

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Tuesday, November 23, 1954.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

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

Read a third time and passed.

**STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

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

Its object is to exempt hospital and medical benefit organizations registered under the National Health Act from payment of duty on receipts given to contributors. Under the Stamp Duties Act receipts for subscriptions to friendly societies are exempt from stamp duty, but receipts for subscriptions to these other benefit associations, which resemble friendly societies in many respects, are charged with duty. The Mutual Hospitals Association has recently asked the Government that receipts given to contributors by the association should be exempt. The association pointed out that it was a non-profit organization, and was making every effort to reduce costs so that the benefits to its contributors could be increased. It asked for exemption from the stamp duty in order to assist it in this endeavour. The Government investigated this request, and came to the conclusion that all medical or hospital benefit organizations in the State which are registered under the Commonwealth National Health Act should be exempted from paying duty on receipts given to contributors. These are non-profit organizations and in the opinion of the Government have the same claim to exemption as friendly societies. The Bill accordingly makes the amendments to the principal Act which are required in order to provide for the exemption.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2.)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 18. Page 1420).

The Hon. E. ANTHONY (Central No. 2)—The introduction of the Budget prior to the advent of uniform taxation was always an event of wide public interest; business people, public servants and, indeed, every section of the community were very interested to watch the

endeavours of the Government to reach financial equilibrium and to produce a balanced budget, preferably of course, with a surplus if that were possible. Since the adoption of uniform taxation this public interest has almost entirely evaporated largely because we know that the financial shortcomings of the State will be met by a paternal Federal Government on the recommendation of the Grants Commission. While there are some comforting features about the system of Commonwealth grants to the States, there are also some disquieting ones. One is that South Australia is deprived of its powers of taxation and thereby is no longer a true partner in Federation, but merely an annex. That is the objection from a constitutional point of view and from the point of view of an independent sovereign State that I have to the present form of uniform taxation. Much could be said for and against the system. It is convenient for State Treasurers to be able to have their liabilities met by the Commonwealth Government, but from a purely independent State point of view this aspect of uniform taxation is not encouraging. This was mentioned by the Treasurer in his Budget speech. The advantages which should come to a State like South Australia because of its increased population and expanding economy could not be properly taken advantage of because, under the Commonwealth formula, it is determined by the Grants Commission that only a state of complete balance can be recommended.

The Treasurer rightly stated that owing to those facts it did not matter very much just what progress the State made or how buoyant its finances, it was prevented from expanding as it would if standing on its own feet, because it was limited by the recommendations of the Grants Commission. I do not disagree that if a State records a surplus in any one year that surplus should not be applied to meet a deficit made in another year. That is good finance and a practice which was always indulged in by the States long before Federation. I do not like the term "mendicant" applied to the claimant States. None of these claimant States can make any progress except at the whim of an agent of the Commonwealth Government in the form of the Grants Commission. In the last few years, with increased population and advance in industry, we would have been in a far better position and free from the shackles of the Commonwealth and standing on our own feet if we had control of our own taxation. The State being deprived of levying its own taxation and thereby being dependent upon an

outside body, namely, the Commonwealth Parliament, has a moral effect not only upon the State Government, but I think upon the whole community. It teaches them more or less to lean upon the Commonwealth Government, and it must affect the actions of our Ministers. Many protests have been made by State Premiers in regard to the breach of faith by the Commonwealth Government in not restoring to the States their taxation powers after the cessation of hostilities as promised, but as far as I am aware there has been no concerted action by them to induce the Commonwealth Government to honour its promise.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The present Prime Minister said that he would hand back taxation powers to the States but this State has taken no action?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I think our Treasurer has made very strong overtures to have taxation powers restored to this State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—If we had our own taxing powers we would be worse off financially.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—That is the honourable member's opinion, but it is not mine. In view of our expansion in the last few years and the possibility of future expansion we would be infinitely better off standing on our own feet free from Commonwealth shackles. Protests have been made to the Commonwealth Government, but whether they had real substance I do not know. I am not aware of any concerted action by the State Premiers in the claimant States to the Commonwealth Government that it should make good its promise that their taxation powers would be returned.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Because they know they are on a better wicket under the present system.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—All I know is that no definite action has been taken by the Premiers to get the Commonwealth to honour its promises. This Budget is no different from others. It is an estimate, and it is most difficult for any Government to estimate its approximate incomings and outgoings from one year to another. Last year's Budget is a strong confirmation of that in as much as the Premier said when he introduced it that he had budgeted for a probable surplus of £10,000, whereas in fact the surplus was over £1,000,000 and payments fell short of estimates by nearly £750,000. The explanation of that is that whereas there was no lack of urgent public works, because of shortages of men and materials they could not be carried out even though

the money was available. I suggest that the Premier's estimate for the forthcoming year will again be wide of the mark because when the Budget was prepared we could not have envisaged the effect of the waterside strike in England nor that on the Australian waterfront. Since then, too, there has been a very disquietous judgment given by the Privy Council in regard to road transport that will have repercussions, and most certainly will affect the Budget figures of this and every other State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—In what way? You are casting reflections on the Privy Council.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I am not casting any reflections at all. The judgment could have been foreseen by anyone who took any interest in public affairs because of the experience of the James case and the Australian banks' case.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You are reflecting on the High Court of Australia.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Nothing of the sort. The honourable member is just sparring. The judgment of the Privy Council must have been foreseen because the principle is much the same in all cases. These matters must affect the Budget figures, and they provide a direct challenge to all Governments in Australia. I have always been an advocate for the very important road transport industry because I realize how much it has done to develop this great country and how much it will do in the future. Governments will have to think and act seriously in order to preserve not only the assets of the railways but also to protect the highways, but in doing so I suggest that they do nothing to restrict road transport which is doing a great service to all States. What the Government should do is to put roads in a condition to carry the traffic and see that the added costs for their construction and maintenance are met by the people who use them most.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Then the honourable member would tax the industry?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Yes, most decidedly, and I do not think it would disagree with the tax.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—What was the case fought on?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I know what it was fought on. Naturally, the Government should do the reasonable thing, and I hope that when the Minister of Highways meets with his fellow road Ministers next week he will see that they do the reasonable thing. I know that if fair and reasonable charges were levied on the industry it would not object because it

would realize it should be asked to pay reasonable charges for construction and maintenance of highways.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Who will determine what the reasonable charges are to be?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—They will all be determined. We will have to endeavour to protect the very valuable assets we have in the railways in all States. If the railways want to compete, as they will, with road transport, they must be put into a state of efficiency to give proper and efficient service to the public.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Now you are casting reflections on the railways.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The honourable member can interpret all these things as he wishes; I am not casting any reflections on the railways, which have the State behind them and should be able to meet any competition. If put into proper and efficient order I feel certain they would be able to compete with any competition offered by the road transport.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—There should be a transport Minister in charge of all these things.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—That is another matter. I do not object to that, because I think it is a very wise thing to have all transport under Ministerial control. One of the mistakes we made was to divorce our railways from Ministerial control. That was done by Act of Parliament but I do not think it was a wise thing in as much as the Commissioner with all his powers is completely hamstrung. He cannot do anything about increasing freights and fares, which must be left to Parliament. The most important part of his business, if it is to be a success, is for him to be able to levy charges to meet competition. The Privy Council judgment is a direct challenge to all Governments to meet the competition of road transport by providing a more efficient service, because they will have to go after business. Given the powers and the encouragement, I feel that the railways will be able to meet any competition.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Would you limit the loads of vehicles?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I would for the time being at any rate. We cannot stop progress or stand in the way of the advance of the transport industry. It has come to stay and in order to meet it we shall have to build roads capable of carrying the traffic and, having done that, we have a right to expect all those who use the public highways to make reasonable contributions towards their construction and maintenance.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Would you regulate their hours?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—All those things come into it; loading, speed and times would all have to be considered. However, I do not think that the problem is completely insoluble.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Does the honourable member think that the Minister of Local Government is competent to look after it?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I have every confidence in him and I do not think he will miss too many tricks at the conference. He has the right vision to be able to see what is needed to put the system on a sound footing. The very valuable report of the Auditor-General is one which I commend every year and my only criticism, perhaps, is that it is available to members rather late in the financial year, when Parliament has nearly finished its business. If it were available earlier so that its full implications could be considered by members it would be of greater value. I suggest that it might even be placed on the Notice Paper in order to provide an opportunity for a full dress debate on it. It used to be the proud boast of the Legislature that it controlled the public purse, but that is no longer true. The whole financial policy of the State is set, not by the State Government, but by the Loan Council, the Grants Commission and other Commonwealth agencies. Parliament can no longer claim that it controls the public purse and, through that, the Executive, as it formerly did. I fear that we are no longer in that happy position, as gradually control has drifted away from Parliament to the Executive and from the Executive to an outside body—the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Then the Federal Government dictates the policy of State Governments?

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Very largely. The honourable member knows that the Commonwealth controls the policy of all State Parliaments today, and that is no exaggeration.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—When I made that comment no-one seemed to agree with me.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The Education Department has become a very large spending instrumentality. I regard our educational system as one of the best in the Commonwealth, but the department is faced with a grave problem in keeping pace with the growth in the number of students. It is a very difficult position indeed, and I commend the Government for placing on the Estimates the sum of £13,000 in an endeavour to attract teachers

from overseas. When I was in England a little over two years ago I made some inquiries on these lines and they said, "For goodness sake do not take our teachers as we want at least 20,000 to meet our **day-to-day requirements**," so just what success the Government will have in attracting teachers from overseas has yet to be seen. However, the Government is doing its best to supply the need and I thoroughly approve of this item which, I presume, is to pay the fares of teachers and their families.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Private schools are accommodating a great number of scholars, thus relieving the Government.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I have heard the honourable member on that and I do not disagree with him. My last word is in commendation of the excellent service rendered by the Premier himself and by his Ministers. The Government has done a first-class job and I feel certain that, in the absence of any untoward occurrences, this State will go ahead and that our people can expect to enjoy happy and prosperous times in the years to come.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Cental No. 1)—I commend the officers of the Public Service responsible for the preparation of this Budget which involves a tremendous amount of work. It reveals an estimated expenditure of £52,982,000 and an estimated revenue of £51,049,000 leaving a deficit of £1,933,000. This, apparently, has been created by the reduction of the Commonwealth grant by £3,850,000. In the past few years the Treasurer has budgeted for expenditures which have not been realized, and surpluses have thereby accrued. For instance, last year he budgeted for a surplus of £10,000 whereas the actual figure was far greater, even allowing for the Supplementary Estimates passed late in the financial year. In years prior to that the Treasurer's Estimates were also off the beam, and as the estimated expenditure this year is more than £1,000,000 a week I think there is every likelihood that the Budget will be balanced, for I believe that revenue will exceed the Treasurer's estimate, as it has on previous occasions. I do not think that we will be in a position to spend the whole of the sum of £52,982,000.

It is interesting to note the surpluses in recent years, namely, 1950-51, £230,000; 1951-52, £89,000; 1952-53, £25,000 and last year, £1,810,000, making a grand total of £2,154,000. Having this in mind the Grants Commission has reduced the Commonwealth grant to the State, doubtless using the valid argument that, as the State had had surpluses

in the last four or five years, it should use some of the money to meet the estimated deficiency this year. Undoubtedly some of the items of expenditure listed will require review in the light of the recent judgment of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court increasing margins. It is safe to assume that because of it prices will be increased. The margins for skill have been increased by two and half times the margins payable in 1937, and one must reach the conclusion that the same formula could have been adopted in 1953, instead of which wages were pegged, following upon the foolish policy of the Commonwealth Government in removing import restrictions. This led to a flood of imported goods—

The Hon. E. Anthony—What else could have been done?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Exactly what the Government was forced to do—to reimpose the restrictions. Its action caused unemployment and some goods piled up in warehouses, but no decrease in prices took place. Indeed, the cost of living has gradually increased and the workers have been called upon to meet the lot. Now we see that a remarkable recovery has taken place. It is interesting to notice that in February last the Commonwealth Arbitration Court said it would take no action at that stage regarding wage margins, but this month the decision was reversed. It is therefore of interest to note that total Commonwealth employment at July, 1953, amounted to 2,557,700, whereas at the end of August last it was 2,659,800, an increase of 102,100. In June, 1953 there were 25,900 in the Commonwealth receiving unemployment benefits, but by November, 1954 this number had diminished to 3,800. The manpower position in South Australia is more acute than at any time. Continual demands are being made for employees, but often these demands cannot be met. After the demobilization of our armed services following World War II the demands of industry could not even then be met, and have not been met since despite the migration policy. According to the *Commonwealth Bank Bulletin* of September, 1954 company profits in Australia have increased from 7.1 per cent in 1953 to 8.4 per cent in 1954. After provision for taxation there had been a corresponding increase in dividends from 4.9 per cent to 5.2 per cent.

The Hon. E. Anthony—To how many companies does that apply?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Those figures are spread over 153 companies. Our overseas balance is in a favourable position, there having been an increase of £9,000,000 in our

national reserve in 1953-54. Apparently the Australian economy is in a sound position. It is interesting to note one of the comments made in a judgment of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court on February 25 last when it refused an increase in margins. It stated:—

There would appear to be a *prima facie* case for a complete review and reassessment of minimum margins appropriate to the occupations covered by the present reference.

We find that our economy has made such remarkable bounds that the court now says that industry can bear an increase in margins. It has laid down a formula granting increases to those on skilled margins. In my opinion this will increase the cost of materials, and naturally manufacturers will desire corresponding increases in the prices of their commodities. If we take the 1937 margins and multiply them by two and a half, as suggested by the court, it will mean an increase of at least 23s. a week to tradesmen, of whom there is a considerable number. This will necessarily result in increases to others on margins, and ultimately an increase in the cost of living, resulting in the need for a review of some of the items on the Estimates. I fear that such an increase will have an effect upon persons on fixed incomes, such as the lower paid wage earner and the old age pensioner, and that it will be beyond their means. It is reasonable to say that all honourable members assume that the increase in margins must affect the cost of living. In the light of the evidence placed before the court and our economic position, the adjustment now proposed should have been made in 1953, because the cost of living has increased since wages were pegged.

An amount of £4,981,000 is provided on this year's Estimates for education, compared with £4,672,461 last year, an increase of £308,539. Increasing demands are being made on the Government for new schools and additional classrooms owing to the increase in the number of pupils. Teaching staff must be trained to meet this expansion, and I understand the Government has met difficulty in accomplishing this. This difficulty applies not only in the metropolitan area, but extends to the country. Mr. Anthony said that the Government was seeking trained teachers overseas. I cannot see why we should be forced to try to induce trained professional teachers from overseas to meet our demands. Surely the Government should be able to influence many of the pupils now at school to take up teaching as a profession. Apparently it is unable to do this but there must be a reason. I fear that in some instances departmental policy is to blame.

An inducement must be offered for people to undertake this profession in country districts, where the number of pupils has increased enormously in recent years. The shortage of teachers is still acute and to some extent the position in the country is due to the higher cost of living. Goods must be carried from the city for distribution in the country and freight charges added, consequently making them dearer. On the other hand some goods are produced in the country areas, but generally the producers demand city prices for their goods. Therefore, the cost of living in the country is dearer than in the metropolitan area. Inducements must be given to teachers to undertake work in the country. One aspect affecting the position is the difference in the cost of living.

The Hon. E. Anthony—It was generally considered that the cost of living in the country was cheaper than in the city.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I have heard that. It might apply to a primary producer, because he can produce many of his requirements such as meat, milk, butter, eggs and so on, but a person who accepts employment as a teacher in the country has none of these advantages and must rely upon his salary to pay for his requirements. All the goods that he buys are taken from the city to the country and are dearer because of freight charges. I know that they are not dearer at Radium Hill and Leigh Creek because of the special circumstances in those places, but in the country generally the cost of living is higher than in the metropolitan area. Previously one of the inducements offered to teachers to go into the country has been the low rental charged for departmental homes, but the recent policy of the department has removed this inducement. This will not only cause teachers not to apply for country appointments but will bring in a flood of applications for transfers back to the city. The rent increases have caused a great deal of dissatisfaction. In one case a man with a wife and four children had his rent increased from 11s. 6d. to 45s., so that in effect he has been reduced to the basic wage. Another is being charged 41s., and he has been supplied with free materials to erect with his own labour a fence around his home to put the place in proper order! There might have been a case for a review of rentals, particularly in the case in which the rent was previously 11s. 6d., but to increase it to 45s. removes the inducement previously offered to that person to remain the country. It is a well-known fact that teachers have refused promotions, in some

cases headmasterships of country schools, because of the differentiation between the country and the metropolitan area. A married man is at a bigger disadvantage than a single man if he accepts a country appointment because of his additional responsibilities, and the single man is paid a boarding allowance that is not paid to a married man. The department distributed circulars amongst teachers appealing to them to accept appointments in the country, and one of the main points in that circular was that rents were cheaper in departmental homes in the country than for those in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—What do you think is the cause of the high rentals?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I believe it is because rentals have increased in the metropolitan area, and the policy of the Government has brought its older type homes in the country to a comparable basis with homes in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. A. Hoare—What about the scarcity of houses?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That would not come into this matter because I am talking about departmental homes allocated to the teaching staff when accepting appointments in the country. If the Government desires to recruit teaching staff for country areas, especially married men, it will have to revise its present policy, and I hope it will do so because the teaching profession is one of the noblest, running a close second to the nursing and medical professions. We cannot expect to recruit adequate teachers from overseas, because even our teachers will not accept the present poor amenities. I could comment on various items in the Budget at considerable length, but I will not weary members by reiterating what has previously been said. Other items will be dealt with by members who will follow me, so I will content myself by supporting the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—Two Bills, the Loan Estimates and the Budget, come before Parliament every year and it is amazing that the estimate of the surplus or deficit is usually very near the actual amount. We cannot amend either of these Bills because of Standing Orders, but we can comment on them, and I desire to make a few observations on this Bill. This State is showing more prosperity than any in the Commonwealth. This can be attributed to the good prices we have been obtaining for our products, good seasons and good Government with the co-operation of the Opposition. The Grants Commission reports

make extremely interesting reading, and I wish to support what Mr. Rowe and Mr. Anthoney said about uniform taxation. It appears to me that our increased production is penalized by the increased income tax we pay by reason of our increased production, and therefore the headway that we are making benefits other States. State taxation would be an advantage because the money raised in this State would be spent here.

This season is a very doubtful one and I believe that the production estimated by the Director of Agriculture will not be realized by a long way. The barley crop is 40 per cent lower than last year because of the dry winter. Barley is not sown until late in the season, usually in June or July, and it is subject to damage by strong winds and unfavourable weather. The variety usually grown in this State has an arched 'neck' and when it becomes ripe a heavy wind will break it. This has caused a total loss to some barley producers. Another menace on Eyre and Yorke Peninsulas, particularly on lower Eyre Peninsula, is a dark grey bug. When I noticed it the year before last, on a crop near Port Lincoln, practically every head had been nipped off. This grub climbs up the straw and nips off the head. The pest can be dealt with only by means of aerial spraying because ordinary spraying would considerably damage a ripe crop. I am sure the seriousness of this pest will be realized by the producers and that they will deal with it in whatever way possible.

The wheat crop will also be disappointing. Some parts of Eyre Peninsula will produce as little as six bushels an acre. At the lower end of the Peninsula and in other districts where wheat has been grown on fallow land the crop is not much below previous years but where it has been grown on grasslands in the Yeelanna district, due to the dry winter some crops in districts that usually yield 14 or 15 bags an acre will not be harvested. I do not think, therefore, that the estimated return of cereals will reach the Director's forecast. Pastures this season have been very good; perhaps not so flourishing as in other years with higher rainfall, but of very good quality. Wool prices have decreased to the disappointment of many, but they are still good, and lamb prices and the lambing season have been excellent. About a fortnight ago I accompanied the Minister of Agriculture and Mr. Edmonds to Cleve to be present at the turning on of the Uley-Wanilla water. On the way we visited Mangalo, which is a good wheat growing district, and I think members will be

surprised to learn of a problem with which the farmers there are faced. Their freight differential is 1s. 3½d. a bushel, or nearly 4s. a bag. The differential between Cowell and Port Adelaide is 9d. a bag and the road freight from Mangalo into Cowell 6½d. There is a stacking site at Mangalo but the only means of transporting the wheat is by road to Kielpa or to the port of Cowell. In view of these costs they are going out of wheat growing because, after deducting 4s. a bag for freight and the cost of bag sewing, which is £3 a hundred at the least, they contend that there are more profitable ways of getting a living from the land.

The stock markets introduced at Port Lincoln a few months ago have proved highly successful and have provided an alternative means of disposing of much surplus stock. It is expected that 4,000 head of stock will go through that market each week, and generally it is one of the best innovations in the sheep industry for a long time. The Railways Commissioner is at present making a tour of inspection of the Eyre Peninsula system, and I am sure that the representatives of the Northern District will be pleased to hear it. We hope that he will thereby get a first hand knowledge of the condition of the railways there and the disabilities experienced by the settlers.

The poultry industry is in a state of chaos. I spoke to the Minister of Agriculture today and he told me that the cost of producing a dozen eggs is 4s. whereas the selling price is 3s., or even lower. The main cause of a fall in prices is that Holland can produce eggs more cheaply and has hardly any freight to pay in landing them in England. Yesterday I was handed a slip from A. W. Sandford and Company showing that the subsidy paid to the industry by the Commonwealth Government last year, from the end of June until the end of December, was £250,000. It is difficult to understand why a subsidy was paid during that period when prices were good. Of that sum South Australia received £32,377, or approximately one-eighth.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Who received that?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—The poultry producers, and it was the equivalent of .94d. a dozen on every dozen sold to the Egg Board. The board had approximately £250,000 in hand, but the inroads into that fund have been very considerable, so I can see nothing else but a subsidy to the poultry raisers if they are to be kept in production. Farmer egg producers

will hardly be affected because farm fowls seem to be well fed by their own hunting around the farm. The commercial grower, on the other hand, has to buy all his feed; so they are the people who will suffer. It is encouraging to see that there is to be some concession in succession duties. I think the Succession Duties Amendment Act was one of the most contentious passed by Parliament since I have been a member and, although it will assist only a few people, it was greatly appreciated. I would like to see concessions extended to all people as soon as possible.

Mr. Anthony and Mr. Bevan referred to the shortage of school teachers, but when we examine the figures we see that, although the position is alarming, the Government has done a fairly good job. In 1946 there were 70,000 scholars and 2,667 teachers in State schools, whereas now there are 120,000 scholars and 4,006 teachers. Although the Government is to be commended on doing a pretty good job there is still a grave shortage of teachers which the Government is doing its best to overcome. I know it attaches great importance to the health and the education of the people, particularly those of school-going age. The recent strike on the waterfront is still having damaging effects on Eyre Peninsula. Yesterday I met a storekeeper who told me that his only means of getting his Christmas goods is to collect them with his own motor vehicle, and that applies to practically all storekeepers on the Peninsula, as tremendous quantities of goods are still stacked on the wharves at Port Adelaide and it is not expected that the consignments will be forwarded in time for Christmas although it is approximately still five weeks away. This clearly proves that the strike on the water front had disastrous results on Eyre Peninsula and it certainly encouraged road transport. We cannot blame people for using the roads, but if water transport is affected so are the harbours and the railways.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Does the honourable member mean that one week's strike results in piling up of five week's consignments?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I believe that the strike continued for two weeks. Anyone who owns his own vehicle can come around to Adelaide without a permit, and that is what they are doing. At any time between Adelaide and Port Lincoln, one sees a constant flow of vehicles loaded with goods. That part of the State is affected even more than Kangaroo Island because of the longer distances involved. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT ADVISORY  
COUNCIL BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 18. Page 1424.)

## Clause 4—"Constitution of Council."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I move—

To delete "two" and insert "four" with a view to adding at the end of the clause:—one of whom shall be appointed from a panel of three persons submitted to the Minister by the Australian Railways Union (S.A. Branch) and the Australian Tramways Employees Union (S.A. Branch) jointly.

If this amendment is agreed to it will involve consequential amendment to clause 8. In recent debates on another Bill it was stated that there should be adequate representation of all interested parties on the council. We have the experience of employee representation on the Electricity Trust and the Abattoirs Board where it has given invaluable service. This Bill deals with public transport, one of the principal forms of which is the tramways system. In 1952 we passed legislation changing the constitution of the trust and we were then informed that it would be necessary to provide £1,180,000 out of general revenue, spread over a period of five years, to place the system on a payable basis. In the last two years the Government has made grants of £700,000 each year to the trust, and this year we are asked to approve of another £600,000, making at total of £2,000,000 in three years, which is £820,000 more than was supposed to be sufficient to rehabilitate the tramways system. Much of this expenditure has been wasteful. Recently the trust withdrew trams from certain routes and substituted buses. The tramway employees' organization has attempted to advise the trust on various aspects, but has been ignored. On one important route there was a change from trams to buses, but now the position is to be reversed.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Permanently?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—We are led to believe that is so, but it will depend upon future policy.

The Hon. N. L. Jude.—What route is it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Glen Osmond. This change entailed additional expenditure. Had the trust been willing to accept the suggestion of employees the change would not have been made in the first place. Mr. Cudmore on one occasion said that if this council agreed that trams should be prevented from turning at the North Terrace-King William Street intersection it would justify

its existence. The employees' union made representations in this direction as far back as March, 1951, and pointed out how it could be achieved, but again the advice was ignored, and we still have the fiasco of trams turning at this corner. I agree with Mr. Cudmore that the change should have been made years ago. It would have saved considerable running costs.

If my amendment is accepted we shall have at least one member of the advisory council who could give advice on transport. Early in 1950 the Tramways Trust had coming to it from J. A. Lawton and Sons, Ltd. about 14 buses. One was delivered for trial and this type became known as the "half front bus" as the driver's cabin was only half the width of the bus. During trial runs the trust was advised that these buses would not be suitable as they were back-end loading, and the seats were in such a position that the driver could not see passengers either entering or leaving. When the trial bus was handed over and put on the road these facts were again pointed out by trust employees. However, the management ignored this advice and after delivery found it necessary to return the vehicles to Lawton's and have them converted to full front buses to eliminate the very faults mentioned by employees. Had it been susceptible to advice in this particular instance the trust would have been saved well over £20,000. It has a number of new buses on order, concerning which it has accepted advice from employees relating to ventilation. In such matters as traffic control the best persons available should be appointed, and therefore I feel that an employees' representative should be selected for this council. This would result in saving the administration much money and improve the transport system. I am suggesting that there should be one employees' representative appointed by the Government from a panel of three names submitted by the two transport unions concerned, namely, the Railways Union and the Tramways Union.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Railways)—I am sure members will agree that Mr. Bevan is always a consistent advocate for representation by unions in these matters. He mentioned that the advice of the tramway employees had not been accepted and referred to specific changes in bus routes. Such changes are purely temporary, due to reconstruction and the changeover from trams to buses, resulting in a lack of balance in the respective services. As regards the Kingswood route, it is mooted that buses from the Glen Osmond route will go there, and *vice versa*. I suggest that Mr.

Bevan was wrong in saying that these changes had been made owing to the trust's financial position. He advocates that a representative of the two unions should have a free say on the proposed council. They already have a say in their respective unions in any case. He contended that if the union's advice had been accepted much money would have been saved and yet a few moments later he quoted examples where its advice on ventilation of buses has been taken. I thought I had indicated that the personnel would consist of experts. The question as it relates to assistance from the unions is one of detail. I am certain that in governmental and semi-governmental instrumentalities reasonable suggestions from employees are always given the closest consideration. I regret that under the circumstances the Government cannot accept the amendment, because it feels that a committee of three is adequate.

The Committee divided on the Hon. S. C. Bevan's amendment.—

Ayes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan (teller), F. J. Condon. and A. A. Hoare.

Noes (12).—The Hon. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, C. R. Cudmore, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude (teller), Sir Lyell McEwin, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Wallace Sandford and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.—“Term of office.”

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I move—

To delete “for three years calculated from the commencement of the year in which he was appointed” and to insert “until the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-seven and on that day of the Council shall cease to exist.”

I am doubtful about the success or otherwise of this council but am prepared to support it for a limited time so that Parliament will have an opportunity to see how it works and to have some say as to whether it should continue as a permanent institution. As the clause stands the council would be a permanent one, although the members would be appointed every three years. My amendment will mean that each person will be a member until December 31, 1957. In other words, the council will operate for three years and will then cease to exist. I hope that it will make useful contributions and bring about economies and co-ordination between the various transport services. It

might go as far as to say that only electric trains shall operate in the metropolitan area, or something of that nature, but I feel we do not want to establish this body, superabundant on the Railways Commissioner, the Tramways Trust and other people, as a permanent organization. It can only mean extra expense, and we do not know what its effect will be.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The Government has considered this amendment very carefully and in view of the possibility that it might prove advantageous, is prepared to accept it.

The Committee divided on the Hon. C. R. Cudmore's amendment.—

Ayes (12).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, C. R. Cudmore (teller), L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, Sir Wallace Sandford and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, F. J. Condon (teller) and A. A. Hoare.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 to 13 passed.

Clause 14 “Directions concerning railways and tramways.”

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I move to add the following subclause:—

(5) No order shall be made under this section after the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and fifty-seven, but any orders made on or before that day shall remain in force after that day for such period as is necessary to give effect thereto.

This amendment is to make it quite clear that orders made before the termination of office of the advisory council shall be carried out but that no further orders may be made after the date we have just fixed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15 “Application of Royal Commissions Act, 1917.”

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I move—

At the end of the clause add the following proviso:—

Provided that when taking evidence the council shall sit in public unless it is of opinion that the public interest or the interests of justice require that such evidence shall be taken in private.

In speaking on the second reading I foreshadowed this amendment when I said that an

important industry like the road transport industry should at least have the right, when the council was dealing with matters that affect it, of hearing what is said. This amendment does not go quite as far as I would wish, but at least it gives an opportunity for this important industry to be represented at hearings of matters which affect it.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I do not think this amendment takes us much further. I had something to say about this council having the powers of a Royal Commission and explained that we have given other committees we have set up detailed powers of investigation, and that this clause is a short way of giving the council those powers. I should say that in general practice all Royal Commissions hold their hearings in public unless there is any special reason for not doing so.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—When speaking on the second reading I said that the tramways and the railways are vitally concerned in this matter and they might not be sympathetic towards road transport, and because of this might elect not to call evidence from it when dealing with matters which vitally concern road transport. I admit that the amendment

does not go as far as I would like, but it will provide an opportunity for road transport interests to be heard.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments and Committee's report adopted.

#### COBDOGLA IRRIGATION AREA DRAINAGE.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on drainage of Cobdogla Irrigation Area (Loveday Division), together with minutes of evidence.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-53.

Read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 24, at 2 p.m.