LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, November 30, 1954.

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

QUESTION.

TUBERCULOSIS SERVICES.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—In this morning's *Advertiser* there appears a letter from the Commonwealth Minister for Health (Sir Earle Page) in which by implication he states that this State has been rather delinquent in making its claims to the Federal Government in regard to the survey on tuberculosis which is being made throughout the States. Would the Chief Secretary care to reply to that statement?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I was rather interested to read the letter referred to by the honourable member, but I would make it clear to him that it was not written as a reply to any complaint from this State, or from me as Minister of Health. The relationships between the State and Commonwealth have always been most friendly in so far as these surveys are concerned. The letter, apparently, was provoked by a leading article which appeared in the *Advertiser*. It was quite a good article based on figures in their possession, showing the allocation as between the States. It referred to the amount of money paid to the States in 1949, as follows:—Queensland, £1,343,000; Victoria, £1,124,000 and South Australia, £110,000. The reply, of course, is that the Commonwealth tuberculosis programme was, after all, only a blue print of what I took to a conference of Ministers in Canberra in 1943. It was put into operation in, I think, 1948, because the base year for expenditure was 1947-48. The idea was to assist the States in promoting tuberculosis surveys and at that time South Australia already had 310 beds available whereas Queensland had only 80 and they were 400 miles from Brisbane. It was only to be expected, therefore, that the expenditure in Queensland would be much greater than in South Australia in order that the scheme could function, but the thing that concerns me more is the Victorian figure. In view of the article I asked for a report from the Director of Tuberculosis Services and received some disturbing information. The demands from South Australia have been less than from Victoria because that State has built large new tuberculosis units with Commonwealth funds, and I am now informed that already 274 beds are to be declared redundant and will be handed over for general hospital uses. I therefore ask whether this is a justifiable use of funds provided for tuberculosis purposes. If I am to be expected as a responsible Minister of Health in this State to put that sort of request to the Commonwealth Government it is quite a different approach from my conception of what is proper, and I am astonished that Sir Earle Page should be so lacking as to allow himself to be carried away by reference to ants and sluggards; apparently the good old ant robs the taxpayers and the sluggard is the one who has done his job 20 years before.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Who are you referring to?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—To the article in the press which I have no doubt the honourable member knows almost by heart. I would add for the information of the honourable member that mortality figures in 1953 in South Australia were much lower than in any other State; there is a sharp decline in the notifications of new cases this year; no patient with tuberculosis requiring admission to hospital has had to be kept waiting; the chest clinic is doing a much bigger job than it was built to do but despite some difficulties it has been able to supply the required services in full. Therefore, by any criterion, other than the expenditure of large sums of money, the tuberculosis campaign in South Australia is going at least as successfully as in any other State. Unless it is that we have merely to spend large sums of money in competition with other urgent measures which I have on my programme, which will exceed £9,000,000, and to request something merely because we are not responsible for obtaining the money, I have no apologies to offer for the fact that we have only requisitioned for £110,000.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Nurses Registration Act, 1920-49. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to give legal status to mothercraft nurses. For some time, the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association has been training girls to look after mothers and newly-born children. These girls are of great value to the

community, as they can do work that would ordinarily be done by a fully trained nurse, and thus free fully trained nurses for more urgent work. The Government believes that the time has come for mothercraft nurses to be given recognition, both for the protection of the public and for the achievement of uniformity with the laws of Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia, where mothercraft nursing has already been recognized, and is accordingly introducing this Bill.

The Bill provides for the enrolment of mothercraft nurses by the Nurses Board. The term "enrolment" has been used in order to distinguish mothercraft nurses from nurses, mental nurses and midwives registered under the principal Act. It is felt that if mothercraft nurses were referred to as "registered" they might be too easily confused by the public with fully trained nurses. The Bill gives enrolled mothercraft nurses two privileges—namely, exclusive rights to hold themselves out as enrolled mothercraft nurses and to wear a distinctive uniform and badge. For simplicity of administration the Bill provides for enrolment in terms closely resembling those in the principal Act relating to registration.

I will give a short explanation of the clauses in numerical order. Clause 3 makes consequential amendments to the existing interpretation section. Clause 4 enables the Nurses Board to issue and cancel certificates of enrolment in the same way as it can at present issue and cancel certificates of registration. Clause 5 inserts in the principal Act a new Part (IIIA) consisting of sections 33a to 33f. Section 33a provides that the Registrar of the Nurses Board must keep a roll of mothercraft nurses and prescribes the machinery for, and conditions of, enrolment. Section 33b entitles persons who have passed the prescribed examinations, and completed the prescribed courses of training, to enrolment. It also provides for the enrolment of persons in practice as mothercraft nurses at such time as the Bill becomes law if they have had the training prescribed for such persons. Section 33c deals with the enrolment of persons trained outside this State, which may be immediate or conditional depending upon their qualifications. Section 33d requires certain conditions as to character, age and health to be satisfied before a person can be enrolled. Section 33e by reference to sections of the principal Act provides for the machinery of enrolment, and also for appeals against decisions of the board. Section 33f deals with the cancellation of enrolment and return of certificates in virtually the same terms as those used in the principal Act with respect to the cancellation of registration.

Clauses 6 and 8 give to enrolled mothercraft nurses the exclusive privilege of holding themselves out and advertising themselves as such. Clause 7 gives mothercraft nurses the exclusive privilege of wearing a prescribed badge and uniform. Clause 9 deals with fraudulent or dishonest conduct in relation to enrolment. Clause 10 makes various amendments to the power to make regulations contained in the principal Act. The more important of these deal with the approval of training institutions for mothercraft nurses, the prescribing of courses of training and the prescribing of rules relating to the practice of mothercraft nursing. Clause 11 is concerned with a purely procedural matter. It extends the presumption in any proceedings under the Act that a defendant is unregistered to enrolment.

The Bill also deals with another matter. The College of Nursing, Australia grants diplomas in specialized branches of nursing. These diplomas are known as the Nursing Administration, Sister Tutor, Midwifery Tutor, and Ward Sister Diplomas. The college recently approached the Nurses Board with the request that it should register these qualifications. The board thought it desirable that the qualifications should be registered, but found that it could not be done without alteration of the principal Act. Clause 10 accordingly enables regulations to be made dealing with the registration of prescribed qualifications and fixing a fee for such registration.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—How many mothercraft nurses are in training?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I cannot give that information offhand, but their training is being subsidized by the Government at Torrens House. Probably they number a dozen a year.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Would not about 50 be registered under this proposal?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—A number are qualified to be registered. Up to now these nurses have had no special recognition. For some time we have desired to register them in this State, but it was first necessary to get our training recognized. It has now been done, so this Bill is submitted.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I move the adjournment because I refuse to speak to a Bill that is not before the Council.

The PRESIDENT—Order! If the honourable member makes a speech now he cannot secure the adjournment.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am simply objecting. I do not want to speak, and I refuse to speak to a Bill that is not before the Council.

The PRESIDENT—The honourable member can do as he likes. It is before the Council.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Where is it then?

The PRESIDENT—That the debate be made an order of the day for—

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Tomorrow.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—On a point of order. The President says this Bill is before the Council so I would like a copy of it.

The PRESIDENT—There is nothing to say that the honourable member shall have a copy of it. There is one here?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—A Punch and Judy show.

Motion for adjournment of debate carried.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AGREEMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

COMMONWEALTH WATER AGREEMENT RATIFICATION ACT REPEAL BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BUILDING CONTRACTS (DEPOSITS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1537.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This Bill contains quite a number of amendments. It is not my intention to speak on them all, but I desire to refer to three matters, the first of which permits the use of the totalizator at night trotting meetings on Eyre Peninsula. Until the requisite lighting is available at any town or district night trotting cannot be carried out, but soon Whyalla, and probably later Port Augusta, will have sufficient to carry out this sport. It is most essential that the lighting must be good for night racing, because if the course is insufficiently lit the drivers' safety is in danger. The second matter, a vital one in the Bill, deals with the number on the committee of the Trotting League. Trotting has made wonderful progress in recent years, not only in South Australia, but throughout the Commonwealth and New Zealand. It is an attractive sport, and I get a lot of pleasure from watching it. The highly efficient way in which the administration has been carried out is pleasing to all its patrons.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Where do you attend?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I attend at Wayville on Saturday evenings when I am not in my own district, and also attend meetings in my own district. The inter-Dominion races that we had the pleasure of witnessing here last year were something that will never be forgotten. That was brought about by the progress made in the breeding, training, driving and everything connected with the sport. In the early days when the league was set up there were only a few clubs and therefore the control was not what it is today. The main charter of the league was given by section 22a (2) which provided:—

On the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and thirty-eight, all members of the League then in office shall retire and thereafter the League shall consist of one delegate from each trotting club affiliated with the League.

Today there are 13 clubs in South Australia, and there is a likelihood of clubs being formed at Penola, Naracoorte, and Port Augusta in the near future, so the numbers have become unwieldy. Each club has one delegate on the league and it is necessary that the numbers set out in the Bill should be embodied in legislation. I think it is a great pity that Parliament has to have anything to do with the control of a sport. Racing does not require legislation, and I do not know of any sport apart from trotting that does.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Isn't there a dispute between the league and the trotting club?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Yes, that is what brought this matter about.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Doesn't it come down to a matter of fair representation?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Yes, and I believe this Bill introduces that, as I shall outline in a few moments. The other day the Leader said it was regrettable that the question of city *versus* country comes into any debates, because our existence and progress depend on one another. However, it has come into the sport of trotting.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—So it has into betting shops at Port Pirie.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Port Pirie's betting shops are not mentioned in this Bill. I congratulate the South Australian Trotting Club on the excellent manner in which it carries out its meetings. It is recognized that this club produces 80 per cent of the revenue

derived from trotting, but that can be achieved only by the support of the country clubs and as there are 12 of them I maintain that they are quite justified in having as much say as the South Australian Trotting Club in the administration of the league.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Does not five to two give them fair representation?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—If the honourable member's suggested amendment were carried I think there could be deadlocks.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Not at all.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—The Bill provides for a representation of five from the country, two from the Trotting Club and one from the Owners, Breeders, Trainers and Reinsmen's Association, which has approximately 800 members. If the representation were five, three and one, as the honourable member suggests, deadlocks would probably arise if the existing feeling still prevailed, as a chairman has to be appointed and he would probably be selected from the five. Therefore, the division would probably become four to four, leaving the matter still in the hands of the chairman, who has not only a deliberative but a casting vote.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The honourable member's arithmetic is wrong.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I think mine is correct but you should examine your own. A great percentage of the best trotting horses are bred in the country. I do not know how some of the breeders exist because a horse must be good if it is to run in the city and few good ones are bred from the trotters introduced into this country. In addition a horse has to be educated, and another difficulty is that it must win two races in the country before it is qualified to run at Wayville, so I think country people certainly warrant the support which is given to them by the lovers of trotting.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—My amendment will still give them a majority and I have no desire to take it from them.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—The South Australian Trotting Club has 35 meetings a year plus two for charity. The country clubs held 82 meetings last year, but could have held 120. It has been suggested to me that I should not say much on this Bill because I am connected with a charitable organization and this Bill may have an effect on what trotting is doing for charity. In 1950 charity meetings yielded £3,835; in 1951, £3,000; 1952, £4,133; 1953, £3,205, a total of £18,992, or an average of £3,758 per meeting. Nomination fees also bring in another £600. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Distress Fund, of which I am a trustee, has been able with that support to assist over 500 people who could not prove that their sickness was due to war service, and I hope that whatever happens to this Bill it will not interfere with these charity meetings. I give the league full marks for what it has done to foster them; it has made quite a number of concessions as, for example, it does not call for any levy on charity meetings. I think the crux of the trouble originated in 1951. I do not want to introduce personalities, but as one who follows the meetings at Wayville very closely I heard nothing of this trouble until the present president was elected in 1951.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What was the trouble?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Probably that he was not acceptable to the South Australian Trotting Club. I know of no other reason.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Who is president?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Mr. Larry Heath of Kadina, who is recognized as having few equals and no superiors in Australia in trotting matters. I believe he has given general satisfaction to everybody excepting a few who seem to hold a grudge against him. I now want to touch on what has been referred to as the dishonouring of the conference held with the Premier and the Chief Secretary. It was agreed, I admit, that the representation should be four, three and one, but it has not been disclosed by those who have been saying so much about dishonouring the agreement that it had to be ratified by the league, and that the league would not ratify it because it was not satisfied with the four, three and one representation, but wanted five, two and one.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin—There was no agreement at that meeting; it was only a discussion.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—The Premier asked them to confer and come to a decision, but nothing was determined at that meeting.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You do not believe in this Bill being before Parliament?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—No, and I do not think the honourable member does either, but he can speak for himself.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I can speak quite impartially.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I think I can too for I am not influenced by anyone, and I do not think it fitting that the honourable member should cast aspersions on other members. I feel that if the country is zoned to the extent

suggested the five best men available may not be selected. If a zone is created in which their are only one or two clubs it will be difficult to get anyone willing to spare the time and travel long distances to attend meetings, and I think we could well leave the selection of representatives in the hands of the country people, so I see no advantage in introducing zoning.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Will the selection be done by the vote of all members or only by the executives of the various clubs?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—If there is to be any form of zoning I do not think there should be more than three zones.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You want it run by a clique.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—No, I want it run by the best men available. I think the honourable member's outlook on the whole issue is narrow.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—I think I have done more for racing than ever the honourable member has done.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I am now expressing my own opinion, after listening to the honourable member with considerable interest the other day. I cannot agree that anyone should be able to claim a dividend without producing a tote ticket. It is suggested that this is done elsewhere and that in racing a person who loses his ticket only has to sign a statutory declaration, but the totalizator, either in racing or trotting, does not pay out any money unless a ticket can be produced.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If one can get it from a bookmaker why not from the totalizator?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I do not see how we can get away from the provisions of clause 5, for what other proof can a claimant produce?

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If you lost your bank passbook you would make a statutory declaration.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—That is quite a different matter. It is numbered and a record is kept of the number.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Totalizator tickets are numbered.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I have never seen anyone taking a note of totalizator ticket numbers. That is a different matter altogether. I support the Bill and in fairness to all concerned I hope that the representation will be on the basis of five, two and one. I feel that the recent bickering is only a passing phase, although it has been going on for several years, and hope the trotting people will not attempt to have other Bills introduced into Parliament to settle their domestic troubles.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1535.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—In supporting the measure, it would not be amiss if I were to make some reference to the part played by friendly societies throughout the State. These societies originated in Great Britain and were instituted by those who desired to receive medical, funeral and social service benefits which the Government of the day did not provide. Some friendly societies here have already celebrated their centenary and the work they perform should receive some recognition. The latest statistics governing friendly societies in South Australia show that there are 15 societies with 730 branches and that members have benefited as follows:—1950-51, £71,591; 1951-52, £67,563; and 1952-53, £63,922. Since the introduction of medical benefits by the Commonwealth Government the membership of these societies has fallen off. Total revenue received by them in the last three years has been as follows:—1950-51, £535,821; 1951-52, £552,032, and 1952-53, £534,800. For the same three years their funds totalled £3,986,595, £4,012,687 and £4,080,613, respectively. They provide funeral, sick, accident and hospital benefits. The Bill makes it possible for friendly societies to transfer their money from one fund to another. Under the principal Act, when they establish a fund it must be sacrosanct for the purpose for which it was established. Because of increasing costs of administration the societies are finding it difficult to meet management expenses, and so that there shall be no increase in membership dues the Government has conceded them the right to transfer all income over four per cent to the general management fund.

Another good feature about the Bill is that when a patient cannot get accommodation at a hospital, or is unable to be removed from his home, nursing costs in his home can be paid

by the societies. In this respect the amendment will provide a benefit similar to that provided by the Mutual Hospitals Association. It is a wise measure which protects the funds of members and I therefore have pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I endorse everything the honourable member has said regarding the wonderful work these societies have done throughout the State. No doubt they have brought great solace to many people, and anything we can do to support such a splendid movement should be done. The object of the Bill is to help these societies to do a little more.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They lend money to build homes, too.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—That is so. Since their return from active war service many members have not continued their payments and so have ceased to be members, resulting in decreased funds being available to these worthy organizations. The original Act provided that interest on investments may not be diverted to any other expenditure except that clearly defined in the Act. That rather hamstrings the societies, because owing to the shortage of revenue they cannot use the interest from their investments except for specified purposes. Section 27 of the Act provides:—

In all societies and branches all moneys received or paid on account of each and every particular fund or benefit shall be kept separate and distinct, and shall be entered in a separate account distinct from the moneys received and paid on account of any other fund or benefit, and the moneys belonging to one fund or benefit shall not be used in any manner for the advantage or otherwise of any other fund or benefit.

The Bill will give these societies the right to spend some of their interest on investments for other than specified purposes laid down in the original Act. Among other things it will enable them to provide nursing benefits for people who, through congestion in our hospitals, are unable to get into those institutions and therefore have to remain in their own homes. It will also permit societies to take advantage of the Government's generous gesture last year to provide on a pound for pound basis money for building homes for the aged. We should wholeheartedly encourage such action. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1542.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—It appears that there is no doubt that farmers desire that the Wheat Stabilization Act should continue. Although the number of farmers who accepted their responsibility and voted on the recent ballot was rather disappointingly small, those who voted were so overwhelmingly in favour of the scheme that there is no doubt they support the scheme. It is a matter of great disappointment that in the scheme provided by the International Wheat Agreement and other arrangements for fixing the price of wheat we should have lost our main customer, Great Britain. During the period we had that agreement the price of wheat sold under it was considerably less than that for wheat sold on the open market. Unfortunately, there was a degree of greed on the part of our negotiators representing the wheat industry, and when Great Britain withdrew from the scheme the obvious result was a fall in the price of wheat. If the agreement was to be of any benefit to wheatgrowers, obviously that benefit was needed during that period when there was a falling market. However, the agreement as it stands today is only a shadow of what it was, and the price of wheat has fallen.

I do not know what there is about the wheatgrower's make-up that makes him desirous of entering into all sorts of schemes. Perhaps it is as a result of the very hard times he experienced when growing wheat for less than the cost of production, but it seems to me that up to the present there has been no scheme that has been of any material advantage to him. A slight advantage accrued from the flour tax some years ago but it was very greatly offset in later years by the fixation of the price of bread. Mr. Condon said that in recent years consumers have had to pay 1½d. a loaf more for bread and have had to pay £3,000,000 to the wheatgrowers, but that is not the case because the quantity of wheat involved in the 1½d. is small in comparison with the amount used in making a loaf. The agreement having been entered into, this Bill provides an opportunity for wheatgrowers on the falling market to be somewhat secured, and it is likely to be of some advantage to them.

In the earlier agreement the price of wheat for home consumption was fixed at 12s. 7d. That has now been raised to 14s. or such price

as is fixed under the International Wheat Agreement, whichever is the lower, and I do not think any wheatgrower can complain that that is not fair. The measure provides for the wheat reaped last year to be included in the scheme. It also provides that the scheme shall last for five years, which is also a reasonable suggestion. Unfortunately, the whole of the funds collected under the previous Act were dispersed last year and consequently there is no fund in existence today. With the great possibility that wheat will be cheaper the export tax of 1s. 6d. a bushel is not likely to materialize to the full, and the Commonwealth may be called upon to make up the guarantee. Whether the industry is justified in calling on the Commonwealth is a matter of debate.

Over the years of very high prices the Australian consumer had very cheap wheat, so possibly that justifies it; but nevertheless it opens the way for political control of the industry. As the Commonwealth Government may be called upon to finance part of this scheme, naturally it has said quite definitely that it will be under the control of a Federal Minister. I do not think anything can be gained by complaining about that at this stage, because it certainly appears that the Commonwealth Government will be called upon from time to time to assist in the payments. Actually there will be no call upon the proceeds of any one crop unless it is beyond the home consumption price, and the maximum that can be levied is 1s. 6d. a bushel. Although in times of high prices there is no difficulty in raising considerable funds for a stabilization scheme I feel there will be much greater difficulty in the coming year, so this measure will be of great benefit to the farmer.

I do not know whether we are justified in giving to the Wheat Board the power to purchase sacks, because I think this function should be given back to the merchants who had it prior to the introduction of the Wheat Board. However, this is provided for in the agreement, and as I know quite well that we are going to have this stabilization scheme, I must be prepared to accept it in its entirety. We will get the benefit of a guaranteed price for 100,000,000 bushels of export wheat, and any amount exported in excess of that will not be subject to any levy if the price falls below cost of production. It seems from the present trend of agriculture that we are not likely to exceed that amount very greatly and with the rise of population in this State it might be that the amount available for export will fall from time to time. Certainly the time has not yet passed when wheat can be produced at quite a considerable profit, and if we should fall on lean times it is hoped that there will be sufficient money in the fund to stabilize the industry. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—I do not intend to address myself at any length to this Bill, firstly, because Mr. Densley has given a comprehensive resume of what it contains and, secondly, because members have had the opportunity over the years to consider the self-same scheme. One of the functions of the Bill is to repeal the 1948 and 1953 Wheat Stabilization Acts. The 1948 Act was to all intents and purposes almost identical with the Bill now before us. The 1953 measure differed in that it was a marketing Bill only, and did not provide for a stabilization scheme, but with the exception that that was merely a marketing Bill, it was much the same as that now before us. This rather confirms the statement I made when we were discussing another matter in this House that had some reference to wheat marketing, that those people who were to be invited to exercise their right to vote on whether they favoured a stabilization scheme or not had a pretty fair idea of what they were voting on. The presentation of this Bill, I think, amply confirms that opinion.

I join with Mr. Densley in regretting that such a comparatively small number exercised their right to vote on the proposal. However, I know of some of the reasons for that. These people are not altogether disinterested, but they must be organized to make an effort in matters of this nature, and as far as I am aware no attempt was made, except by the Wheatgrowers' Federation through the medium of its monthly publication, to organize anyone in this matter. Although the result was disappointing, it showed there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the scheme.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Do you think the scheme will succeed on a voluntary basis?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—I find some difficulty in answering that because, after all, a scheme of this nature must be 100 per cent supported or it will break down. We had some evidence of that in the early days of wheat pooling. Whilst there were compulsory pools they received full support, but when they ended and an endeavour was made to carry on voluntary pools, it was only a matter of time before people gradually drifted away.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Isn't that the danger here?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—This legislation sets up a scheme in which the wheatgrowers are bound to sell their wheat through the Wheat Board, which is the authority to handle and dispose of it. Penalties are provided for those who attempt to sell it in any other way. Judging from the success that followed the stabilization scheme that operated under the 1948 Act, I think we have every reason to believe that this scheme will be equally successful. When the 1948 legislation was introduced, wheat prices were gradually rising. That circumstance prevailed to such an extent that in three years the stabilization authority had collected about £20,000,000 which, of course, it had not been called upon to use because of the high prices. Subsequently this money was distributed amongst the growers, who had been contributors to the scheme. I can foresee that the possibility is that the reverse may operate during the life of this Bill, because there is every indication of falling markets, and if they get down to a level that brings them within the operation of this Bill, the stabilization fund will need to be called upon to supplement prices. The amount of 1s. 6d. a bushel will, in the light of our previous experience, be adequate to meet a fall unless it is of a drastic nature, and I do not know of any reason why that should occur. However, it appears that we must be prepared for a fall in overseas prices for our cereals, and this stabilization scheme is an effort by the growers to help themselves. They make the major contribution and the Government guarantee comes in only under the circumstances that Mr. Densley outlined. In the main it is the wheatgrowers themselves who will be building up the fund which will be available to assist them if and when prices fall below cost of production. I support the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1534.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—When the Government introduced a Bill to amend the Succession Duties Act in 1952, it was out to get as much revenue as possible, and considerable debate took place upon it. No-one wants to see increased taxation but always prefers a reduction which, in one way, this Bill will bring about. In the 1952 debate the Grants Commission came in for much criticism on the grounds that it was alleged to be dictating to the State the manner in which it should spend its money. It was suggested by Mr. Bevan then that the exemption on estates bequeathed to widows and children under 21 should be raised to £4,000, but, of course, this Council was not sympathetic and the second reading was carried by 14 votes to five. Mr. Rowe in Committee moved an amendment to provide that the Bill should cease to operate after December, 1953, and that was defeated by one vote. So, today we reach a very interesting stage, in so far as this is an attempt by the Government to give concessions to some of the people, and on that point I am quite in accord with the Government's action.

The Bill also makes alterations in the methods of assessing duty on property given duty-free. The Minister explained its provisions fully and said that it has the support of the Law Society and therefore it is unnecessary for me to enlarge on it to any great extent. It is interesting to note that revenue from succession duty in 1952 was £1,081,552. In the following year it decreased by £80,000 and a year later it amounted to £1,593,051, which was an increase of £591,000 over the previous year. The main increase in succession duty was chiefly due to the greater number of larger estates assessed during 1952-54 and the full impact of the higher rates imposed in 1953. During the year the 34 estates of over £50,000 in value were assessed for a total duty of just under half a million pounds compared with about £103,000 for the previous year. This represented an increase of 22 estates and £346,000 in the duty. The balance of the increase was due to an increase of 25 in the number of smaller estates and the full impact of the higher rates.

The Bill increases exemptions from succession duty on property taken by widows, widowers, and children. The present law which has operated since 1952 provides that duty shall not be payable on the first £2,800 of property taken by the widow, or any child of the deceased who is under 21, or on the first £500 of property taken by a widower or a child over 21. This has imposed hardships on many people and consequently the Bill will give relief by raising the exemption for a widow or a child under 21 to £3,500 and for widowers and adult children to £1,500. I can see no objection to any form of relief from taxation. It must be realized that the Treasury is crying

out for money, but this Bill at least does something to meet deserving cases. I am not concerned so much about people who have been able to come by considerable wealth honestly, but I am more concerned about the struggling persons who have to meet increased costs without increasing their income. For example, persons with families who are purchasing, say, a Housing Trust home for about £3,500 will get some relief under this measure and that is a step in the right direction. Therefore I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—In 1952 the Act was amended and certain exemptions were made to the advantage of widows, widowers and children. The new scales of 1952 provided that duty should not be chargeable on the first £2,800 of property taken by a widow or children under 21, or on the first £500 of property taken by a widower or a descendant other than a child under 21 years of age. At the time of the amending legislation various views were expressed, and since 1952 the Government has given further consideration as to whether the exemptions were adequate to prevent hardship to persons succeeding to relatively small estates. It has been said that it is not easy to decide what the exemption should be. The Leader of the Opposition and others, while approving of anything which is taken away from someone else to give to another, are apparently unable to make any workable suggestion in regard to this form of taxation. Admittedly it is not easy to decide what the exemption should be. The opinion has been expressed that this type of duty is a form of wealth levy and in consequence not a desirable form of raising money. However, the system has been established, and we are confronted with a Bill designed to alleviate certain charges.

I think it was when the Bill of two years ago was being debated that I said that it dealt with capital, and that capital should be handled with special care because, whereas income may be replaceable, capital was not so easily replaced. I mention that to show that I have not changed my outlook regarding this form of what is termed taxation. As the law stands property work £3,500 passing to a widow will be charged £87 duty whereas a similar property passing to a widower will be charged £250. Why so great a difference I am not quite clear. Representations have been made to the Government that this amount of duty, together with other unavoidable expenses, sometimes causes hardship and embarrassment to families of moderate means and the Government has come to the conclusion, therefore, that it is desirable to liberalize the exemption. It has decided to raise the exemption for widows and children under 21 to £3,500 and for widowers and adult children to £1,500, and to adjust the scale of duty on property valued at amounts in excess of these sums so that the existing amount of duty will be retained in the case of property valued at £5,000 or more. New schedules are set out in clause 4 to give effect to the concessions referred to.

The Bill also alters the method of assessing the duty on properties given duty free. It is a common practice to give property duty free, and so much so that I am given to understand that a beneficiary sometimes feels a grievance against the testator who has not made provision for the fact that the beneficiary would have to pay the succession duty on the property inherited which he did not in any way help to build up. The Bill means that the total value of a duty free legacy is the actual amount taken by the legatee plus the value of the exemption from duty. That is dealt with by clause 3. The Crown has to be protected in collecting the amounts claimed. If the Crown is paid on the instruction of the person making the will that saves the beneficiary so much, but it is the value of the property plus the succession duty which represents the figure the beneficiary will inherit. This is a definite improvement. I think it was in the time of the depression some 20 years ago that succession duties were substantially increased, and I hope that when the opportunity offers reductions will be made and thus relief obtained from a form of taxation that is not a favoured one. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—It would be a little unusual if I allowed a Succession Duties Bill to go through without comment. As Sir Wallace Sandford rightly says, in the depression days we imposed a kind of surcharge of 25 per cent on all succession duty. I am glad the Legislative Council was instrumental in getting it removed at the rate of 5 per cent a year over a period of years. Like my honourable friend, I am opposed to succession duty because it is a tax on capital. In 1952 we altered the Act materially. I then expressed the opinion, which I now repeat, that if we are in a position to relieve people of this capital tax the relief should be equal all round and not given

to one section only. That is all I have to say about the alteration in the rates.

It is interesting to realize that as a result of what we did two years ago people have become succession duty minded, and it has made those with the larger estates calculate how much they would have to pay. A number of people have paid the gift duty and parcelled out their estates while they were alive to members of their families. The net result has been that the gift duty has been paid to the Commonwealth, and there being no succession duty the State did not get the money. That has been the result generally of the alterations we made two years ago. I think we are taking liberties with the testator's right to do what he likes with his own money when we provide as in new section 9a:—

Where a will, settlement or deed of gift directs that property derived, given, or accruing thereunder is to be taken free of duty, the net present value of that property and of all other property derived, given or accruing under the will, settlement or deed shall be calculated as if there was no such direction.

Is it proper that we should say that we do not care what the testator puts in his will but we shall say by Act of Parliament what the result is? Some years ago we made many alterations to the Trustee Act which said that the trustees could do certain things unless they were specially directed not to do so by the testator. I always have a second look at anything when it seems to me we are saying by Act of Parliament what a testator shall do with his own money. I still think he is the person who should have the say. I do not think it is insuperable to work out the complications which are suggested. I confess that I did not quite understand the Minister when he said:—

Before 1952 the whole of a legacy was chargeable at the same rate of duty. Now, however, a legacy may be charged with duty at more than one rate. This fact greatly complicates the calculation of duty and where the beneficiary is given some property free of duty and other property not free of duty the exact amount of duty can only be calculated by making arbitrary assumptions. The rule which requires the value of the exoneration from duty to be taken into account in assessing the duty on a legacy given duty free does not necessarily benefit the revenue. This depends entirely on the size of the residue of the estate.

I am not concerned whether it benefits revenue or not. The residue may be of such a size that it attracts a considerable rate of duty as against a legacy of £100. I cannot quite bring myself to see that, in spite of the fact that it may take a little more calculation under the present law, we are entitled to say that the net present value shall be calculated as if the testator had given no such instruction. I am against clause 3, but have no objection to the remainder of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Duty free gifts."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I do not think this clause is necessary and would much prefer that it was not included.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I think the points raised by Mr. Cudmore are important, and would be happy if the Minister could see his way clear to allow the Committee time to study the clause in detail. I should certainly like further time to consider the points raised by Mr. Cudmore before voting on the clause.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—If honourable members desire further time to study the clause, I have no objection.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1540.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I support this measure, which amends the Act along the lines that many of us have advocated for many years; that is, that the rating on country lands should be increased. Although I have no figures at hand, I would say that three-parts of the State come under the schedule providing for rating of 4d. an acre. I should imagine the land covered by the schedule would be almost the whole of Eyre Peninsula, a great deal, if not all, of the Murray lands and a good deal of other country. The extra rate will be applied, not in a schedule as formerly, but by gazettal notice by the Minister of Works. That is an alteration in the method of rating because the Minister will decide when the rate is to be increased and conversely when it is to be reduced.

I think I would be right in saying that even country people would agree that an increase in water rating is not unfair. There has never been a time in the history of this State when the settler has been in a better position to meet the increase than I hope he

is at present. We have had high wool and wheat prices, and these are continuing. This afternoon it was mentioned that owing to the change of trading between Australia and the United Kingdom we may meet a good deal of fluctuation in our market prices. The Commonwealth Treasurer, on his return to Australia last week, intimated that this was so, and said we could expect a decline in wheat prices. That is a pointer to what we might envisage as a probable decline in the value of our primary commodities. However I do not think the country people will object to an increase in water rating. After all, our whole life is limited to the supply of water, and I suppose no more valuable commodity can be supplied to anybody.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is to be congratulated on a very great scheme of water reticulation and conservation. Members of the Public Works Committee have had the opportunity to see all our reservoirs and know the tremendous capital outlay they have involved, quite apart from the cost of reticulation. We have a right to be proud of our system of water reticulation. As we all know, water is carried from the Tod River to Ceduna, which is a very great accomplishment. This morning many of us were privileged to see the inauguration of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. This was a great experience and a source of comfort to all of us, particularly those who reside in the metropolitan area and who are beginning to feel anxious about the metropolitan water supply. It was a great thing to see the supply of Murray water coming through the pipes. I am sure the people will realize what this will mean to the city in a dry period and will appreciate the foresight of the Government and the splendid work done on that job by the engineers and all associated with the work. I pay a tribute to everyone concerned in the scheme. The department is a vast one, with a capital expenditure since its inauguration of about £36,000,000, and this new scheme will add considerably to the amount of public debt in this State.

There is one sad feature in the Auditor General's report this year and that is that the Adelaide water scheme, which has always been a profit-making one, for the first time for a number of years has shown a deficit. The loss would not have been incurred had it not been for the very heavy debt charges which completely absorbed the surpluses. Actually, without the debt charges, the scheme showed a profit. It is regrettable that a scheme such as this, serving more than half the population of the State, should not be capable of being run on more profitable lines. However, the return of about £1,500,000 took nearly £1,500,000 to make. The main purpose of this Bill is to increase the rate on country lands, and I hope the people concerned will always be in a position to meet the added charges.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—I support this important measure. Both in this Chamber and in the House of Assembly a good deal of information has been conveyed to Parliament and the general public, and I feel repetition is quite unnecessary. In view of the remarks that have been made, I sometimes wonder why this system of rating was not considered in 1925 and in 1936, when Bills were before Parliament. Under the measure the Minister each year may alter the rating on country land. This matter has been discussed in this Chamber may times, and each time the Public Works Committee has submitted a report on country water schemes it has compared the existing rating system of 4d. and 7d. with the capital value of £2 2s. 5d. and £3 7s. 6d., so that honourable members would know precisely what was involved in the losses sustained. The committee has felt that it is necessary for Parliament and the people to know just how much is being lost by country schemes. As Mr. Condon pointed out, the committee has drawn attention to the indirect benefits derived through them. Some very important evidence was given before the Public Works Committee on the Yorke Peninsula water supply, summed up in the report as follows:—

Mr. Spafford estimated that the number of livestock maintained on Yorke Peninsula would be increased by the equivalent of 208,000 sheep without any material reduction in cereal production. One-fifth of the value of this number of sheep at £1 per head, the figure last used by the committee, is £41,600.

This is just one example of the type of information the committee conveys to the House when dealing with a country water scheme.

Under this Bill, the Minister may vary rates by notice in the *Government Gazette*, but Parliament will still have the right to watch the matter and ensure that excessive charges are not imposed on country people in the event of a recession. Clause 10 (*b*) provides that the rate shall be payable on such country lands as are indicated or described in the notice of the Minister published in the *Government Gazette*. I hope the Minister in Committee will elaborate a little on this provision. The existing method is that the land for one mile on each side of the main is ratable. There may be

circumstances in which that system is not given effect to entirely, but in this measure no definite area of land is mentioned. I am not quibbling about that because as we all know under the existing administration of the department people have always received first-class and genuine treatment. However, I know that difficulties have arisen on land within five miles of the River Murray on the Murray Flats and on that some little distance from the West Coast water reticulation area, although the department is usually prepared to meet any difficulty of people who are too far away from a water main to receive a service. They are allowed, with the agreement of landholders adjacent to the water main, to have an indirect service. The land held by people who have indirect services is not rated and I am wondering whether that comes within the provisions of new section 103 (1) (*b*) which is referred to in clause 10.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I do not propose to discuss the relative prosperity of the primary producer and his ability to pay, for if we base our argument on that we would have to increase water rates in the metropolitan area very considerably. I prefer to view it from the point of view of the inestimable value of the extension of water schemes in country areas. Generally speaking, the larger communities situated within townships have had the fullest use of Government water schemes, but the more they can be extended to country lands the greater the carrying capacity of the country will become, with consequent benefit to the State. We cannot expect the Government to extend water schemes if they do not pay anywhere near interest on working expenses, let alone the capital cost. Water has been and still is the cheapest commodity available and the price for it should return at least somewhere near interest on working expenses. Few people, if they had to provide their own water supplies, could do it at anything near the cost at which they obtain supplies from Government schemes. Even the cost of a well with mill and tanks would be more expensive than the moderate cost of water from reticulated schemes, and if a complete conservation scheme were undertaken it would be inestimably higher than the cost of Government-provided water. It is a matter for great pleasure that the Government is able to provide so much water at reasonable cost and I am sure that no one will quibble about the price being increased to enable the Government to make further extensions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Power to levy annual construction rates on country lands."

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—New subsection 1 (*b*) reads:—

The rate shall be payable on such country lands as are indicated or described in the notice.

Can the Minister offer some explanation of what that means? The existing system provides for a rating on one mile back on either side of the main.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I touched lightly on this radical alteration when speaking on the second reading, and I must confess that I am not enamoured of this provision which leaves to the complete discretion of the Minister the lands which are to be rated. Under the existing law everyone knows that land within one mile of the main on either side is ratable, but under this proposal no-one will know what area is to be rated. It would be easy for a Minister who wanted to make himself a good fellow in his district to look with a very kindly eye on the rates imposed in that district, and I much prefer the old system and would like to know whether that principle will be continued under this Bill.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—New subsection (1) says:—

The Minister may in any year declare and levy a construction rate on any country lands.

To take a hypothetical case, a main may be constructed past a settler's property and he might be charged a construction rate based on its cost, in addition to the ordinary annual rate on the land. I would like an amplification of this provision.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—The points raised by several members are worthy of closer investigation and, although I have been assured that the principle will remain the same, until I can confirm this I prefer to report progress, and move accordingly.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LEIGH CREEK NORTH COALFIELD TO MARREE RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1542.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—This Bill authorizes the construction of a standard gauge line from Leigh Creek to Marree. In the last few years we have authorized the

broadening of other sections of this line and we are now making a very definite step towards fulfilment of the agreement with the Commonwealth Government for the complete construction of a railway line to Darwin. The Stirling North-Brachina section was authorized several years ago and that work is still in progress, so we cannot expect that the completion of the section to Marree will be achieved in a matter of a few months. Taking a line through the time taken on the construction of the first section we will be fortunate if the line to Marree is completed within two years.

There can be no doubt about the benefit that this standardization will confer on cattle raisers in the far north. Anyone who has seen cattle put on trucks at far northern sidings and compared their condition on arrival at the abattoirs cannot but appreciate how much is lost in condition and value by the necessity to use the narrow gauge system and to transfer the cattle to the broad gauge system at Stirling North. Cattle raisers in what is known as the channel country in the south-west corner of Queensland will also derive much benefit. A big percentage of the cattle that reaches our markets in good seasons comes from that locality and after travelling very long distances to reach the railhead the cattle have to be trucked on the narrow gauge system. This Bill therefore will overcome some of those disadvantages. I can see that the extension must ultimately go right through to the northern cattle raising country. However, this is an agreement which has been reached between the Commonwealth and the State Governments but I hope that ultimately we will see the line carried on another section and finally to Darwin. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—I support the Bill because it marks progress in the development of the State. When the Bill providing for the extension of the line from Stirling North to Leigh Creek was passed and construction commenced it led us all to believe that a great improvement would take place, not only in the transfer of cattle to the metropolitan area, but in the bringing of coal to Adelaide for the production of electricity, and other purposes. The extension of 61 miles has been made possible because it was so necessary to bring coal to the metropolitan area. Some time ago the cattle people at Marree claimed that the standardization of the gauge would enable them to transport their cattle to the metropolitan area in better condition. Marree is the point from which cattle from the Birdsville track are trucked. An improvement has been made in the last few years in the transport of cattle, but on the Birdsville track watering places are about 30 miles apart. Under the old system a drover required about 20 horses to bring forward a mob of cattle, but with the advent of the land rover he is able to carry sufficient water for the horses at least, and this has enabled a reduction from 20 to about six. However, on the long stages the horses must have a drink every 24 hours, especially those used for the droving. It therefore became necessary to have relief horses sent forward to the watering places, and these were interchanged with the remainder. This entailed additional travelling for the horses. Notwithstanding improvements, we find that the number of cattle coming forward on the Birdsville track is decreasing year by year until in the last few years they have dwindled to about 5,000 a year.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Is that not due to better facilities in Queensland?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—If they provide better facilities than we do, the cattle will go to that State. This morning we saw the turning on at Birdwood of water from the River Murray which will help to augment metropolitan supplies and will eventually provide for greater extension of the metropolitan area. This in turn will result in an increased demand for beef because of the increased number of people. If we do not compete with Queensland in providing facilities, the cattle will go to that State. I notice that the Premier of Queensland has said that undue influences have been brought to bear on the Commonwealth Government to get the extention of the railway line under discussion as against the building of a line from Dajarra to Brisbane. It will be necessary for us to do everything possible to counteract the pull from Queensland so that beef can be supplied here. One only has to consider the number of cattle yarded each week at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. It varies from about 1,500 to 2,700. When there is a large yarding the price drops by about £1 per cental. During the last week or two when there were only about 1,500 marketed, the price has increased. It is necessary that we should provide ample facilities to bring sufficient stock to the Metropolitan Abattoirs in order to help counteract the increased cost of living. Under present marketing conditions with cattle having to travel two or three days, they deteriorate through loss of moisture, and this impairs the quality and palatability of the beef.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—In Western Australia they deal with the problem by air transport.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I am pleased with the progress in this direction, but it will not have a big bearing on our meat supply. I was interested to read the following article in the *Advertiser* of last Wednesday under the heading "Low Meat Loss from Bruising":—

Economic loss to the meat industry caused by the bruising of cattle in transit from Central Australia to Adelaide has been disclosed as being a great deal less than expected. This is revealed in a report by the Department of Agriculture on an investigation of the problem. The Beef Production and Transport Conference, held yesterday released the report. It states that the average loss of 1.4 lb. of bruised trim a head from a total annual intake of 30,000 head of cattle from the Alice Springs district represents an annual loss of 42,000 lb. of carcase meat.

Taking bone at 25 per cent of carcase weight, in terms of animals, this represents an annual loss of 108 head. The loss from total condemnations through bruising, at the rate of three per 1,000 cattle, represents an annual loss from this cause of 90 carcases. The combined annual loss from bruised trim and total condemnations therefore amounts to about 200 head of cattle, equivalent to one day's beef consumption in Adelaide the report says.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What would be the total value of 200 head of cattle?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—If you multiply the number by £30 to £40 you will see that it represents a value of between £6,000 and £8,000 a year. I believe the proposed extension of the railway will not only encourage the development of the beef industry, but will materially add to the quantity forwarded to the metropolitan area. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1543.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 1)—The object of the Bill is to increase contributions by the Municipal Tramways Trust to the Highways Fund. The trust has nearly 200 buses on the roads and this represents a great change compared with a few years ago. Of this total 91 are trolley buses and 101 fuel buses. Judging by present-day trends in traffic, we shall have more buses than trams in the near future. Whereas the trust previously contributed .17d. to the Highways Fund, under the Bill the amount will be increased to 1d., which is a substantial increase. One must consider, however, that the trust pays no registration fees on its buses. The new contributions will amount to about the same as would otherwise be paid for registration. The Bill provides for the trust to contribute towards street lighting. I find on inquiry that it actually pays very little in this direction. It contributes towards the upkeep of lighting on Anzac Highway and the Port Road, and the amount is limited to £5,000 a year. I notice that the Bill insists that the trust shall carry out its obligation for the upkeep of roadways and lighting. That is something which in the past has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance. We know that tracks on which the trams formerly ran were not kept in proper repair.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.30 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, December 1, at 2 p.m.