six people were involved, but when they are added to the growing total of unemployed people, it is obvious that something must be done. By standardizing this railway line, we should obtain the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland.

I emphasize the future importance of Western Australia, and of the industries being established there. Adelaide is centrally situated between Western Australia and the Eastern States, but unless something is done it will become isolated. Goods from Perth will move directly to Sydney, and Adelaide manufacturers sending their goods to Western Australia will have to tranship them at Port Pirie. Motor cars exported to Western Australia from this State are hauled by road transport to Port Pirie and then loaded on to trucks on the standard line for movement to Western Australia. Now, we have an opportunity, given to us by the wisdom of a former Premier of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford, who made an agreement with the Commonwealth Government, for the work on this line to be done at no immediate cost to this Government. It is a part gift: seven-tenths of the cost is to be paid by the Commonwealth Government, and three-tenths only will ultimately have to be paid by this Government. That three-tenths will be spread over a period of 52 years. This is not the first occasion on which the present Government has not accepted what I would call a gift, that is, by providing a sum in order to accept the Commonwealth Government's offer. South Australia's industry and capacity to employ depend on this project. I have heard of no suggestion that the Government will act in this matter. I recently led a deputation from constituents in Crystal Brook in regard to this project, but the Minister of Transport said that the negotiations reached thus far did not permit his replying to the deputation. That is unfortunate for South Australia. I know the South Australian Government has no money; it has unwisely spent what money it had.

Mr. Ryan: What other State has any money?

Mr. HEASLIP: Even if other States have no money, they have at least spent what they had in obtaining assets. Evidently, people

investing money in industry in New South Wales are not afraid of the Government in that State becoming bankrupt, but investors in this State have lost confidence in the present Government.

Mr. Casey: You got an answer from the Premier on this matter yesterday.

Mr. HEASLIP: I received no answer; I wish I had.

Mr. Casey: Weren't you here when the Premier answered a question on this very matter? I suggest you read *Hansard*, because you are off the beam.

Mr. HEASLIP: I asked a question but never received an answer. In any case, it is no use talking about these things; we have to get busy and do something.

Mr. Ryan: Why did you increase the prices at the Grosvenor?

Mr. HEASLIP: I run the Grosvenor successfully, and I wish the Government could run its own business successfully, so that shareholders would be satisfied. Their money is being spent unwisely.

Mr. McKee: Make a responsible suggestion! Irresponsible, that's all you are!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is addressing the Chair, not the member for Port Adelaide or the member for Port Pirie. The honourable member for Rocky River!

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I appreciate your help. The member for Port Pirie asks for a constructive suggestion; the motion states, in part:

... the Government should immediately negotiate with the Commonwealth Government to have provisions of the Railways Standardization Agreement implemented to provide a standard gauge railway connecting Port Pirie to Adelaide . . .

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that already being done?

Mr. HEASLIP: If it is, I shall sit down.

Mr. McKee: Well, sit down!

Mr. Ryan: Why wasn't it done during the Playford Government's term?

Mr. McKee: It had only 30 years to do it!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may receive 30 years if he does not remain quiet. The honourable member for Rocky River!

Mr. HEASLIP: It would have been stupid to implement this work before the rest of the standard gauge had been completed, because two changes would have been necessary. It is now important to implement the work and to follow up the standardization that has already taken place.

Mr. Ryan: Important, because a Labor Government is in office!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There have been sufficient interjections.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the link is not completed Adelaide will be isolated. I remind honourable members that the Commonwealth member for Mackellar said:

The second loose end is the standard gauge connection between Port Pirie and Adelaide. This is a matter of negotiation with the South Australian Government.

The member for Mackellar, who is not a South Australian, is vitally interested in this matter and can see the importance of the connection.

Mr. Ryan: How many from your side are Commonwealth members?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not see how Commonwealth representatives can dictate to the South Australian Government. This is a matter for the South Australian Government. Have South Australian members in the Commonwealth Parliament been approached to do something?

Mr. Ryan: Have you read Commonwealth *Hansard*?

Mr. HEASLIP: No. I have not seen any request from the South Australian Government to South Australian members in the Commonwealth Parliament to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government. I cannot imagine the South Australian Government going through those members because this is a matter where the South Australian Government should negotiate direct with the Commonwealth Government. It is the responsibility of this Government to take action and it should do so without delay. Action should have been taken already regarding the gas pipeline, but still nothing has been done.

Mr. Burdon: Do you think the pipeline should have been built before the reserves were proved?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think the honourable member should be careful about asking questions like that. I ask the honourable member whether the supplies there have been proved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must not ask questions but must make his contribution to the debate.

Mr. HEASLIP: I will not continue with that point.

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you conclude?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked members to respect the Standing Orders but they are ignoring them altogether. There are continual interjections. The honourable member is not permitted to invite interjections and to have discussions with members on the

opposite side. He must speak to the matter before the Chair and other members should refrain from interjections.

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you for trying to protect me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Although the narrow gauge line from Gladstone to Wilmington is not referred to in the motion that matter should be taken up with the Commonwealth Government so that standardization can be provided.

Mr. Quirke: They don't like that one.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know, but that is no reason why it should not be done. Economic waste is involved because of the necessity to transfer goods from one line to another. We have a narrow gauge line from Gladstone to Wilmington, a standard gauge line from Gladstone to Port Pirie, and a broad gauge line from Port Pirie to Adelaide. That is a real jumble.

Mr. Burdon: How long is it since you discovered this terrible position?

Mr. HEASLIP: Can I answer, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member need not reply to interjections because they are all out of order.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is all-important that standardization be completed as soon as possible. Standardization of the line to which I referred cannot be undertaken until the first link is completed. If something is not done to connect Adelaide with the standard gauge system, we will be completely by-passed.

Not only the man hours lost in the transport of goods because of the different gauges is important: we must consider the delays caused. There are complaints about the Railways not being able to compete with road transport. Goods can be delivered by road transport from Sydney to Adelaide over the weekend but how long does it take by rail because of the change from one gauge to another? What the motion suggests would cost the South Australian Government nothing, and the work on the railway lines would employ people and relieve the unemployment position. I cannot see how any member opposite can oppose the motion because what it suggests would help the unemployment position and South Australia generally. I know that is what all members opposite want, and I cannot imagine any of them opposing the motion.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I would not be as optimistic as the member for Rocky River with regard to his last remarks. The member for Torrens (Mr.

Coumbe) referred to trade between this State and other States. I know it is desirable for rates to be as cheap as possible. We have tried to rescue some of the money lost in the past on the railways. The member for Rocky River said that the Government was opposed to road transport, but I assure him that the Government has never been opposed to it. The Government's policy has been (and is) that there shall be co-ordination between road transport and other forms of transport. There is much difference between what the honourable member said and what is the true position. Instead of going around the country saying something untruthful, members opposite would have been better advised to assist in enabling co-ordination of transport in this State. Never has the Government said that it opposes road transport. What we have said and what we will insist on is that there is room for all forms of transport, and it must be co-ordinated.

Mr. Heaslip: There are extra costs.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: That is not a real argument. The honourable member says things that he cannot substantiate. The plain fact is that he is sometimes not responsible for what he says. The honourable member said that we were opposed to road transport, but that is not so. We believe there is room for all, but we also believe there must be a co-ordinated system.

Regarding objective (a) of the Leader's motion, that is, "obtaining the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland", I can only conjecture what this might be. There is no doubt, however, that leaders of commerce and industry have evinced a keen interest in proposals to connect Adelaide with Sydney, Brisbane and Perth by direct standard gauge. The Leader, in his objective (b), suggests that the proposals should be implemented with the object of providing relief from unemployment in this State. The State's view is that the work between Adelaide and Port Pirie should be timed so as to phase in with the tapering off of the work now in hand between Port Pirie and Cockburn. This would also provide sufficient time to undertake the detailed planning associated with the works in and around Adelaide, while at the same time enabling work to be started in the less dense areas.

For these reasons, it could not be anticipated that the proposals for this work would create any employment opportunities in the immediate future. It is a longer-term project. It could

be confidently expected that the Commonwealth's view would also be that this work should phase in with the latter stages of the Port Pirie to Cockburn standardization project. Further, experience on current construction works indicates that the categories of labour in which we are experiencing the greatest shortage are not those where there is a surplus of labour at the present time. If a census was taken of the turnover of labour on the standardization work between Peterborough and Cockburn, it would be very enlightening for honourable members. I can assure them that there has been a big turnover as a result of labour problems.

Much planning and survey work is necessary before construction could start on the Adelaide to Port Pirie link, and it is pertinent to say that because of our forward planning in connection with the Port Pirie to Cockburn standardization, our progress and costs have been such as to arouse favourable comment in Commonwealth circles. Representations have been made on several occasions regarding the possibility of constructing a standard gauge line between Merriton and Crystal Brook, linking up with the Broken Hill to Port Pirie standard gauge railway, thus obviating the conversion of the line between Merriton and Port Pirie. This has been studied in detail by the South Australian Railways, and its views have been conveyed to the appropriate Commonwealth authorities along with those on the other alternatives under consideration.

I refer now to a statement made regarding the Port Pirie to Adelaide section in the report of the Government Members' Rail Standardization Committee of 1956. The position is not as simple as stated in the report; in particular, its reference to a 4ft. 8½in. connection to the automobile plant at Woodville. Since that date another motor factory has been established at Tonsley. Standard gauge access to both of these works would be impracticable unless wholesale conversion of the metropolitan area and the lines to Melbourne was undertaken. The handling of traffic from these works to Sydney, Brisbane and Perth would be done by bogie exchange. Further, it was necessary to undertake very detailed studies of traffic flows in order to ascertain the effects of standardization on the rail network north of Adelaide. For example, if the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway were standardized it would still be possible to reach Moonta on the broad gauge *via* Hamley Bridge and Balaklava, but this would involve a greater mileage. Similarly, acid from Port Pirie consigned to Wal-

laroo, and superphosphate from Wallaroo destined for stations on the Adelaide to Port Pirie line, would have to be transferred at Snowtown or Bowmans.

It is not intended to build an independent 4ft. 8½in. gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie, as inferred by the Leader. It would, however, be necessary to build an independent line between Adelaide and Virginia, but beyond that point the existing line would be converted by shifting one rail. Even this operation, although much less costly than the construction of an independent line, involves a great deal of preliminary work so that the final conversion can be done on both the main line and in the station yards in the shortest possible time.

The matter of a standard gauge connection between Cockburn and Broken Hill has been actively before the Government for some considerable time, and its views have been placed before the Commonwealth Government on more than one occasion. The State has provided all information and assistance requested by Commonwealth authorities. At this stage we are not in a position to say what the outcome will be, but it is evident that time is running out in this regard.

The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) is in error when he says, "Estimates of costs of the whole project were worked out and the Commonwealth actually allocated money". Earlier figures quoted in regard to costs were on a very sketchy basis, but more recently estimates which, although still only preliminary but considered to be more accurate, have been prepared. The Commonwealth Government allocated \$30,000 for investigation only, and Sir Robert Menzies in his letter dated August 8, 1964, to the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, said:

Upon receipt of the report the Commonwealth will give further consideration to the proposal, but I must emphasize that the Commonwealth's offer to examine the proposal in this way is not to be regarded as an acceptance of any additional commitment as to the nature or timing of further rail standardization work in South Australia.

The member for Gumeracha also refers to a standard gauge railway between Port Augusta and Whyalla. The construction of this line is, of course, a matter for the Commonwealth Government, but I am confident that it will be built in due course. Incidentally, he mentioned that the grade in the west-bound direction between Cockburn and Port Pirie would be 1 in 200. In actual fact the grade is 1 in 120. The conversion of the Adelaide to Port

Pirie railway in isolation would of itself introduce some disabilities as well as some advantages, and the Railways Department has studied these aspects in very great detail. It is felt that as a first step an integrated standard gauge system on the Peterborough Division would be more advantageous, followed by a co-ordinated system leading into Adelaide. This has recently been discussed with Commonwealth authorities, and the Commonwealth's attitude should be known in the reasonably near future.

Let me say finally that this Government has been continually active in negotiating with the Commonwealth for the provision of standard gauge between Port Pirie and Adelaide, the provision of a link between Whyalla and Port Augusta, and for the completion of the project between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. For the reasons I have given, planning alone would prevent an immediate commencement of standardization between Port Pirie and Adelaide, and this consequently could not create any employment opportunities at the present time. In addition, as I said earlier, experience on current railway construction work indicates that the categories of labour in which the railways are experiencing the greatest shortage are not those where there is a surplus of labour at the present time.

This House has my assurance that the Government will continue to energetically press for the standardization of appropriate railway systems in this State. Although there is no harm in the Leader's motion, it cannot achieve any purpose as it only supplements what the Government is already doing. I oppose the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I am surprised to hear the Premier oppose the motion, because the Opposition thought that this was a matter of considerable importance to the State and one in which we wanted to support the Government.

Mr. Hughes: That's a change.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Much historical recounting has been given of the establishment of a committee under Sir Harold Clapp in 1944 to consider the standardization of railway gauges in Australia. In 1946, the Commonwealth Government passed a Bill that was subsequently ratified by this State in 1946, but a separate agreement was made between the Commonwealth Government and this State's Government in 1949. Under that agreement whatever was to be done in future was to be done by agreement, and this is the matter to

which we have drawn attention. I am pleased to know that the Government has done this, but it was news to the Opposition. Under the agreement provision was made for the State to carry out certain works. It was to convert to standard gauge the entire 5ft. 3in. gauge system, and the 3ft. 6in. gauge line in the South-Eastern Division. Also it had to carry out the conversion to standard gauge of existing locomotives and rolling stock suitable for conversion, and the construction of standard gauge locomotives and rolling stock to the extent necessary to replace the existing capacity of all units unsuitable for conversion to standard gauge. That section of the agreement has been completed and we know the benefits that have accrued.

The second point in the agreement provided that there should be a conversion to standard gauge of the 3ft. 6in. of the Peterborough Division; the conversion to standard gauge of existing locomotives and rolling stock suitable for conversion, and the construction of standard gauge locomotives and rolling stock to the extent necessary to replace the existing capacity of all units unsuitable for conversion to standard gauge. We know that this work is now being implemented, and I suggest that Mr. Freeth did not understand the question asked of him by Mr. Wentworth, because he referred to \$17,000,000. This is not the correct figure for the project we are considering in this motion in respect of the connection between Adelaide and Port Pirie. It may be correct for the conversion of the whole of the Peterborough Division.

Mr. Wentworth was Chairman of the Government members' Rail Standardization Committee, and a 1956 report of that committee stated that the cost of the conversion in which we are now interested was about \$800,000. Another item in the agreement was the provision of terminal facilities rendered necessary by the conversion of any line specified in the foregoing provisions. The agreement provided for, first, the standardization of the South-Eastern Division; secondly, the conversion of the Peterborough Division, and the provision of necessary rolling stock to adequately replace that which was either obsolete or could not be converted; and thirdly, the provision of terminal facilities rendered necessary. The financing was to be by a simple system. We have been losing money on the South Australian railways for many years because of the disabilities in the system.

Mr. McKee: You want it fixed up in five minutes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This agreement was not entered into until 1949 and since then negotiations have been proceeding. The previous Government, a Liberal Government, signed the special agreement to take advantage of the Commonwealth Government's offer. As the Commonwealth Government was a Labor Government, why did not the Labor Government in New South Wales take up this offer? One particular disability has been the break of gauge. In the past, goods have been sent by rail from Adelaide to Albury, transhipped, and sent to Sydney. The transshipment cost time and money, even when containers were used. With a standard line from Sydney to Melbourne, goods from South Australia had to be sent to Melbourne, transhipped, and then sent to Sydney. It is no wonder that road transport became important to industry in this State and that the development of road transport assisted our industries. Now, we have a reasonable alternative to road transport. Mr. R. J. Fitch, when speaking to the Adelaide Rotary Club recently, said:

For each gallon of fuel, the average train produces 190 ton-miles of transportation, compared with 58 ton-miles from the average motor vehicle: for each pound of distillate, the South Australian Railway diesel locomotives provided 12.6 payload ton-miles.

No other form of transport could compare with this, but we have not been able to take advantage of it. Any advantage derived from dieselization has been restricted to this State, because of the breaks of gauge in movements to other States. Industry is now finding it difficult to compete with other States, and some of our previous advantages in costs have been lost. Industry is finding it cheaper to expand its enterprises in other States and not in South Australia. The Opposition is as vitally interested in this important matter as the Government is.

Mr. Hughes: How long has it been happening?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Over a period, but it has suddenly escalated.

Mr. Hughes: Over what period?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It has been most critical in the last 18 months.

Mr. Hughes: I thought so!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not blaming the Government entirely. One of our disabilities is in producing commodities here that must be sold in other States. We have not been able to take advantage of cheap rail freights; we have had to rely on road transport because we have not had the vital rail

link. The project should have been implemented as soon as possible, and it is important that it should be implemented before it is too late.

Mr. Hughes: Only until 18 months ago you said South Australia was the cheapest State in which to set up industry.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Without doubt, South Australia was one of the cheapest places, because services were cheap, certain other costs were cheap, and inducements were given to industry to establish here. Some of those advantages have now been lost, and things have reacted against South Australia. A general change in the economy has taken place, and other States have changed their policies toward industry.

Mr. Hughes: It's not the Government's fault.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We now have the opportunity to remedy the situation; otherwise, the run-down will continue and become more difficult to arrest. Once people lose confidence in industry in this State it will take much effort to regain that confidence.

Mr. Hughes: They haven't lost it yet.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We have not had the advantage of cheap rail movements between South Australia and the other States. It is all very well to say that South Australia is central, and that Western Australia will be an increasing market for South Australian goods. I doubt whether that is so, because Western Australia is reasonably self-contained with resources such as coal and ore that South Australia does not possess. We send goods to Western Australia by road, partly by road and pick-a-back, or by sea.

Mr. Hughes: Which would be the cheapest?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Movement by sea, unfortunately. I have been gravely concerned for some time about the fact that we have not been able to use fully the connection between Adelaide and Melbourne. We have had to contend with the disability of manual signalling operations, as against automatic signalling. I asked the Treasurer during the Estimates debate whether or not provision had been made for the electrification of part of the signalling along that line because I understood from discussions I had had with the Railways Commissioner that it was intended to install electric signalling between Tailem Bend and Serviceton over a period of about two years. At present only seven movements can use that line at night—two fast freights either way,

an express either way, and on nights when the Blue Lake express runs, that is it! That represents a tremendous disability to rail transport in this State, in that it cannot cope with the volume of movement. The Minister of Works, who has talked about containerization in the House, should know that containers are becoming an increasingly important component in the movement of goods. South Australia, which unfortunately does not have a container port, must rely on Melbourne in this regard. From information I have received, it would seem cheaper to rail goods from Adelaide to Melbourne and ship them to Fremantle than to bring a ship into Port Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: Container ships come to Port Adelaide.

Mr. NANKIVELL: But not in the volume that I should like to see. If we are not careful, we could miss out in this regard, because of the time factor involved. We can move goods by rail from Adelaide to Melbourne overnight far more quickly than bringing a ship into Port Adelaide to load and go out again.

Mr. Ryan: How long does it take a containerized ship now to load and unload at Port Adelaide?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is a question of the time involved in bringing a ship up the gulf. We must do everything possible to make use of the existing link to Melbourne. Motor bodies and stock are, of course, not suitable for container movement. The tremendous movement of stock from South Australia to Western Australia necessitates much double handling. It would be much easier to tranship the stock at Dry Creek where I understand provision has been made, and to move it through from there. I agree with the Premier that a line to General Motors-Holden's would not satisfy the motor industry, bearing in mind the Chrysler establishment at Tonsley Park. However, there would be tremendous advantages to the industry if motor bodies could be loaded at a point somewhere in Adelaide without having to be transhipped at Port Pirie.

Everything possible must be done to foster these industries, and it is important to do everything we can to reduce their costs. Here, we can do something to assist industry. It is not a big undertaking; according to the original report of the committee of which Mr. Wentworth was Chairman 134 miles of new line is involved at an estimated cost of about \$800,000. I believe there are three alternative routes between Adelaide and Port Pirie, one of which could be standardized or ganntleted. A delay has apparently occurred in trying to

decide which one of those alternatives is suitable or, indeed, whether a completely different route should be used.

Mr. Hughes: What would be the cost?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It would not reach the \$17,000,000 mentioned by Mr. Freeth in his reply to the member for Mackellar. I suggest that was for the cost of the conversion of the Peterborough Division. Apparently, even that is not settled. At the time of inquiry the committee drew attention to the fact that there was about 36 miles of private line (the Silverton railway line) held privately. This was recommended to be acquired by the Commonwealth and handed over to the State; and it is an important link in the line we are discussing. In today's *News*, under the heading "Silverton Still In The Dark" the following article appears:

Silverton Transport and General Industries Ltd. still has no idea when the Government's intentions on the Silverton Tramway will be made known. The chairman, Mr. A. J. Hancock, told the annual meeting yesterday that the board was hoping for compensation based on average profit. Reflecting the impasse created by the Federal Government's failure to inform the company of its intentions, yesterday's meeting lasted a mere two minutes.

Mr. Ryan: That would be Commonwealth, not State.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but this is something that must be solved. It is no good putting a broader gauge to Cockburn if this section is not the same. It is in the interests of this Parliament to ensure that this matter is negotiated by the Commonwealth Government. I do not say that this Government is to blame for it: I say we should make sure something is done.

Mr. Ryan: Don't you think it is being done?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Apparently not. It was reported today that nothing had been finalized.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They don't know what is happening.

Mr. NANKIVELL: True.

Mr. Ryan: It is a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: But it still affects us. We must arrange it because this section of line will be transferred to us under recommendations of the committee.

Mr. Ryan: Who is going to pay the compensation?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Commonwealth Government, but whoever pays for it we are still involved. This motion has some important aspects associated with it. With the standard gauge line linking Brisbane and Perth, South Australian industry is at a disability.

It is losing a tremendous advantage that could be obtained by the use of diesel locomotives. I have quoted factual figures which show that there is no cheaper form of transport over long distances than diesel locomotion. If the railways operated efficiently and were given an opportunity to do so I do not think there would be any need to worry about road transport; I believe competition would deal with it, if an adequate alternative service were provided.

It is important to South Australia that the standard gauge line be built between Adelaide and Port Pirie to join up with the standard gauge trans-continental line. It is also important that we do everything possible to cut the costs of industry, and this is one way we can do that. If we can enable our industries to compete with those in other States more employment will result. I do not look at this line as an alternative means of employment but as a means whereby we can place industries back in a position where they can compete so that people can be re-employed in the industries from which they are now being disemployed. Therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I cannot support the motion.

Mr. Quirke: Why?

Mr. CASEY: For several reasons that I will expound if members will give me the chance. I say categorically that this motion, in my opinion, has no sincerity at all. It was moved by the Leader purely and simply for political reasons. Members opposite have asked questions on this matter over the last few months—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They have not been able to get satisfactory answers.

Mr. CASEY: —and they have been given up-to-date information. The member for Gumeracha was Premier of this State for many years. I remember his talking about rail standardization in about 1959. The Clapp report was brought down in 1945.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Look what was accomplished by the previous Government.

Mr. CASEY: It accomplished absolutely nothing from when the Clapp report was brought down in 1945, except, perhaps, for the line in the South-East.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The honourable member wants to wake up.

Mr. CASEY: I suggest that the member for Gumeracha should go back to sleep because he is not with us. Members have spoken about the economic factors involved in the motion. In 1960, the member for Gumeracha,

under press headlines, was reported as saying that rail standardization work was going to commence and would employ 800 people in Peterborough. How many people are employed on work on the section of line between Cockburn and Peterborough now? First, a matisa machine does the work of 120 men. Contractors move earth which is all done on a contract basis. There are about three tournapull prime movers working on sections of embankments and cuttings which do the work of about 300 men working with picks and shovels.

Mr. Rodda: That is about 900 men.

Mr. CASEY: Men with picks and shovels are not used today; the honourable member is about 50 years behind the times. At least they have modern equipment in the North where bulldozers and tournapulls are used.

Mr. Hughes: When was that statement made about 800 men—during an election?

Mr. CASEY: The member for Gumeracha will never live that down. The Clapp report is appreciably out of date today, and a report on the standardization of railways in South Australia now would be much different. Nevertheless, the whole principle behind that report was a very good one. We have heard much about the economics of transportation in South Australia, but in my opinion the only thing that will help in this regard is the total conversion of the northern system of railways to standard gauge, that is, 4ft. 8½in. I have always advocated this, and I have often mentioned it in the House. I consider that if we tried to convert the line between Port Pirie and Adelaide from 5ft. 3in. to 4ft. 8½in., we would run into a snag straightaway, because we would be cutting across the 5ft. 3in. line that goes to Wallaroo.

Mr. Hughes: And a line that pays for itself, too.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This has all been worked out.

Mr. CASEY: The Clapp report clearly states that if we want to convert this section of the 5ft. 3in. line to 4ft. 8½in. we must include that section from Brinkworth through Snowtown to Kadina and across to Moonta and Wallaroo. That is the line that has to be converted to 4ft. 8½in., in conjunction with the Port Pirie to Adelaide line. The member for Albert, who has just resumed his seat, said we could lay a third line, but I can tell him that it would not be possible to do this in the way he suggested. It is necessary to lay out the rails in welded lengths, to remove one of the present rails and to replace it with the welded

rail length to form the 4ft. 8½in. gauge. It cannot be put down as a third rail, because it would be almost impossible to get a dog spike between the flanges of the rails. I believe that at least 40 miles a day could be done by this method, which means we could complete from Adelaide to Peterborough in a weekend.

Mr. Shannon: A very long weekend!

Members interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: Members opposite can laugh about this, but if they examined the matter thoroughly they would find out that what I have said is true.

Mr. Shannon: That is your opinion.

Mr. CASEY: It is not my opinion: it is the opinion of skilled engineers who have gone into the matter. I repeat that the line between Peterborough and Adelaide could be converted in one weekend, provided gangs were spaced along the track at various points. Members opposite may be thinking of the work involved in culverts, bridges and embankments, but I remind them that that work would not be necessary because we would be converting the line to a narrower gauge.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Does the honourable member think the standard gauge line should be from Peterborough to Adelaide or from Port Pirie to Adelaide?

Mr. CASEY: I think they should both be standardized. In fact, I used to ask the member for Gumeracha questions on this, and I pointed out to him the advisability of standardizing the line from Peterborough to Adelaide.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Were you satisfied with the answers you got?

Mr. CASEY: Never; he hedged every time I asked a question, and he would not even show the respect that is due to any honourable member. He can sit there and laugh now, but he knows that is true. Members opposite are trying to suggest that no negotiations are taking place in this matter, when in fact negotiations are proceeding and the Opposition has been advised of that fact. If the Government agreed to this motion it would be admitting that negotiations were not going on, when in fact they are going on at this very stage. I said earlier that this motion was moved for political reasons only; the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) knows this, because he made a political speech on the matter this afternoon. The honourable member talked about the economics of this project and about how it would employ people, but in fact it would not employ many people at all.

Mr. Heaslip: Don't you want men employed?

Mr. CASEY: Of course I do, but tradesmen will not go up there to drive bulldozers and to do that sort of work, because contracts would have to be called for the work and the successful tenderers would have their own workmen, anyhow, so what honourable members opposite have said is just nonsense.

In 1961, the then Commonwealth Railways Commissioner (Mr. Smith) told me that he could not get to first base with the former Premier on this subject, yet the member for Gumeracha today is trying to force an issue on a Government that has done everything in its power to make this matter a reality. The member for Gumeracha does not deny that, either, because he knows it is true. I believe what Mr. Smith told me. I remind the honourable member that whenever I mentioned Senator Paltridge's name in the House on this question of standardization the honourable member used to go scarlet. However, that was a private vendetta, and I will not go into that at this stage.

I have heard members opposite say that the Commonwealth Government has done survey work and carried out investigations on the line from Broken Hill to Cockburn. In fact, the South Australian Government did this.

Mr. McAnaney: Who provided the money?

Mr. CASEY: I am talking about who did the work. If the honourable member puts up a new fence on his property, he puts it there.

Mr. McAnaney: I provide the money for it, too.

Mr. CASEY: If the honourable member got a contractor to put it up, it would be the contractor who did the work. We are less fortunate than the other States because we have many breaks of gauge. We have 3ft. 6in., 4ft. 8½in., and 5ft. 3in.; New South Wales has only the 4ft. 8½in. gauge; Victoria has the one gauge of 5ft. 3in., with the exception of the standardized line between Melbourne and Albury; and Queensland has the one gauge of 3ft. 6in., except for the Brisbane to Sydney line, which is 4ft. 8½in. In Western Australia, all lines are 3ft. 6in. gauge, except the line to Kalgoorlie, which is 4ft. 8½in. gauge. Members opposite have argued about road transportation and how we cannot offer better facilities for industries in this State because of our transportation mix-up. They are not helping this matter, because all other States have road transport regulations, yet their railways are still losing money.

Honourable members cannot tell me of one railways system in Australia, other than the Commonwealth Railways, that makes a profit. Members opposite accuse this Government of not doing the right thing but they forestall any moves to bring road transport under some governing body so that it would have to make a contribution, as is done in the other States. We all know that we are hamstrung, and that difficulty will not be overcome by the moving of motions such as this.

Mr. McAnaney: The Western Australian Railways make a profit, don't they?

Mr. CASEY: As far as I know, the Commonwealth Railways is the only railways system in Australia that makes a profit, and that is because road transport cannot compete with it.

Mr. Ryan: The Commonwealth makes sure of that.

Mr. CASEY: That is the whole point.

Mr. Quirke: Do you agree that road transport should be hamstrung to assist the railways?

Mr. CASEY: No, and I did not say that. That is nonsense.

Mr. McAnaney: You voted for the elimination of road transport in certain areas.

Mr. CASEY: That was not hamstringing road transport. Is road transport being hamstrung in New South Wales and Victoria? Of course it is not. Let us be realistic and stop talking nonsense. The only reason why the Commonwealth Government shows a profit of about \$1,000,000 on the Commonwealth Railways is that road transport cannot compete. Most of the road transports operating on the Commonwealth line go on the railways.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The Commonwealth Railways make a profit because they have not a public debt.

Mr. CASEY: I agree that that is another big item that contributes to the profit. I agree with everyone who says that the whole railways system in South Australia needs to be converted to the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, but this motion is not the way to do that. The Premier has covered the major aspects, and I support him in his opposition to the motion.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPENSATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should, this session, introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1890.)

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the motion and congratulate the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on his able contribution to the debate. As usual, he has been thorough in preparing his speech, and he presented a wealth of evidence from which I think every member could conclude that his motion was worthy of support. He has referred to what has been done in other countries in recent years, and I think it can be said that until recent times the State has been more concerned about providing protection for the property of individuals than about providing protection and compensation for individuals who suffer injury to their own persons.

Recently the winds of change have blown over various countries and provision has been made for the payment of compensation by the State to individuals who have suffered as a result of crimes of violence. The Right Honourable Lord Shawcross, Q.C., in the preface to a report by *Justice*, the British section of the International Commission of Jurists, said:

But the twentieth century has seen many departures from traditional attitudes and an increasing acceptance of the view that it is the responsibility of the State or the community as such to concern itself with the welfare of the individual and that the individual has corresponding rights against the State and need no longer rely on the Poor Law to save him from complete destitution. State education, industrial injury and health payments, the National Health Service and so forth are matters now taken for granted. No great philosophical revolution is therefore required for an acceptance of the simple principle that the innocent victim of violent crime should be entitled to compensation from the State for his personal injuries.

That report was printed in 1962 and, following that, a compensation board to which claims could be referred was set up in the United Kingdom. In appropriate cases, that board awards compensation. It was not only the United Kingdom that did something about this matter: New Zealand, a country closer to South Australia, in 1963 introduced the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, which provided for compensation for victims of criminal attacks. It may be said that New Zealand has an enviable reputation as a pioneer of legal reform. We know that that country has an outstanding record, because the testators family maintenance legislation found its way on to the Statute Book of South Australia many years after New Zealand had introduced it. New Zealand pioneered legislation to enable women to sit on juries, and it also has an ombudsman. The member for Mitcham referred

also to California, which introduced legislation in 1965 to provide for compensation to persons on whom criminal attacks had been perpetrated. I consider the case cited by the honourable member, relating to California, is so important that no Government can refuse to take notice of the position. Honourable members will recall that, when a certain case came to the notice of Judge McCarthy in the State of California, he was so impressed by the matter and so shocked by the injuries that had been inflicted upon a woman by two teenage purse snatchers that he immediately wrote a letter to a Senator in that State, as a result of which legislation was passed within three months.

It may be asked, apart from what I have said on this matter, "Why should special provision be made for compensating victims of criminals?" There are two main reasons, the first being the inability of a victim to recover, in many cases, compensation for damage suffered by him. Honourable members may think that adequate protection is provided by law for the claiming of compensation from criminal offenders, but even if the law provides the right to the victim to prosecute a criminal or take civil action, there are difficulties that hamper the person on whom the crime has been perpetrated from getting justice. The first of such difficulties that I can see is that, if injury is caused by felony, no civil action can be maintained in a civil court until the criminal has been prosecuted. That rule was established in the well-known case of *Smith v. Selwyn* in 1914. In his monumental work on the laws of England, Halsbury states that it is against public policy to allow a citizen the privilege of recovering damages in a civil action before he has done his public duty by prosecuting the felon, or at least taking proper steps to that end. So honourable members will see that the existence of this rule can bring about considerable delay in pursuing a civil remedy and could possibly defer civil proceedings if the proper authority failed to prosecute the perpetrator of the crime.

New Zealand has again been in the forefront because, under the New Zealand Crimes Act, 1961, section 405, this rule of law has been done away with under legislation. Consequently, this difficulty would not arise in New Zealand. The second difficulty confronting a person wishing to take action against an offender is that it is necessary for him in pursuing a civil action to know who the offender is. Frequently the perpetrator of a crime gets away with it without being detected.

It is not known who the offender is. Consequently, it is impossible for the person on whom the crime has been perpetrated or for the proper authority to take any action. So justice is denied the person who has suffered the injury.

A further difficulty is that, if any action is taken by a person who has suffered an injury, then to be effective it is necessary for the offender to be able to pay the damages that the court may award. In many cases that come before the court it is apparent that the offender is a man of straw who is unable to pay the damages awarded, and an aggrieved person is unable to obtain the fruits of the judgment. No other avenue of compensation is open to a victim to insure against the possibility of attack. Provision is made in this State (and I think in all the States of the Commonwealth) for the insurance of persons against injuries caused by motor vehicles. They are insured under both comprehensive and third party insurance schemes against damage and personal injury and, even if the defendant in a motor vehicle running down case is unable personally to pay the damages, his insurance company must meet the damages that may be awarded. But I think there would be some difficulty in giving effect to some insurance scheme whereby every member of the public would be bound to insure against the risk of being involved in a crime of violence.

It is, therefore, apparent that there are many cases where there is no likelihood of victims of crimes receiving any compensation unless it is provided by the State. The second reason why provision should be made by legislation for the State to compensate victims of crime is that the State has undertaken the protection of the public against crime through a properly organized Police Force. Therefore, I consider that the perpetration of a crime of violence represents, at least in many cases, the failure by the State adequately to perform its function of protection. If that is so, it behoves the State to compensate victims of crime.

I earlier referred to a report by *Justice* dealing with compensation for victims of crimes of violence. I now refer to paragraph 68 of that report, which deals with the summary of its conclusions. It states:

The State should accept some liability for the victim's injuries because it has a duty to maintain peace and order and to provide effective civil remedies for wrongs; it also interferes with the victim's civil remedy by the exercise of its right to punish offenders and by imprisoning them; it also requires the citizen to assist in the administration of the law, and restricts his right of self-defence.

The committee recommended that the State should provide compensation for victims of violence, and that is being done in England, although the board that deals with claims for compensation is not a statutory body. It has been set up to ensure that justice is done, and it awards compensation to innocent sufferers of crimes of violence. Last week, the Attorney-General spoke about the cost involved in this scheme and said that the Government would be unable, at least at present, to be interested in such a scheme. A report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board in the United Kingdom stated that from August 1, 1964, to September 30, 1965, there were 1,517 applications and \$368,552 was paid in compensation. Averaged over 12 months, this would be \$315,900. The latest report of this board, referred to in *The Times* of January 20 this year, shows that \$609,296 was paid in compensation to the end of December, 1965, a period of 17 months since the inception of the scheme.

For a period of 12 months the proportion would be \$430,092. As the South Australian population is about one-fiftieth of the population of the United Kingdom, the proportionate compensation figure for this State for a year would be about \$8,600, which is not a large sum. Where injury is suffered by a person in a brawl, the aggressor may be a person of means so that when action is taken a suitable amount of compensation will be recovered, although this does not apply in every case. However, in many cases a person does not suffer injury and no claim will be made to the board for compensation. Obviously this State could meet any claims that might be made from time to time. Assuming that a crime was perpetrated on a person and that person was compensated by the State in respect of the injury suffered, the right of that person to recover from the criminal could be subrogated to the State, enabling the State to pursue the remedy and try to recover from the offender such sum as may be reasonable. Paragraph 71 of the report states:

Once the victim has received compensation from the State his right of action against the offender should be taken over by the State, which should seek to recover a contribution from the offender if it is economically practicable, and only to the extent that it does not impede the offender's rehabilitation.

The member for Mitcham has dealt adequately with the position: he has given cogent reasons why action should be taken by the Government

to introduce legislation that would bring about an effective scheme. This scheme operates in several countries, and I am certain that it will not involve the Government in the payment of large annual sums.

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

MITCHAM BY-LAW: ZONING.

Order of the Day No. 6.

Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 13 of the Corporation of the City of Mitcham in respect of zoning, made on October 4, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on March 1, 1966, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

MURRAY BRIDGE BY-LAW: MOTOR BOATS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

That by-law No. 46 of the Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge, in respect of the control of motor boats and water skis in the Murray River within the limits of the boundary of the Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge, made on July 19, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on June 21, 1966, be disallowed.

(Continued from July 13. Page 480.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): As the Murray Bridge corporation intends to install the necessary buoys, I move:

That this motion be read and discharged.

Motion read and discharged.

FISHING.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): I move:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to inquire into and report upon:

- (a) all aspects of the survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor; and
- (b) the need for any amendments to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, considered necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources, including amendments to provide for licences for master fishermen, part-time commercial fishermen, employee fishermen, amateur fishermen and fish dealers.

At present, regulations demand that vessels of 25ft. and over shall be surveyed every two years, at a cost of \$2 a lineal foot. Those engaged in the industry are claiming that boats of a lesser length should be surveyed. Some go so far as to claim that all commercial fishing craft should be subject to survey.

Another argument advanced is that surveys should be required only once in every three years. Many are alleging that the requirements of the surveys should be varied in order to meet the requirements of the various sections of the industry. For instance it is claimed that the demand for decking is in order for one section of the industry and in another section is most unsatisfactory. Many arguments have been advanced that plastic fuel lines could be accepted, and there are arguments to the contrary.

When the present regulations were brought into force, I was under the impression that the length of 25ft. and over was determined because it was considered that vessels of this dimension would be inclined to employ labour and that this labour should have protection. While I understand that insurance companies insure on conditions at least more favourable on the presentation of a survey certificate, owners of craft 25ft. and over have put forward a case claiming that a craft of 20ft. to 24ft. 10in. unsurveyed, is a strong competitor and is able to compete on a more favourable basis than those compelled to be surveyed.

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

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On the other hand, I have had a strong case put to me that unsurveyed craft are not only the cause of great danger to the users but could cause persons in the industry much loss of time in searches resulting from accidents at sea. In all, I can assure the House that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the industry regarding survey requirements, but from no-one have I had a claim that the industry is opposed to survey. On the contrary, it is accepted as something desirable. Nevertheless, there is a claim that there is need for variation and extensions of the provisions. This in itself is not only important to the economics of the industry but also for the safety of those engaged therein. I think that, to gain a clear picture which will permit the determining of what is required for the economic welfare and the safety of the industry, a Select Committee of this House can do nothing but good. It will inquire into all aspects of survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor. This will permit a report to be made from evidence from all concerned (such as experts in safety requirements, insurance companies and persons engaged in the industry).

Regarding the licences for the various types of fisherman, I am not taking over from the Minister of Agriculture, as it was claimed

recently, but the Government believes that, owing to the great concern in respect to the industry and the varying views in regard to the types of licences (if any) that should be required, this aspect should be added to the duties of the committee, as it affects the same industry and would result in the saving of expenditure for both the Government and the industry. If further explanations are required by the House in regard to the latter aspects of the inquiry, I am confident the Minister of Agriculture will oblige. I assure the House that the reason for the Select Committee is to see that justice is done. We do not want any matter to be dealt with more severely than it should be, and we want to see that the things required are provided. Accordingly, I commend the motion to the House and trust that it will be carried.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1587.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The Bill amends a provision that has become rather obsolete because of the increase in assessments made by the Land Tax Department, and it makes provisions of which I approve; therefore, I shall support it. Members may recall that a couple of weeks ago I gave notice that I would introduce a Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act, and that Bill was designed to do much the same things as this Bill does. When the Minister said that he intended to introduce the Bill, I did not proceed further with my Bill; I decided to wait until I could see the provisions in his Bill. Having seen it, I am satisfied that generally it is a good Bill. Basically, it provides for increases in the limitations of land tax assessments to enable allotments of Crown lands, and for this purpose section 31 of the principal Act is amended.

The other major provision is the amendment of section 220 of the Act. This deals with transfers of land and enables people who hold property with an unimproved value up to \$36,000 to qualify for the transfer of a perpetual lease. I do not know how far back the assessment limitation provision dates, but my first recollection of it was when the limit on unimproved value was \$14,000. I believe that, following the 1960 quinquennial land tax assessment, the limit was increased to \$24,000. The Bill now provides for the limit to be raised from \$24,000 to \$36,000 which increase is, in fact, about the equivalent of

the increase in unimproved land values outside the metropolitan area over that period. Therefore, the increase is fair.

All members would agree that the principle of some limitation is essential. However, I would not suggest that the limitation should be higher than the figure now proposed. There is a qualification relating to transfers providing an overall limitation of 4,000 acres, and this will apply to most areas of the State (for instance, the South-East and Eyre Peninsula). In his second reading explanation, the Minister pointed out that, because of the type of assessment, \$36,000 might allow for the transfer of areas much larger than 4,000 acres. It is difficult to argue the merits of that contention. I raise no objection, but it seems rather anomalous that we should accept land tax assessment as a principle of the Bill and yet have to say that in certain respects land tax assessments are unsatisfactory. I am willing to accept the contention of the Land Board that much larger areas than 4,000 acres would be allowable. Therefore, although it seems a pity that this matter is involved, I raise no particular objection to it.

Quite apart from the Crown Lands Act, the Government's policy is against the issue of freehold titles. It is well known that the policy of the former Government was to issue freehold titles. I strongly support the principle of freehold title, because this State eventually will be handicapped in its agricultural development if no further freeholding is permitted.

The other States that did not allow freeholding (some of them had very tight land tenure provisions) were well behind South Australia in agricultural development. In fact, I think this State has led Australia in that regard. I recall that in Steele Rudd's book *On Our Selection*, which must have been written 60 years ago, there was a passage that lauded the farming ability of South Australians. I believe that we in this State have far more closely realized our agricultural potential than has any other State of Australia. We do not have the natural resources possessed by most of the other States. I believe the area of country in Queensland that has a 20in. rainfall exceeds the total area of South Australia, whereas only about 3 per cent of the total area of South Australia has a 20in. rainfall. Therefore, it can be seen what a colossal potential exists in some of the other States.

On the other hand, Queensland lagged far behind the other States in development, and I believe that was in no small measure due to the

insecure land tenure policies of previous Governments of that State. Now that Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia all have Liberal Governments, I expect that those States will catch up with and probably go ahead of South Australian development. Of course, it is difficult to prove that, and I may be wrong, but that is my impression. I believe the fact that we are restricting the freeholding of land will eventually hinder our development.

I do not wish to imply that South Australia does not still have a big agricultural potential. The pastoral areas, which are mostly held on pastoral leases, probably have more closely reached their full potential than has any other region of the State, and unless something such as desalination becomes practicable or an effective rainfall can be brought about (which, of course, would be far more effective), this potential must be strictly limited. The cereal land, although it is farmed in a much better way than ever before and, although it has widened its rotation with the introduction of legumes and far more sheep and cattle and has higher yields of cereals, still has more potential to be realized.

However, it is in the wetter district (in the South-East and the Upper South-East of the State) where I think the greatest potential still remains. I have frequently quoted the figures of increased stock numbers and production in these areas and, although these increases have been staggering in the last few years, there is clearly far more potential yet to be realized. We know that the scientists are still well ahead of the practical application of research findings. For instance, in the early 1960's, when the average wheat yield in the State was about 22 bushels, wheat crops that were being grown in experimental strips yielded as much as 70 bushels. That indicates just how far ahead small research projects of the farmer can still be. Our cereal varieties were all introduced or bred as being suitable to low-fertility soils, and they have been improved by breeding ever since. Now in many instances we have high fertility soils, and we are naturally looking to higher fertility varieties of wheat from other parts of the world that hitherto have been ignored. Some of these varieties have produced staggering results in small plots. Therefore, I believe that within the next few years our cereal increase will be considerable.

The same will apply to animal production. The whole of Australia now is interested in grazing experiments and in actually seeing just what can be produced from an acre of pasture.

In extremely small experimental areas in parts of South Australia yields of well over 100 lb. of wool to the acre are now being produced on a permanent basis. I have heard of a yield of over 130 lb. of wool to the acre coming from sheep grazing on permanent pastures in South Australia, without the addition of any supplementary feeding whatever. The same sort of work is being done in the Eastern States. I am sure that, although our practical application of these things will be a long way behind the scientists' research, we will still find tremendous room for improvement. Therefore, I think that the South-East and the Upper South-East are the areas with the greatest potential for improvement. Also, the biggest irrigation potential is in the South-East of this State.

I believe that in this respect we need land administration that will allow private enterprise to flourish, and that the restriction of freeholding will be a considerable bar to progress. We all know that there is a difference between perpetual lease and freehold when it comes to borrowing money, for the security of freehold is greater. Interest limitations exist on perpetual lease land. Incidentally, in general I support the principle of interest limitations. Although they are distinct limitations, I acknowledge that there should not be unlimited permission to borrow money. However, whether or not that is good, there is a distinct difference between perpetual lease and freehold, and the former is a distinct handicap. We know that people who perhaps work their lives out on perpetual lease find that their rent can be altered very considerably, yet they have a poorer asset than they would have if they were on freehold country. They suffer also because they can sell only to a limited class of buyer. Many people desire to obtain perpetual lease land but they are disqualified from doing so by the provisions of the Act. If freeholding were allowed, these sales could take place, and I consider that they would help the progress of the State considerably. I sound the warning that our rural progress may be hindered eventually by this Government's policy of not permitting the freeholding of Crown land.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is getting away somewhat from the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am merely summarizing what I have said.

The SPEAKER: I know that. I have been waiting for the honourable member to connect his remarks with the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If we have to confine ourselves to such narrow limits as the clauses of the Bill and if we cannot mention freeholding in connection with land administration, is that not rather restrictive?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the honourable member can say that I have not allowed him to continue. I think the debate has proceeded on a fairly wide scale. I am merely asking the honourable member to have regard to the Bill before the House. I am not ruling on a point of order. I merely want to keep the debate to the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to the Crown Lands Act which is as wide as the horizons of heaven.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I would have finished before now if you had not called me to order, Mr. Speaker. I was simply summarizing what I had said. I support the Bill as far as it goes but I protest against the Government's policy on freeholding. I say in conclusion that I hope you will not rule out of order further reference to the freehold tenure of land during this debate.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I hope you will not so rule against me, Mr. Speaker. One would be completely handicapped in attempting to discuss this Bill if reference could be made only to the clauses. It is necessary to mention freeholding because of the difficulties that the Bill overcomes. I support the measure. If an estate consists of both freehold land and leasehold land and the landholder wishes to acquire more leasehold land, the combined unimproved land values are used in assessing whether the total value is more than \$24,000 and so in determining whether further leasehold land can be added. Therefore, freehold cannot be separated from leasehold in a consideration of the measure.

The Bill removes an anomaly that has arisen because the increase in land values has rendered the amount of \$24,000 completely unrealistic. The Government, to its credit, has recognized this by introducing the amendment. I remember a case where an area of land in an estate had been assessed for succession duty purposes and it was necessary for the people concerned to sell part of the land in order to pay these duties. The land comprised both freehold and leasehold land and only a small area was to be sold to meet the

duties. The people concerned did not wish to sell more than they had to dispose of in order to meet the duties.

However, these people could not dispose of it to people with contiguous land and the area was too small for anyone to hold as a single entity. The portion of land could not be disposed of, even though surrounding landholders who held both freehold and leasehold land, or all leasehold land, wished to buy it. They were prevented from buying by the limitation of an unimproved value of \$24,000. This Bill will prevent such cases arising in the future.

People in South Australia, as the member for Alexandra said, have learnt the art of building the fertility of the land and, therefore, of making the land more valuable and thereby increasing its unimproved value. That process is still going on. A maximum production of 30 bushels an acre was considered a peak crop in some areas of South Australia at one time but that land, after 70 or 80 years of wheat cropping, has been producing far more because of the application of scientific knowledge, good husbandry and good farm working. The fertility of the land has been improved and it is producing not only more wheat, but better wheat. As a result, the land has become more valuable and, as the land tax assessment based on unimproved value has increased, the limitation in the principal Act has become more obsolete. This Bill remedies that anomaly, and I am all in favour of that.

In many areas of the Lower North, such as Salters Springs, Merildin and Rochester, a 60-bushel crop, which is a 15-bag crop, in a good year is no longer considered something to chalk up. The land is strong, but its natural inherent fertility was not sufficiently strong to permit such production. Fertility was achieved by the adoption of scientific methods of production and the intelligent working of the soil by the farmer. Increased production has meant increased land values and an obstacle has thereby arisen.

I agree with the rather clever delineation of the areas, as shown on the map on the board. It is a wise provision. There is also provision here for the amount relating to Crown lands to increase from \$10,000 to \$15,000. I admit that that applies to what I may call virgin Crown lands—the first allotment of Crown lands. That, too, is a feature I can support, although I have doubts about the restriction to 4,000 acres in some country. It has been suggested that 4,000 acres will carry

4,000 to 6,000 sheep. Some areas of 4,000 acres will do that comfortably, but some will not.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: There may be some land in it that cannot be cleared.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes; there is land that cannot be cleared. What we sometimes come up against in legislating for something is that we tend to get a fixed figure. It is difficult to overcome that, but 4,000 acres of land can be virgin Crown land or land just cleared and, although ultimately it will probably be able to support that number of sheep, for many years in the building-up process, which is difficult in some of these areas and much slower than on the heavier soils, it need not necessarily carry that number of sheep. Perhaps it will not for many years, but 4,000 to 6,000 sheep will certainly provide a living area. If the land will not carry them, it means that 4,000 acres need not be a living area. I shall not intrude that now with the object of trying to amend this Bill; I do not intend to do anything of the sort. I am pleased with the Bill but I commend this point to the Minister. Perhaps he will ask the Land Board to look at it again. I know from my experience of the members of the Land Board that the wise men from the East have nothing on them, in many respects: they are good at their job, they are fair, impartial and understanding, and the State owes much to those men. I am prepared to leave it at that. I understand that the Minister says he can answer that. I wish sometimes the Minister would answer these things and not force us to ask questions. I think 4,000 acres can be an unreasonable limitation in some areas but, generally, I am pleased with this legislation. It is needed but, like the Minister, I think there are circumstances in which the Government could relax the restriction on the freeholding of these lands, lands that come under review everywhere.

As I have mentioned here previously, there are big areas in South Australia under ancient perpetual leases with practically peppercorn rentals, bearing no relation to the rentals that would be charged today and could be asked for land being allotted today; but I would not approve of people paying any altered amount for those leases, if that was possible, unless there were big areas in South Australia where higher rentals could and would willingly be paid. Of course, a few disgruntled people would raise their voices in alarm. However, there is much land attracting a high rental mainly because of the work of the people and

the close settlement of the country, but I would not agree to any alteration in those leases unless at the same time the owners were given the right to freehold their land. In that way they would be able to decide what to do, in view of the higher rent being charged. They should be given the opportunity to freehold the land, and they could choose between the two alternatives themselves. That would be fair and reasonable, because they would have to pay a substantial amount of money to freehold those areas. They could accept a rise in the cost of the leasehold, with the right of freeholding it, and they could make that decision themselves. That would be fair. Of course they all pay land tax and bear the appreciation in land tax.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Not all of them.

Mr. QUIRKE: I believe the Minister is right, because from the figures I saw from the drier areas in the last assessment, the tax did not increase at all; in fact, in some cases it was reduced, which I am certain was a mistake.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Some under perpetual lease do not pay any land tax at all.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. Those are things that can be adjusted later. I do not wish to victimize anybody; neither do I want to see one section of the landholding community holding land where the costs are high, while another piece of land, just because its owner's ancestors "came over in the *Mayflower*", has an advantage. There should be a reasonable adjustment there somehow. I support the general principles embodied in this Bill and hope that the House approves of them.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I, too, support this Bill. The second reading explanation of the Minister was a skilfully drafted document. I am referring to the fact that it tends to place a different construction on the Bill from what I read into it—not that I disapprove of what I read into it. For instance, I heartily approve of the fact that the Minister has agreed to a substantial increase in the limitation on the value of land for this purpose, perhaps more than the member for Alexandra would have asked for, but there is also this question of acreage which, in a large measure, rules that increase out, except in some areas. My attention was drawn to the county of Cardwell. It was stated that some acres of land are worth more than the present unimproved value. Naturally, this assessment was made by taking account of the price for which this land was being sold. It is realized that people place a much higher value on it than the Land Tax Department does. But

there are areas (for instance, in the mallee) where there are 4,000 acres under perpetual and marginal lease. That land will not produce anything like what can be obtained from 4,000 acres of this other type of country.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Some of it could be under the marginal land scheme.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Much of this area does come under the Marginal Lands Act as far as development is concerned. Unfortunately, it is true that even some anomalies will arise. One thing that always perturbs me about Crown lands is this. Assume a successful farmer wants to reinvest money, which he has made from his property, in land. Obviously, he will not have this money unless he is a man in a big way, but if he wants to take out developmental land he cannot obtain land under perpetual lease.

On the other hand, because the Act does not apply to assets in the city, the professional or city businessman can do, without restriction, what the farmer would like to do. This is an important issue. A farmer must treat farming as a business, otherwise he will be on the rocks, and he should have sufficient latitude and margin to work on to allow for exigencies that occur from area to area at different times. Why is it wrong for a successful farmer to be able to expand? He can buy freehold land but he cannot take up any Crown land. I can take up land for my son and develop it, because I am not a big landholder, but I cannot do it until he is 18 years old because until then land cannot be held in his name. If I were a person holding 4,000 acres or land to an unimproved value of \$36,000, I could not provide for the future of my children unless I bought freehold land. The Minister's second reading explanation was skilfully drafted, as it seemed that concessions were being granted, but when it was examined, the restrictions cancelled out the concessions.

Mr. Hughes: What size holdings should there be?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not specifying any, but there should be a base from which to start. There should never be less than a living area, but a man should not be restricted to a living area if he is competent and successful. Often, we have the example of two adjoining farmers: one makes a bare living but the other is successful. Why hold back the successful farmer?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You must not be successful in this world!

Mr. NANKIVELL: Apparently one must not be successful at farming, and this is a principle that we have to accept. I thank the Minister or the Land Board for the one important exception of the exemption of Counties Chandos and Buckingham from this restriction. This is a concession to some people. The land is to be made available preferentially (with which I agree) to adjoining landholders to develop in conjunction with their properties, if they can satisfy the Land Board that they are competent, have sufficient money to do the job, and are willing to do the work according to prescribed standards. I agree with this idea, but this is a special exception being made in order to enable people holding land to develop more land. It is the only exception. Why cannot the principle apply in other cases?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can answer that yourself. This is different.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Not entirely different. I am being fair and realistic, because I know what it will cost to develop this and other areas.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is why we are doing it in this instance.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I hope people will have the capital. I am pleased to see that provision is made for this land to be developed, and that if sufficient people of the necessary category were not available then others would be given an opportunity. No other restrictions exist on the land (and that is a good thing) except that no further subdivision is permitted. I quibble with the principle of a certain type of development being allowed in one area but not another, and I cannot see why there should be any distinction. I disagree with the principle of the allocation of Crown land to any person who can develop it, whereas a freeholder with certain areas is not entitled to develop land. I am satisfied that the Bill will achieve its purpose, and I am happy that one exception has been made for a particular area with which I am concerned. My one hope is that we can find sufficient farmers adjoining this area with sufficient capital and confidence to develop this land, and to take advantage of this opportunity, so that we shall not have to depend on outside capital to develop it.

Mr. Quirke: Don't you think the land is a type that necessitates special treatment?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It will, but when it is developed properly it will have reasonably good production: that has been proved.

Mr. Quirke: And also blow over the border.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We are going to ensure by future amendments to the Act that this does not happen. However, that is not relevant to the transfer of land and the ability to aggregate. At least this is one place where one can aggregate for a special purpose, although it is not possible to do so with Crown land in other places. Except for that one reservation I have mentioned, I support the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I thank honourable members who have contributed to this debate and also thank them for their support of the Bill. Initially, I was going to pay a tribute to the Director of Lands and the Chairman and members of the Land Board for their part in drawing up this Bill, but the member for Burra has beaten me to the punch, and rightly so. I realize that, as a predecessor of mine, he can acknowledge the value of these officers who spent much time and gave much thought to what was a difficult proposition. Honourable members have said that this is a good Bill, but it was only produced after much hard work. The people to whom I have referred were responsible for this work, and I should like to commend them for what they did. Both the members for Burra and Albert questioned the restriction on the area that could be held. Whilst this restriction exists, section 225 of the Crown Lands Act provides that the Land Board can exercise its judgment in areas where there is doubt about whether the 4,000 acres is sufficient for a living area. Section 225 (4) of the Crown Lands Act provides:

Notwithstanding anything in this section, the board may recommend, and the Commissioner may consent to, the transfer or subletting of any lands suitable only for pastoral purposes, if the effect thereof will not be to increase the holding of the proposed transferee or sublessee, under any tenure, to land which is capable of carrying more than 5,000 sheep . . .

Then it deals with lands previously (according to the Act) situated wholly or partly outside Goyder's line, which now, of course, has been altered slightly, as shown on the map displayed on the notice board. However, it will have the same effect, except in regard to land outside the hundreds specified in the schedule.

I take it that is the type of land to which the honourable member referred.

Mr. Nankivell: It is farming country and it is accepted as farming country that grows much grain.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Land Board can use its discretion in this matter. The board is a continuing authority; it is not subject to change or to any influence from the Minister. The only thing the Minister can do in respect of the board's recommendations is either to approve or not approve them; he cannot vary a recommendation. Indeed, since I have been the Minister of Lands, I have never had cause to be at variance with the board's opinion on any matter. I am sure that if the member for Albert has any doubts in this matter they can be resolved by the experience, knowledge and judgment of the Land Board which, I believe, has always been perfectly fair in its administration of the Crown Lands Act. Criticism of the Government's policy in regard to freeholding has been made in this debate, the matter having also been referred to in the Budget debate.

Whilst it may be considered that restrictions may apply in regard to people not being able to re-invest in land money they have earned from the land, I point out that 14,000,000 acres in this State is under freehold tenure and only 20,000,000 under perpetual lease. The member for Alexandra referred to the fact that banks sometimes will not lend money on land because the tenure is not freehold, but perpetual lease. That is a fallacy, because perpetual lease virtually offers the same type of tenure as freehold offers.

Mr. Nankivell: But the bank cannot hold the title and therefore there can be no security.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A bank manager can easily say that because the land is on perpetual lease and not freehold the bank cannot lend money.

Mr. Quirke: That is being broken down a bit today.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That may be so, but I believe that that excuse is used by bank managers as a polite way of saying, "We do not think it is a proposition."

Mr. Rodda: Do you think the banks will alter that policy henceforth?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They know as well as the honourable member and I what perpetual lease means. If the proposition put to the bank is not considered economical, it is often a nice way out for the bank officer concerned to say, "We cannot look at this; you've

got only a perpetual lease." I think that excuse is sometimes used when it should not be used.

Mr. Nankivell: Are you going to amend the Trustee Act for this purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall not do anything further at the moment. I am happy that honourable members who have spoken to the Bill have supported it, for it justifies the work that went into the measure in order to try to arrive at a solution in the best interests of all landholders in this State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Conditions of surrender."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister say whether the reference in this clause to Goyder's line of rainfall is the only official reference to it in the Statute Book?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Although I am not sure about that, I think I know why the honourable member has asked the question, for I think it would be a pity to lose from the Statutes a name in this State as famous as Goyder. However, I should imagine this Act would contain the only reference to it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I was wondering whether you intended to christen the Eleventh Schedule with another name.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although that is not intended, I could not think of a better name than Goyder to suit the purpose.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 and 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1965.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As the Treasurer said in his explanation, the Bill has three main objects. It is designed to increase stamp duty substantially to bring extra taxation into the Treasury to the extent of \$1,350,000 in a full year. I regret the alleged necessity for increasing these charges. I remind honourable members that it is not only by increasing the unit charge that the Government receives additional revenue from stamp duties. We know that over a number of years there has been a continuing rise in the prices of articles which would come within the

ambit of this legislation. These increased prices themselves have brought substantial increases in Government revenue through this measure of taxation. It is not correct to think that only by raising the particular rates of taxation does the Government's revenue increase by this means. With continuing inflation, as we have in our economy, the Government receives each year through this means an increased amount of stamp duty.

I find it difficult to follow the drafting of the Bill and its application to the principal Act. I believe the Treasurer will be asked to explain some of the clauses when the Bill is in its Committee stage. It seems that the Bill introduces a new principle into the Act. Whereas at present stamp duties apply compulsorily to receipts for amounts over \$50, the Bill provides for two types of receipt. A new responsibility is to be added in that duty stamps are to be placed on receipts for sums of \$10 to \$50 given upon request. On the one side there is a compulsory system for duty stamps on receipts for amounts of \$50 and over, and on the other side there is to be a request system. I believe this will cause some confusion and I am quite sure that members of the business community and individuals who are involved in this matter will not know the fine distinction between the compulsory and voluntary systems.

I also regret that, at a stage when South Australia is going through a somewhat difficult trading period and is endeavouring to foster the tempo of commerce and industry, we are levying an additional charge of \$1,350,000 a year on the business community. The public must realize that what they get from the Government they will pay for. The fact that, in its financial management, the Government last year increased its expenditure by 8.8 per cent whilst its income increased by 6.6 per cent means that inevitably we shall have the type of increase in charges that we are now considering.

Mr. McKee: Do you think it will affect age pensioners?

Mr. HALL: I think the member for Port Pirie could do better than bring that subject into the debate. However, I believe this will affect all members of the community to some degree as these charges will undoubtedly be passed on to the consuming public. Therefore, age pensioners will receive that much less value in whatever they purchase because of the increased taxation.

Mr. Clark: You are not against this Bill?

Mr. HALL: Although I am not going to vote against it, I am certainly not enthusiastic about it. The people of South Australia will eventually realize that they will foot the bill as long as the present Government is in power. This is one of the truths they will have to realize, and they will realize it where it hurts: in the hip pocket nerve. This Bill is more or less supplementary to the Budget, because it is designed to gather taxation revenue that has already been allowed for in expenditures in the Budget. The increase provided in the Bill in most instances will be as much as 50 per cent. I had figures of this but, fortunately for members opposite, I cannot place my hands on them now. Because of the complicated financial arrangements involved in the Bill, it will have to be considered in detail, clause by clause. I regret its introduction and I regret the fact that charges are to be increased to such an extent. I look forward to obtaining more information from the Treasurer in the Committee stage.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): As usual, the Bill is so bad that one does not need any notes to get steamed up about it. The whole idea of having receipts is outmoded in the modern world. About 20 or 30 years ago it was the general procedure to cross out "or bearer" on a cheque and write in "order". It was also the practice to endorse one's name on the back of a cheque so that the bank clerk could check it easily. However, gradually people became more progressive and accepted a not negotiable cheque as a receipt. We now have the extraordinary situation where receipts are compulsory for amounts of more than \$50, and voluntary for amounts from \$10 to \$50. Under the voluntary system a person can demand a receipt if he wants it but the person giving the receipt will have to pay the 2c duty. I cannot see any justification for that. If a person is so old-fashioned and careful that he wants a receipt he should have to pay the 2c. However, the whole system of having both a compulsory and a voluntary levy is extraordinary.

Mr. McKee: What about people who pay in cash—wouldn't they want a receipt?

Mr. McANANEY: If people pay in cash, perhaps they need a receipt. It is slipshod to make the issue of a receipt in one instance compulsory whereas in another instance it is not compulsory, for people will be confused about what they are required to do. We have a recession in South Australia, and car sales

have been reduced, yet this Government is increasing stamp duty on hire-purchase transactions and loans from moneylenders. Nearly all motor cars are bought on hire-purchase now. The Government is shrieking out that the Commonwealth Government should give the motor industry a boost, yet it is inflicting an extra tax on nearly every person who wants to buy a motor car in South Australia. How can we give the economy here a boost if we restrict the very thing that needs a boost?

By taking money from the individual and spending it, the Government does not create any additional demand for labour or assist the economy. This State is still sound and healthy and, if the people had confidence in the Government, industry would regain confidence and things would brighten up. I cannot quite follow the increase in stamp duty on conveyances. The Treasurer said that the figure of \$12,000 had been chosen so that conveyances of modest house properties in South Australia would be stamped at the low rate of \$1.25 for each \$100 or part thereof. I concede the point he made. However, I question why a person should pay more in duty on the purchase of a business. This is a penalty to a person buying a business, such as a farm. Perhaps when a big business purchases something it can well afford to pay the high rate of duty, and in any event it can pass on the extra charge in the increased price of its products.

I agree with the Leader that if the Government wants to increase expenditure on so-called free books and things like that it must have the money to do so. However, if in the process of levying taxes the Government slows down the economy, it only makes matters worse, and that is possibly where this Government has got into the most trouble since it has been in office. As a result of the slowing down of the economy, there have not been so many transactions, and that is why collections from stamp duty last year were so much below what the Government expected. Until the Government can get the economy going again and people are prepared to spend again, and until the Government can get normal taxation collections, an increase in taxation will mean that the law of diminishing returns will apply because there will be a dampening rather than a boosting of the economy.

I oppose the increase in stamp duties. If the Government wants to extend its activities so that it can hand things out to people, it should be careful that in levying that duty it

does not slow down the economy and obtain less taxation as a result.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I am not very happy about this legislation, which increases stamp duty payable on receipts and on conveyances of property. Last year a Bill introduced into this House provided for an increase in the stamp duty payable on cheques. I still have a vivid recollection that that increase was substantial, for the duty was raised from 3d. to 5c—a 100 per cent increase. According to the Treasurer's second reading explanation of the Bill last year, the increase in duty on cheques was expected to increase revenue by \$900,000 in a full year. As the Government must have had a substantial increase in revenue from that source, I consider it is going a little too far in these additional imposts.

As I understand the Bill, it will be necessary for receipts issued for sums between \$10 and \$50 to carry an adhesive duty stamp of 2c. Such receipts would have to be issued if requested. For receipts for payments of amounts of \$50 and upwards the duty is to remain at 5c, but such receipts are compulsory. Considerable confusion may arise in the minds of the public about what is necessary, because in one case it is not compulsory to issue a receipt unless it is requested whereas in the other case the issuing of a receipt is compulsory. No doubt the Government has in mind to try out another place once more, for I believe that last year when the Bill was introduced for increased stamp duty in respect of receipts certain of its provisions were not acceptable to another place. A conference ensued, and the present legislation in respect of issuing receipts and the stamp duty payable thereon resulted.

The other important provision in this Bill deals with the stamp duty payable on conveyances. As the Treasurer has said in the second reading explanation, the stamp duty payable on the transfer of property has not been increased for a long time, but I remind him that the value of property has increased considerably, in some cases tenfold. Therefore, the Government is receiving increased stamp duties.

This Bill seeks to impose an increase of 25 per cent in the stamp duty payable on transfers or conveyances of property if the value of that property is less than \$12,000. However, the present rate is increased by 50 per cent in relation to the transfer of properties valued at \$12,000 or more. That is a considerable increase, bearing in mind the large increase

that has taken place in property values in the last 10 or 15 years. Many properties affected by this increase are primary producers' properties. The stamp duty payable in respect of some of those transactions will be considerable. Clause 3 provides:

This Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by the Governor by proclamation.

I realize that the Government has the numbers in this Chamber and that the measure will be passed. The Treasurer may tell the House when he replies to this debate whether that proclamation is likely to be made at an early date if the Bill becomes law. I suggest that the proclamation be deferred for a reasonable time, because many pending transactions will not be finalized for some weeks because of the time it takes to obtain signatures and lodge the necessary documents. It would be unfair to the people concerned if increased duty had to be paid in respect of transactions now pending.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I shall not oppose this measure, but I shall give my reasons for objecting to it. We, as an Opposition, have not the numbers to do anything about the Bill.

Mr. Langley: What about when we were on the other side? That is not a good line of argument.

Mr. HEASLIP: We are here today and, although we oppose this measure and object to it, the people of South Australia have elected a Labor Government and that Government has seen fit to introduce this Bill. The will of the people is bringing about these increases and, although we can say what we think, we cannot prevent them. In my opinion, it would be futile to call for a division, because we could not win it.

Mr. Langley: What happened before?

Mr. HEASLIP: The same thing.

Mr. Clark: You might try adopting this attitude to all our legislation. That would be a big help.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is our right to say what we think. A conference between the Houses was held on the stamp duties legislation last year. I attended that conference, and agreement was reached that there would not be any stamp duty on receipts for less than \$50. After 12 months the Government, because of mismanagement and misdirection of money, sees fit to tax the people 2c on receipts for amounts between \$10 and \$50, although I admit that this duty is payable only when a receipt is demanded. Although the issue of a receipt may be said to be voluntary, why does the Government bring

it in? The Government has not spent money wisely and now, when it is in financial difficulties, it sees fit to impose this additional tax after 12 months.

The stamp duty payable on conveyances is more important. The duty payable will be \$1.25 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 when the total value of a property does not exceed \$12,000. This is an additional charge of 25c for every \$100. Where a property exceeds \$12,000 in value, for every \$100 or fraction or part thereof we will pay \$1.50, which is a 50 per cent increase. I do not know why, after a conference held 12 months ago, the Government now finds it necessary to increase costs by 50 per cent to those people conveying their land or property to their sons or daughters, or selling it. Does this mean that the cost of Government has increased by 50 per cent? Where has the money gone?

Mrs. Steele: We would all like to know that.

Mr. Langley: Your speech has gone up by 50 per cent, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: Unfortunately, I cannot go to a department and draw blood out of a stone—but the Government can, and does. We on this side cannot raid trust funds—we would be in gaol if we did. Have the Government's estimates been so bad that it has had to increase this taxation? This is an increased cost to the people of South Australia. While I shall not oppose this Bill, because I know we cannot win in any case, I express my opposition to it. It will not help South Australia; it is dragging it down more and more. I have been accused time and again of writing down South Australia. I have not. I am trying to be a realist. I know that the first thing to do when in difficulty is to cut costs, but all that the Government is doing is increasing taxation.

Mr. Ryan: You are increasing your prices, and it is all right.

Mr. HEASLIP: We are in a minority and have no say in it.

Mr. Lawn: You are charging more for your printing, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: Earlier today I tried to point out that we would lose as a State if we did not bring the railways to the capital city or cater for our industries. Here, we are penalizing industry and everybody in South Australia.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: This record is "top of the pops", isn't it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I could go on saying it over and over again, but I am not imagining it; it is real.

Mr. Ryan: How would you know about the farmer's problems?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not boast about anything, but I think I know about them.

Mr. Ryan: You merely represent a primary producing district, don't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Port Adelaide asks, "What do I know about primary production?"

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a little wide of the subject.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think it is, too, but when something is thrown into the ring like that, I take exception to it. If there is anybody in this House who knows anything about primary production (I have spent all my life at it) I think I do. Members opposite are "stamp-dutying" me out.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to maintain order. The member for Rocky River.

Mr. HEASLIP: I brought children into this world. I am responsible for them and whatever I have accumulated by hard work during my life-time I hope to pass on to them. I have made money only in order to be responsible for my children, but this measure will not allow me to. I am taxed when conveying my land which was passed on to me by my parents and which I expanded later. The best primary producers are those who have been reared and educated in the country and are the children of people in the country. We want to pass on to our children what we have accumulated. This iniquitous 50 per cent increase in tax on transfers of land from parents to children is socialistic, proposed by a Socialist Government. We cannot defeat the measure, but I express my opposition to it.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): At a time when we have been looking to the Government to introduce a measure to inspire confidence in the business community and create greater employment in this State, not only have we had a Bill concerned with dog racing but now we have a Bill to increase stamp duty on business transactions—the very opposite of what we have been looking for. If anything is designed deliberately to curtail or slow down activity and to weaken confidence, it is this Bill. What does it do? It makes a direct impost on any transaction between \$10 and \$50.

The history of this matter makes interesting reading. Last year the Government introduced a Bill that imposed stamp duty, on a sliding scale, on all receipts of \$10 and upwards.

That measure subsequently passed through this House, despite protests from this side, and then it went to another place, where it was amended. Then there was a conference of managers from which came the compromise that has been in operation ever since. All items of \$50 or part thereof must have a duty stamp affixed, and this is compulsory. The Treasurer said that this Bill was designed on the basis of 2c for amounts between \$10 and \$50. He said that deliberately, and that the Government intends to overcome the position that prevailed last year. The Government failed last year because of the outcry by the business community, by housewives, and by the ordinary people of the State against the proposed savage impost. Because of the protest, the other House refused the Government its point, and a compromise was reached in which everything above \$50 would be subject to stamp duty tax.

The Government again introduces the measure to try and catch the unsuspecting public. In explaining the Bill, and in trying to justify it, the Treasurer said that the Government would be losing \$100,000. Members will recall that when the Stamp Duty Bill was debated last year one provision doubled the duty on cheques: it had been 3d. a cheque, but the Bill provided that it should be 6d. (or 5c) a cheque. It was pointed out that not only business men and employers used cheques but, because of the change in social circumstances and the promotion by savings banks of the use of cheques, many ordinary people used cheque books, and they would be slugged.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It was to bring in \$900,000 a year.

Mr. COUNBE: Yes, that is what the Treasurer said when explaining the Bill last year, but for a half-year the increase would be about \$300,000. What did the Auditor-General reveal about this?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He did not support the Treasurer's remarks.

Mr. COUNBE: Of course not. The Auditor-General is unbiased and presents a correct picture of the affairs of the State to this House. He said that stamp duty on cheques for the part of the year had increased by about \$665,000—not the \$300,000 that the Premier had estimated. The increase was more than double. For about half the year the people of South Australia were slugged an additional \$665,000 over and above the previous year. The Treasurer estimates that this Bill will increase the duties payable on receipts by

about \$100,000, but I am sure that it will be more than that if the provisions of the Bill are observed.

At present everyone has to put a stamp on a receipt of \$50 or more, whether the receipt is asked for or not. The silly part is that, whether a person asks for a receipt or not, the receipt has to be made out, stamped and placed in a file, and then perhaps forgotten. An inspector may demand to see it later, but the receipt must be made out whether the purchaser wants the receipt or not. It is voluntary now for the issuing of receipts, but if a person purchased goods worth more than \$10 and asked for a receipt he would have to be given one. What has been wrong with the position that obtained up to now? It was arrived at after a consultation between both Houses when a limit of \$50 was decided upon.

The Treasurer is using this Bill as a device to overcome the point on which he was defeated last year. What excuses can the Treasurer have for the rate provided in the Bill, as well as the increased duty on conveyances and other measures? Because other States have a higher rate of duty than this State, is that any reason why we should immediately raise our rates? We are entitled to have a mind of our own and to think for ourselves, and people should be given some incentive to create employment, and to produce goods more cheaply so that they can be sold, thus creating more employment. I said that this Bill did not create one iota of confidence in the Government, or more employment in this State: rather it is a bar.

I object to the specious reasoning that because other States have a higher rate of taxation than we have, we should raise our rate of taxation: that is a weak argument for a financial measure of this kind. I protest as vehemently as I can against this imposition, which is an extra charge on the people of this State and on the business community. It will not only fall on the business community but on every man and woman, as most purchases made in this State by ordinary men and women are under \$50.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What about hire-purchase agreements?

Mr. COUMBE: They will be reduced. This imposition will hit the ordinary man and not the big businessman, as the Government confidently believes it will. I believe the people of this State are tired of having added burdens of taxation introduced from one week to another. We have been waiting to hear of something

that will create more employment, but this Bill will only add a further impost. I oppose the measure.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I thought that, this matter having been dealt with last session, it was now behind us. We are now apparently loading the people with an impost of about \$1,350,000 (mainly from conveyances, etc.) together with the \$900,000 imposed last session, totalling \$2,250,000. Added to that, of course, is whatever is derived from the stamp duty on receipts made out for sums between \$10 and \$50. That is an imponderable, because we do not know how many people will demand receipts, but it will be a heavy impost nevertheless. The member for Torrens suggested that further jobs would be created, but I am inclined to think vacancies will be created. We cannot take over \$2,000,000 out of an economy and place it in the State's coffers without affecting the State's overall economic position.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Does it stay in the State's coffers?

Mr. SHANNON: If the money were spent on productive works, thereby benefiting the State, it might not be so bad. At the moment, however, money is being spent in ways that will not profit the Government. I should have preferred to see more developmental works undertaken. For instance, if we could encourage more industry to establish in South Australia, thereby creating more wealth for the general public, it would be more beneficial.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It depends on your definition of wealth.

Mr. SHANNON: It is the sum total of the profits made by the people in the State, over and above their expenditure. That is the only wealth that can be accumulated. A man in private industry quickly learns that if he does not make a margin of profit he soon goes out of business. Even the ordinary man working for a living and helping someone else make a profit knows that he must live within his income and that, if he does not, he is in trouble. The impost created by this Bill is unreasonable. I do not think any justification exists for increasing by 50 per cent charges on transactions that will fall most heavily on people who have inherited an estate. These days, properties are mainly held tightly, transfers occurring only when an estate falls into administration because of a death. That is where we find most of the income will be derived and where the people to be hit will be those who have inherited estates.

We have already had a go at these people; I suppose we are entitled to have another go, but there seems to be no end to our attempts to suck a little more blood from the various sources at the State's disposal. Although last year's attempt was largely abortive, I believe these imposts tend to create in the minds of people a sense of futility, especially when people are trying to obtain something for themselves and to build up an asset that will at least keep them off the dole that many people abhor. Some people in my district would not put out their hand for a pension; they say it is beneath their dignity, although they are probably entitled to it. Drawing a pension is something that some self-respecting people do their best to avoid at all costs. However, this legislation may discourage many people in that regard. I do not know why the Government has decided to extract this form of taxation from the man who issues a receipt for \$10 to \$50. After all, \$50 is not a large sum.

The Government is supposed to be the small man's friend, comforter and guide, yet it is responsible for this legislation. I thought the conference held last session in connection with this matter would have cut some ice, because the duty on receipts for \$50 and upwards was increased by 5c. That seemed genuine Labor

policy, but I cannot understand its policy to have a bite at the little fellow. I suppose that in proportion there are 100 smaller transactions to only one one transaction involving \$50 or more. The number of receipts will certainly be greatly increased on the previous number involving sums of \$50 or more. They are not good Labor tactics, although I may be wrong. Unlike some of my colleagues on this side, I intend not only to express my opposition to the Bill but also to vote according to my attitude towards it.

I oppose the Bill because it is unwarranted and will create even more difficulties in the employment of people in this State. This is one of the effects that we are suffering through a desire to catch up with the Joneses living across our eastern borders. We certainly cannot compete with our neighbours in the Eastern States if such imposts are to be added to the disabilities that South Australia suffers because of its geographical situation. Until we realize that, South Australia's industrial and commercial life will continue to regress.

Mr. HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 6, at 2 p.m.