

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 6, 1964.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**MAIN NORTH ROAD.**

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to a question I asked on September 30 in relation to speed zones on the Main North Road?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I have obtained the following report:

The Main North Road from Gepps Cross to Smithfield North has been speed zoned, and speed limit signs have been erected at the commencement of each zone. The section between Smithfield North and Gawler South has not been zoned because the traffic and physical conditions are such that the State-wide non-urban *prima facie* speed limit of 60 miles an hour is considered adequate. It is intended to paint the speed limit on the road surface at the start of each zone to give additional warning to motorists.

DUFFIELD LAND.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Chief Secretary obtained a report in reply to a question I asked on September 16 about the Housing Trust's building programme in the township of Duffield, which is close to Gawler?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have obtained the following report from the Chairman of the Housing Trust:

The Housing Trust has built 19 houses on the land of the trust at Duffield, Gawler, has subdivided a further 38 allotments, and holds land sufficient for another 40 allotments. There is only a relatively small demand for houses at Gawler, and the trust's present building programme is being carried out at Evanston Park, where the trust has some 100 allotments. It is unlikely that the trust will build at Duffield for at least two years. The drainage problems at Duffield have not been created by the trust alone, and the trust has prepared and discussed with the council a drainage scheme to serve about 120 acres, of which the trust owns about 25 acres. In due course it can be expected that the trust will make some contribution to the cost of a drainage scheme to serve the area.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Brighton Boys Technical High School,
Outer Harbour Passenger Terminal.

K3

METROPOLITAN AREA (WOODVILLE, HENLEY AND GRANGE) DRAINAGE BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1176.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill. Estimated payments from consolidated Revenue Account for the year 1964-65 total £112,568,000, while estimated receipts total £110,076,000, giving an estimated deficit of £2,492,000. Fortunately, we have had some accumulated surpluses over the past few years, which is indicative of the prudent way in which the State has been conducted over those years, and when these accumulated surpluses are set against the estimated deficit for this year the estimated net deficit on Consolidated Revenue Account at June 30, 1965, becomes £570,000. We have obtained the accumulated surpluses in various ways. For instance, the Radium Hill project was of great benefit to the State and it gave a lead to the Commonwealth in uranium mining and refining. It also played an important part in providing our friendly allied countries with a raw material that they needed.

It is unfortunate, but perhaps I should say fortunate, that we do not have the demand now for uranium that was earlier envisaged. In getting into the uranium field so early we gathered much useful information about the mineral. South Australia has the nucleus necessary for the mining and refining of uranium. We have a plant at Port Pirie, which I imagine could quickly be again used for its original purpose. We have a fine mineral laboratory, which was so highly regarded by the Commonwealth Government that it came into the scheme and is now a partner in the operation of the laboratory. We can be proud of what this State, including the Department of Mines, has done in uranium development.

The moneys also come from some surpluses that have accrued as a result of prudent spending and saving as well as a rather remarkable situation that has taken place in the last 12 months. The last Budget included a disabilities grant from the Commonwealth Government to provide employment for many people, whereas at the end of the financial year the numbers of people unemployed were insufficient to enable all the money allocated for that purpose to be spent. This shows that, generally, the State is in a sound financial position but, like most prudent business people, we must not be complacent; a business may be going along well, but it is necessary to look into the future and

perhaps take remedial action to keep the business afloat and put a sum away for reserves.

It is interesting to see that the State ended last year with a surplus of £1,625,000 instead of a deficit of £492,000. The Hon. Mr. Shard had some worries about this point and said he found it difficult to find out why certain officers had been so far out in their estimates. In running one's own business it is not easy to estimate the unknown financial factors. A person in applying for an overdraft always thinks, "I had better be on the safe side", and the banker on the other hand thinks, "We will not allow this man to get too far out of hand." So the position at June 30, 1964, was that the receipts were £2,689,000 more than estimated and the payments were £572,000 in excess of the estimates. In other words, the payments were a half per cent different from the estimates while the receipts were 2½ per cent out. In a Budget of over £100,000,000 it is remarkable for the Government to get as close as that to the estimate.

We had an excellent season last year in agriculture—one that was not anticipated by many people. It was a season that finished on well for all seasonal crops, including fruit and potatoes and various other commodities. The wool season in the inside country was extremely good. Mining activities last year were greater than originally anticipated by those responsible for preparing the Budget. All of those things point to the prosperity not only in this sphere of Government activity but in the general economy of the State at present. It also indicates the effect that a bountiful year in the primary industries has upon the whole economy of this State.

Liquidity now stands at a high level; at least, it does in the sectors that I know well, and I think that it does in most of the business sectors of the community at the present time. Values generally in the State have risen in the 1963-64 period and I believe have been maintained in the short period of this financial year. There has been an increase in motor registration fees of £196,000 above the estimates. Stamp duties were £167,000 above the estimates, and those two items are always good pointers to the state of the economy in any country, and in this State in particular. Increases in hire-purchase and land transactions would account for much of the increased stamp duty revenue. Succession duties were £630,000 above the estimate. Those responsible for drawing up the Budget would find it most difficult to assess the revenue for the ensuing year.

First, it is not known how many people will die during the year and, secondly, it is not known what class of people will die—whether they will be rich or poor. Statistics and averages are the only guide and, as it turned out, there must have been more people in the higher income bracket who died. I suppose some estates must have benefited to a large degree by the prosperity of this State. It must also be difficult to estimate whether or not the State will have to pump water from the Murray and whether that pumping will cost £250,000, which has been the lowest cost over a period of years, or whether it will cost over £800,000, which has been the maximum cost over that same period of years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have that point covered up very nicely now, though!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is nothing new. The honourable member made that point in his speech, but this item has been in the Appropriation Bill for quite some time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was not in the Bill two years ago.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That does not alter the fact that if the clause was not included the necessary powers were always there.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Nobody could tell me that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: But there is nothing mystical about the honourable member's question. I am sure the Chief Secretary could have given the honourable member the answer.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He just could not. You read *Hansard* and see.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I find it difficult to believe that nobody could give the honourable member the answer, because the money has always been found legitimately, otherwise the Auditor-General would have been breathing down somebody's neck.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am not suggesting that the money was not found honestly. All I wanted to know was where it came from and how it was secured.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure the honourable member would have been given the correct answer. Perhaps he did not frame his question in the proper way.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will take you back to *Hansard* and show you it was not answered properly.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The whole point is that the provision has been there in the last three Bills. I return to the point that I was making on how difficult it must be to judge how much water would be pumped

in any particular year, because when the Budget is being drafted in July we may be in the grip of a drought but when the Treasurer delivers the Budget in another place we may be receiving very beneficial rains. For pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main the provision this year is £170,000, which is 10 per cent less than for last year. The money to be spent on the Morgan-Whyalla main is £240,000, an increase of £54,000, making a total of £410,000 for estimated pumping costs for this year. Last year the estimate was £366,000, which amount was not all used. The highest figure we ever had was £834,000, in the year 1961-2.

An interesting point arises in connection with the Railways and Engineering and Water Supply Departments because they provide important public utilities. Without water, sewerage and such facilities, any city would be in great difficulty. This applies equally to the country areas. This State has a proud record of providing sewerage facilities for its towns—a much better record than that of any other State in Australia. Many parts of some of our larger capital cities are still not sewered but we have gone to great lengths in this State to provide sewerage services. I am pleased that country sewerage is going ahead, though perhaps not as quickly as some districts need it, particularly in those areas where underground water has to be drawn upon for use in the towns and in those cases where a high water table exists, such as the flat country in some of the Murray towns. However, these schemes are going ahead. Mount Gambier now has its sewerage system and Whyalla is well under way with its system. Many of the hills towns have been sewered as a result of appropriations from this Parliament.

The Railways Department last year incurred an expenditure of £390,000 less than the amount estimated. Again, we have to take note of the labour position. The department has not been able to get sufficient suitable labour recently to carry out all the desired maintenance work on which it could have spent its allocation of money. Suitable labour is one of the biggest problems we have to face in industry, particularly trained artisans and semi-trained people for the departments dealing with essential services. South Australia is receiving far more than its share of overseas migrants. We have by far the biggest intake of British migrants of any State in the Commonwealth, and that has been the case for some time. But the number is still not sufficient. If we are to maintain this high standard that we have set

for ourselves, we shall need more migrants from somewhere. This is a major problem. Our State Government has gone a long way towards providing facilities for people who come here to settle. I think that no other State provides similar facilities. Where else can a migrant make arrangements in his own country before he actually leaves it to put down a small deposit to buy a house in this State? The house is ready for him when he arrives. Generally, it is in a congenial area, not over-crowded but provided with practically every service imaginable, as is the case in Elizabeth and neighbouring towns.

We are entitled to a higher rate of migrant inflow. The income of the Railways Department for this coming year is estimated to increase by about £164,000. The Hon. Mr. Shard says he hopes there will not be a decrease in railway income this year. I do not think we can avoid it because, when the previous year is looked at, it can be seen that much wheat was held at sidings in country areas as a carry-over from previous harvests. So, in order to move that wheat to the terminals, the railways had a particularly busy time for the first six months of the year 1963-64.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: To December, 1963.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; it was a busy time. It appears that we shall for this year, because of recent rains, have an excellent cereal harvest. We shall not have that backlog to pick up and therefore there will not be quite the same amount of cereal cartage as last year.

Here, I pay a tribute to the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board for the magnificent job they have done in shifting the wheat and barley so quickly from the country. It has made it possible (with some slight inconvenience, I must admit) for the bulk handling company to shift wheat quickly, thus causing the growers not so much financial loss as they would have incurred had it been left on their properties. The Wheat Board has made arrangements for overseas sales. As honourable members know, much of this wheat is sold to Communist China. At times we have been greatly criticized for trading with Communist China, but that trade has given the Australian economy a great fillip. It has shifted wheat and made it possible for the producers to get their money and so circulate it. Also, it has provided the people of China with something to eat which, in my opinion, is also important.

As we well know, there has been a great increase in the amount of superphosphate used

in this State and in other parts of Australia since the Commonwealth Government's subsidy on superphosphate, which subsidy, I am proud to say, was introduced by the Government that I support. This has been of great benefit to the economy of the whole country, besides building up the structure of our agricultural areas. We can look forward confidently to a general increase in the productivity of our farming areas as a result of this additional superphosphate being used by farmers today.

The Railways Department's accounts disclose that much more superphosphate is being used since the introduction of the subsidy than previously. The slight increase in rail fares will certainly help a little to keep the Railways Department as solvent as it can be. A railway is an essential service and, provided that it is run with the maximum efficiency, I do not think in the present circumstances we can expect that it will run at a profit and be able to maintain an adequate service. The Railways Commissioner strives hard to see that his undertaking is run efficiently and well in the interests of this State.

There has been a record year in relation to the movement of ore to Port Pirie. The Government was worried whether we would continue to have the business of shifting ore from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. I am pleased that the problem seems to have been resolved and that increased tonnages have been carried by the railways to Port Pirie, where the smelting is done. It is essential for Port Pirie that the industry remain, because that town, like so many others, could become a ghost town if the main commodity dealt with there happened to dry up. Nobody wants to see that. Members of Parliament are particularly concerned to see that country towns within their districts are maintained and that wherever possible industry is given the opportunity to flourish.

As the Hon. Mr. Shard said last week, some of the matters mentioned in this Bill are dealt with in other measures, particularly those dealing with stamp duties, fauna conservation, and one or two others. As a result, I do not think it necessary for me to deal with the Estimates in detail. If we are to maintain the high standard we have reached in education, hospitals, and other essential services, we must be prepared to pay for them. If we want to provide benefits and make promises, somebody must find the money. Unfortunately, it is always Parliament that must find the money, and the unfortunate Treasurer has not only to dole out the money equitably but find ways and means to get more money for these purposes.

When people dream up grandiose schemes and say we should have this or that, they always seem to forget where the money will come from.

In order to keep our finances in their present stable condition, money must be raised from new sources. No Government derives any pleasure out of imposing new taxation, but this is a realistic approach to a subject that I believe the Government is facing up to in this case. Some other States that are better placed geographically and should be better placed financially are considering more stringent methods of raising money to keep going. If we have to get more money, I think we must decide what is reasonably equitable for the whole community. Measures to obtain additional revenue have been foreshadowed by the Treasurer and are now before Parliament for consideration. We shall have to raise some more money and, although the community generally will be somewhat disgruntled at first, I think people will realize that if we are to have stability—and that is all we ask—we must raise additional money. I support the second reading of this Bill, and commend it to honourable members.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): It is a pleasure to rise to congratulate the Government on the introduction of a record Budget which, as the Hon. Mr. Story has just said, is over £112,500,000. I congratulate the Government also on the continuing development of this State in both secondary and primary industries. This is a time of rising costs as a result of an increase in the basic wage and other cost factors. In the circumstances the Government is to be commended for the small estimated deficit, which is only just over £500,000.

Mr. Story mentioned the bounteous 1963 season. Although there have been considerable worries during this year because certain parts of the State have been struggling whereas others have been reasonably well off from a seasonal point of view, the bountiful rains in the last month or two have changed the position in most areas. Although some areas still need rain, this State and Australia as a whole can look forward to a successful harvest, which will create more buoyant conditions and more public stability, as in 1963.

In relation to water reticulation, I believe our achievements are an object lesson to other States. They have been referred to in detail previously and I do not intend to deal with them in detail myself. I remind the Government, however, that in its continuing development of water extensions some places, such

as the Murray Lands, Southern Yorke Peninsula, and Sedan and Cambrai on the Murray Plains, to mention just a few, still need a reticulated water supply. I am glad to know that some improvements in reticulated supplies have been planned and others have been put into effect, particularly in the Barossa and the Warren water districts, parts of Yorke Peninsula, and that plans have been made to provide an underground water supply for the southern part of Yorke Peninsula.

I have no complaints about the work done by the Electricity Trust in extending power supplies throughout the State. However, I was told recently of a case where the trust had failed to consult the district council regarding the placement of poles. It did not provide any plan for the council. The trust will probably have to pay for its omission by having to remove the poles very soon, because of the projected realignment of the road. If it had consulted the council this action could have been avoided, but that does not alter the fact that the trust should carry out its obligation to consult councils on these matters.

The extension of electricity services, and the provision of cheap power in industrial areas, has had a great bearing on the successful development of this State, and the fact that we are now in a buoyant position. Last year I drew the attention of the Minister of Works to conditions in a considerable part of Gawler and in Evanston South, where the drainage of effluent from the septic tank system is almost non-existent. I inspected the area in company with Mr. Laucke (member for Barossa in another place), and we were shown conditions in the Housing Trust area that were undoubtedly a menace to public health. On that occasion I said that I was aware that the position could not be righted overnight, but I believe that, because in this area evil-smelling effluent was lying around for small children to play in, there should be an immediate investigation and an interim scheme adopted, pending the laying of new mains. Conditions have scarcely improved since then, and although I am aware of the permanent action being taken at the Bolivar sewage treatment works, I ask the Government to consider assisting the council concerned to provide some form of temporary relief from these objectionable conditions. I commend the Government for its far-sighted policy in establishing the Bolivar works, which will cope with the area for many years to come. It is being constructed with an eye to the future.

Referring to the amount to be made available for education and educational buildings, I express appreciation of the continuing progress being made in this field. The opening of the new Teachers College at Kintore Avenue, which unfortunately I was unable to attend, was a real milestone on the road to progress. It will increase the number of teachers and provide them with better facilities and improved opportunities for training. I believe that the increased facilities and the additional new buildings being supplied in country areas are also evidence of the Government's determination to proceed with improvements to and the expansion of our educational system. However, many facilities are still needed in the older types of schools. In company with the Hon. Mr. Hart I recently inspected some of these schools in the northern portion of Yorke Peninsula.

Passing on to the money to be spent on hospital and health services, I express appreciation to the Minister of Health for the progress being made in this connection. I have had the privilege of accompanying deputations to the Minister seeking improvements to hospital and health services in various portions of my district. There has been helpful consideration and, where possible, the practical assistance of the Government, which is much appreciated. I am sure that the money being devoted to extending public health and hospital services in this State is being well spent. My colleague (Hon. Mr. Story) referred to the amount provided for the Railways Department. We have a railway system which, as my friend pointed out, cannot be expected to pay because it provides facilities and service extensions throughout the State. We have a system that is as efficient as it can be and, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, the Railways Commissioner is doing his best to provide us with an efficient service and extended services.

I commend the Government for its increased allocation to the South Australian Symphony Orchestra. Last year, in common with the honourable member for Burnside in another place, I made representations to the State Government for an increased grant and I am glad to say that appropriate action has been taken. The Government has always done its best to provide cultural facilities. In this instance there will be an adequate number of string instruments. It has come about as a result of the allocation made by the Government and the increased amount allotted by the Australian Broadcasting Commission. It has made a great difference to our Symphony Orchestra

and has brought it to a comparable standard with the larger orchestras in Australia.

In concluding my remarks on the Bill, I refer to the amount provided for agricultural purposes, and I pay a tribute to the work done by the Department of Agriculture. However, in doing that I seek a reconsideration of a matter brought forward by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and myself last year. I refer to the supply of antibiotics and the older and more simple drugs available for the treatment of stock. I was able to examine a container for the veterinary penicillin that is registered for general distribution under the Stock Medicine Acts of Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania. I am informed that the penicillin is freely available in Queensland. I draw attention to the fact that this drug is available fairly freely in those other States, but in South Australia, even though we still have a shortage of veterinary surgeons, we must go to a veterinary surgeon every time we want to get supplies of penicillin to inject into stock. The experienced primary producer in South Australia is no less efficient or intelligent than the primary producer in the Eastern States, and we could very well have some relief in the distribution of these drugs. I do not suggest that we should have a wholesale release. I do not believe that chemists should make the drugs available to strangers, but that they should be made available to experienced stock owners, who might be asked to sign a book somewhat similar to the Poisons Book. I stress that at the present time veterinary surgeons travel over large distances, and it is possible for them to be a long way away when penicillin is required. It is often urgent that this drug be administered early in the treatment of animals. It may be fatal to delay treatment for half a day while trying to find a veterinarian.

I suggest that the Government give further consideration to providing partial release for products used for the treatment of mastitis, which occurs mainly in cattle. I know it is possible to procure a product for the treatment of mastitis that contains 100,000 units of penicillin, but it contains penicillin alone. I also believe it could be possible to obtain a much more efficient product containing protein penicillin and streptomycin combined. It is fair to say that this Government does not believe in unnecessary restrictions, and I consider that our experienced primary producers are responsible people who should be able to obtain some of these products, at least under partial release, as I have suggested. The Hon. Mr. Story and

the Hon. Mr. Shard indicated that there are a number of Bills coming into this Chamber dealing with matters contained in this Appropriation Bill and there is therefore no need to go into considerable detail over those matters. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STAMP DUTIES AND MOTOR VEHICLES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 1131.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): My Party and I will have nothing to do with this Bill as we do not think it is drawn up to meet the wishes or the best interests of the people. I do not know who was responsible for drafting the Bill but, whether it was the Government or the Parliamentary Draftsman, if the intention was to complicate it and make it difficult for an ordinary person to understand, then a better job could not have been done. I consider the measure should have been divided into three separate Bills. It is becoming a habit in this place in recent months to introduce Bills amending one, two or three Acts, and this is not a good practice.

I think this amending Bill should have been dealt with by three separate Bills. The new tax on motorists would be dealt with in one Bill, and the new provisions relating to money-lenders and the tax on shares could be dealt with by other Bills. Whether the intention of the Government is to short-circuit debate, it is not good draftsmanship to amend more than one Act in one Bill. I have spoken on that aspect on a previous occasion.

This is an important Bill, and before dealing with one or two clauses of it I shall mention something that happened a few years ago. That was when the Government, and particularly the Premier, were proud to announce that this State was no longer a mendicant State. I said then that the people might live to regret this, and I think that now the chickens are coming home to roost. Whichever way we look at it, whether from the point of view of the poor or the wealthier sections of the community, the effect of this Bill is that an additional £1,500,000 is to be raised in taxation from the people of South Australia in the coming year. If it was the desire of the people concerned to get away from the Grants Commission and be no longer a mendicant State, all we can do now is enter a protest, and that I will do.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you oppose the basic wage increase?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, I do not.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It has to be paid, doesn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, it does. It has been paid for years through the Commonwealth Grants Commission. We were better off by being a mendicant State than we are today. If the Minister disagrees with that, he is entitled to do so, but I am also entitled to my opinion. I am not going to say anything that will please the Government this afternoon. I think the taxation in the form of this Bill has gone right away from the principles of taxation. I think that most of the money that will be raised will come from the poorer sections of the community.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They are not too poor if they can afford a motor car.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In my opinion this taxation will widen the gap between those who have and those who have not, and anything that does that will never receive my support.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Isn't this Bill trying to bring the "haves" down to the "have-nots"?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. I would like to see the "have-nots" brought up to the "haves". I have never tried to push anyone down. I have spent the whole of my life trying to lift people on the low rungs of the ladder up two or three rungs and, without being egotistical, I say that in some cases I have succeeded.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Isn't this the reason that we are not a mendicant State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There are other States in a better financial position than we are that are still mendicant States. It was not that this State was told that it had to become a non-mendicant State; it was merely for the purpose of satisfying somebody's ego and giving him the satisfaction of saying that during his time we became a non-mendicant State. I remember my old friend, the late Hon. Frank Condon, who used to occupy the seat I now have, commenting that in the not too distant future the people of this State would be taxed heavily for the sake of our no longer being a mendicant State. I think other members will remember that being said by Mr. Condon.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why are we still the lowest taxed State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That might be right, and again it might not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is right.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Is it? I have heard that statement challenged, but I am not going to try to prove or disprove it now, because I have not checked it. Some people in South Australia, not the poorer sections, are without doubt not taxed as much as they are in other States.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What claims have we for remaining a mendicant State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Greater assistance from the Commonwealth Government out of the pool of taxes paid by the South Australian people. It is our duty to remain a mendicant State and get our due return from the Commonwealth. That is the answer, but the leaders of this Government did not want it that way. That is the reason why we should be still a mendicant State, and I venture to say that, if that were the position now, this legislation would not have been needed.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We are one of the highest taxed States in the Commonwealth at present.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Honourable members have a right to speak on taxation and various other things. If there is to be taxation (and our Party realizes that there has to be taxation; we have never opposed it) we say it must be on an equal basis, according to the means of people and their ability to pay. This amending Bill is far from that. I want to touch on only one or two things this afternoon to make my point clear. If this Bill provided for taxation for everybody on an equal basis, I should not be speaking as I am now, but the Bill does not do so. Therefore, we voice our protests against it. One part of this Bill anticipates a return of £60,000 a year to the State Government, 99.9 per cent of which will come from the poorer section of the people. I will go further and say that no-one classed as a wealthy person will pay anything in that direction, and neither will I. Do honourable members think that is fair?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What are you talking about?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am talking about stamp duties, in respect of which £60,000 will come from the poorer section of the community, and not a penny from the wealthy classes.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Don't farmers buy many commodities on hire purchase?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The most heavily taxed industry dealt with by this Bill is the motor industry, in respect of which there is to be an increase in the registration fee of 1 per cent of the purchase price of a car when first

registered. With a car costing £1,000 the additional fee will be £10. A car costing £200 will cost an extra £2, which is the minimum charge. If I had to come down to buying a car costing only £200 I wouldn't have it, but many people need cheap cars as a means of transport to and from work. This is a charge of 1 per cent but it will not stop at that. It is only the beginning. At some time in the future the 1 per cent will become something higher. So it is a sectional tax on the motorists. The motorist is being charged for this and that and, sooner or later, irrespective of what Governments are in power, either in the Commonwealth or in the State, these Governments will be going a long way towards killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. It must be stopped. This in itself may not have such a great effect on the motor industry but, following closely the recent increase in sales tax on cars (2½ per cent, which increased the price of an average car by between £20 and £30), the two taxes together will mean an extra £40 tax on a £1,000 car. That adds to the difficulties of a prospective buyer. It reflects throughout the industry. It is peculiar that the Government decided to tax the motor industry of this State because today it is the largest employer of labour in the State. If that position is jeopardized, it must have an effect on the economy of the State.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It appears that 8,000 people are not too keen to work at the moment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is in Victoria. I do not know whether or not they are justified. I presume they are justified, judging by what I read this morning, because, when an employer, whether he be large or small, refuses to talk or negotiate, it gets the employees' backs up quickly. When the employers say, "We are not going to talk," that does not do any good. Within this State very few such situations have arisen. In my time as Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council, if somebody said, "We shall not meet you", we replied, "Right; if you want it that way, the fight is on", and that is what happened in Victoria. Sooner or later they will have to talk and then the men will go back to work. Their attitude may be justified. I do not know the pros and cons of it but, if the firm concerned is not prepared to talk, it is like a red rag to a bull to the employees. Getting back to the industry, Mr. Fred Birrell, the Commonwealth member for Port Adelaide, had something to say on the Appropriation Bill in the House of Representatives on August 26,

1964. Previously, Mr. Birrell had been Secretary of the Vehicle Builders' Union and I consider him an authority on that particular industry. I shall not read all his remarks, but some of them are pertinent. The Government might consider this before having anything further to do with the motor industry, because we know that its effect on the economy of this State and of the whole of Australia is great. Mr. Birrell said:

I now turn to the Government's decision to increase sales tax on motor cars from 22½ per cent to 25 per cent. This increase represents the eighth change in sales tax on motor cars in 13 years. There have been four increases and four decreases. History reveals that each time the tax has been increased motor car sales have fallen alarmingly and the Australian motor industry and its allied industries, including rubber, paint, glass and steel, have been forced to make heavy retrenchments. However, each time the Government has belatedly adjusted the position by reducing the sales tax these industries have quickly come back and picked up. The Australian motor industry, taking into account manufacture, sales, repairs and other aspects associated with it, is the biggest employer of labour in this country. As such, it is of paramount importance to the nation. This is particularly so in my State of South Australia.

It is no idle statement to say that it has had a great effect on the motor industry of this State. I was surprised that the Government further penalized the motorist by the imposition of this 1 per cent increase.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Would you rather have had it on water rates?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I would sooner have seen it on an equitable basis. If the Government wants money, that is the way to get it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Are you a supporter of State income tax?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, I am not. However, if we had been a mendicant State, we would not have had this Bill that is before us now. I believe that, as Australia is one country, the people should pay one tax according to their ability to pay.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Unification!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: From a taxation point of view, yes. Another thing the Bill proposes to do is put a stamp duty on memoranda made pursuant to the Money-lenders Act. This is a charge on contracts now used by money-lending firms in South Australia—the hire purchase companies—to evade the provisions of the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act. It has been suggested by the Minister that, because of the provisions of clause 8,

this will not be passed on to the borrower. Clause 8 provides that a money-lender shall not add the amount of any duty on the note and otherwise demand or recover or seek to recover any amount from the borrower, and that the borrower can get it back from the money-lender if he does. How would the borrower be able to prove this? In the majority of these transactions, the money-lender operates directly through a retailer, and the charges will not appear on the note; the retail price will go up. How will this be controlled under the provisions of this Bill? As far as I know, there is nothing in the Bill to control that position.

The charges will be passed on to the borrower under the hire-purchase agreement, the personal loan contract, or the unregistered bill of sale, which will all be caught under this proposal. The people who need to make use of hire-purchase or money-lending finance are the poorer sections of the community. They are the people who go to the money-lenders for assistance. They are the people responsible for the very large sum in time payment contracts outstanding in the books of money-lenders in this State. The wealthier interests are not using money of this kind; they are using overdrafts, and they will not be paying any stamp duty. Hire-purchase is called the small man's overdraft, and it is the small man who will be paying. The big man has no charge on him at the moment despite the fact that already he pays less in State taxation than is imposed in any other State of the Commonwealth.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The fellow who wrote that is on your side!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: He is a very good adviser. Recently we debated whether another charge would be passed on to purchasers, and we were told that it would not. However, it was passed on. I am confident that the extra costs imposed on these firms will be passed on to the community. It is expected that over £450,000 will come in various ways from insurance companies, but I do not accept that the bulk of the added charges will not be passed on to the community. From mortgages, £225,000 per annum is expected to be raised, and this also will be passed on to the community. I do not know what will happen in relation to sharebrokers; I am not a sharebroker and, as I have never had enough money to dabble in shares, I have never bought any. However, I presume that most of this money will eventually be a charge on the community.

I think I have said enough to indicate the opposition of my Party to this Bill. Since last Thursday I have read *Hansard* to see what has been said in another place. If I have not stated my opposition as well as I could, I advise honourable members to read the *Hansard* report of the proceedings in another place last week to see in more detail the opposition of my Party to the measure. I oppose the Bill, but as I know that the Government has made up its mind on the matter I shall not debate it further. My Party opposes the Bill, and will vote accordingly.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I cannot rise with the usual gusto and say that I wholeheartedly support the Bill, as I do not think anyone particularly wants it. However, it is a little like medicine, which one has to take sometimes to do one good whether one likes it or not. It is easy for Opposition members to say that they would not do anything at all about this form of taxation, yet scarcely a measure is brought before this Council or another place without the Opposition having some bright idea about improving it. The Party opposite wants to provide services for the people whom the Leader refers to as being in the lower income bracket. Obviously, these things must be paid for, and this measure is a way to pay for them. The Bill deals with five specific items. The Hon. Mr. Shard raised an interesting point about our not being a mendicant State. I refer him to Parliamentary paper No. 18, which is the Treasurer's financial statement, where the Treasurer says:

South Australia has now had five years of financial independence from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and the results of next year's review of the taxation reimbursement grants arrangements, which are independent of the commission, will indicate whether it is in the interests of the State to continue as a "non-claimant" State. For the past five years, and even including the sixth which is the present rather difficult year for budgeting, there is no doubt that the interests of the State have been well served by being "non-claimant". Over that period we have had four years of surplus aggregating £3,610,000 and one deficit of £311,000. Allowing for a deficit this year of £2,492,000, the net result would still be favourable to the extent of about £800,000.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Where is the justification for an increase in taxation?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think I said, when speaking on another Bill, that this was a difficult year, and the Treasurer pointed that out in his Budget speech.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Every year is difficult yet we always finish with a surplus of several million pounds.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have never finished with a surplus of several million pounds, but we have had a better result than expected. However, we are £800,000 better off than we would have been under the old system, and that is not an inconsiderable sum. Apart from this, we have been independent and away from the apron strings of the Grants Commission. If honourable members cast their minds back to the time when we were subject to the Grants Commission they will remember that we were closely watched and our expenditure in certain avenues of development was channelled. However, since then we have been able to go along on our own resources. We have been through a period of much development. My friends in the Labor Party never seem to realize that we have changing conditions. They want everybody to be of the same pattern and then they impose stringent rules. Following that, things just have to run straight ahead, irrespective of what happens.

Over the last 28 years in South Australia there has been much flexibility and I believe that in the last few years we have benefited immensely because we have been able to conduct our own business profitably. Undoubtedly we shall reach the stage where expenditure will exceed revenue, but in the meantime we shall have had flexibility. The Commonwealth Government is adopting the policy of trying to keep inflation within bounds, and this year it has been tough in that South Australia is £2,000,000 down on previous grants. We must realize the Commonwealth Government's position. We have previously had complaints from Opposition members about that Government's "Stop and go" policy, as they called it. When the Commonwealth Government tries to keep the economy within bounds and at the same time we try to raise additional revenue, we are accused of levying sectional taxation. I cannot get away from the fact that the motor vehicles tax is not a sectional tax. If a person can afford three motor cars he can afford to pay the increased tax. The man on the lower wage will pay a smaller amount.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What will he pay?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the price of the car is £200 or under, he will pay only £2.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that not a sectional tax?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is hardly worthwhile picking up the pen to scratch it out. The poorer man is not penalized. Surely we should not get down to imposing such small

taxes as 5s., 6s. 8d. or 7s. 6d. The minimum has been fixed at £2, and I think that is fair enough. Where the stamp duty is £1 for each £100, the purchaser of a motor car costing £1,500 will pay £15. If the amount is £200 or under, the tax will be £2. I cannot see that that is sectional taxation. I come now to the contracts and notes pursuant to the Money-lenders Act and point out that this matter deals with hire-purchase. My friends in the Opposition believe that the hire-purchase business is related only to people who go to a Rundle Street store to purchase goods, but many of the so-called "haves" that my friends opposite talk about, the biggish farmers, have to buy machinery on hire-purchase.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They would get it more cheaply if they bought it on their bank overdraft.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. If the honourable member wants me to tell him why that is so I shall do so later. I am now dealing with the Bill. Very little machinery is purchased by a primary producer on his bank overdraft, which is "carry-on" money and is not used to buy goods. Commercial firms are also involved in this hire-purchase business: it is not only the person who buys a washing machine from a Rundle Street store. I think we can discount the suggestion that the tax on hire-purchase business is a sectional tax, and I do not think the tax on insurance companies is sectional.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said that it would be channelled back as a cost to the community.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: To the individual, it would not matter very much if that were so. Life and personal accident premiums are to be exempted and this will affect the small people. I do not think we need worry very much about it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about the ordinary householder?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It does not come back to him. The tax will be carried by the companies. There will be overhead expenses to be absorbed. The Minister said that insurance companies in South Australia were getting out of this business much better than insurance companies in other States. As insurance is balanced on a Commonwealth basis, it was said that policy holders in this State were not receiving the benefit of the low rate of tax. Therefore, these people will receive a benefit by the companies contributing a little more. I do not think there can be any complaints about this.

Now we come to mortgages. Mortgages and debentures cover a wide field, included in which is house ownership. The proposal is to increase the stamp duty from 2s. 6d. to 5s. for each £100. The man who mortgages his property to the extent of £3,000 (and there would not be many who could raise a mortgage above £3,000) will pay £3 15s. more than he does at present. Spread over 40 years, which is the normal term for this type of finance, it does not amount to very much. Many houses are being built now, most by means of a loan secured by a mortgage, so that many people are contributing money to the Treasury, though to the individual it does not amount to much, being an increase of only £3 15s. on a £3,000 house. Therefore, I do not think we should get steamed up about this.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: A man pays an increase of 100 per cent as far as the mortgage stamp duty is concerned, and that is only one aspect. He has increases on other things as well. Add it all up and see what he has to pay!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It amazes me that so many people come here to live if it is such a rotten place! I have heard it said for many years that we do this and we do not do that, but we have attracted many people to this State and more still are coming. What is more remarkable, most of them are staying. I am proud to be a South Australian because there is freedom here, and we breathe fresh air most of the time. There are plenty of people in Australia and plenty of places in Australia where people would be only too happy if they could get a house at all, so why worry greatly about the additional £3 15s.? This Government has made an honest endeavour to get sufficient houses for people and this increase is not great, nor will it rock the nation.

The third item deals with share transfers and stamp duties thereon. This only brings this State into line with New South Wales, which was the suggestion of the deputation that waited on the Treasurer because they considered that if an increase was necessary it should be on the basis of the rate in New South Wales. The duty on the conveyance of shares amounts to 7s. 6d. in every £100. I don't think anybody will be worried about that, as most people who deal in shares have few transactions in a year. The person who is a speculator, and speculates daily, is doing it for that specific purpose, in the same way as a punter goes to the races and invests his money

on the hot tip for the day. With great respect, I say their chances of success are about equal.

The punter has to pay a reasonable tax for his speculation, and people who use the facilities of the Stock Exchange should pay for them too, but people doing normal business on the Stock Exchange will not be unduly hit by this provision. It is necessary that the State have this extra money to maintain the facilities existing at present and to continue our development of the State. If the Opposition Party can find any logical method to replace this system, I would like to hear of it. I have read the *Hansard* reports of another place from cover to cover and I have not seen where anybody has put up a practical solution to raise the £1,000,000-odd necessary to finance this particular item. The Hon. Mr. Shard suggested that we should have some flat rate of income tax, but that has been proved impracticable, and even if it were practicable I do not think anybody would be any happier about it than they are about this method. The Opposition wants something to grizzle about, and this is an opportunity to grizzle. I support the second reading.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1182.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I intimate at the outset that I oppose this Bill on various grounds. I have noticed for many years since being a member of this Chamber that the Local Government Act, an Act with something like 910 sections, usually comes down for amendment in the dying stages of the session so that it can be rushed through. Then, in the following year, the very clause that was dealt with on the previous occasion has to be amended. This has happened again this year, as the Bill seeks to clarify the intention of the previous legislation. This is not conducive to good legislation, especially with a statute of this nature. I repeat that this is done year after year.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The honourable member would be quite incorrect, because last year it was one of the first Bills introduced.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This is done repeatedly and I consider that it is done deliberately. I have various criticisms that I intend to voice on this Bill. It is not my intention to be personal, even if I appear to be so. My

remarks will not be directed personally at the Minister or any other member of the Council. Clause 4 of the Bill alters the day of the notification of company nominees who are eligible to vote at council elections from March 31 to May 31. Further amendments should be made to this clause. I have never agreed that a company should have a multiplicity of votes in relation to its property. It may have a multiplicity of nominees but only one person should vote, as is the case with any other ratepayer in the district. That is not embodied in this Bill. The clause deals only with an alteration of date from March 31 to May 31 in respect of nominations of individuals by a company.

Clause 6 is contentious. It amends section 120 of the principal Act and deals with the method of voting at council elections. There is a proposed alteration in voting at such elections from the use of crosses to the use of numerals. The proviso to the amended section 120 states that it is not necessary to place a figure in every square or a cross where two candidates are required to be elected. Last week the question was raised in this Chamber whether it would allow for plumping. The voter can plump if he so desires. The system of voting by crosses does not affect that, and that will apply to numerals where two candidates are required to be elected.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Surely not!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Where two candidates are required and there are four nominees, the vote will be formal if the voter places the figures 1 and 2 in the first two squares and leaves the others blank. I think that answers the interjection of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. The same thing will apply if an elector chooses to vote by a cross. With two candidates required to be elected and with four nominees, the voter may put a cross in the first two squares if they are the candidates he desires to vote for. If they are not and he wants to vote for two others, as long as he puts a cross alongside their names, his vote is formal. The other squares can remain blank.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: His intention would not be clear if he put four crosses in.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will deal with that later; we all appreciate that point. The proposed new provision will provide for voting by numbers. A phrase used is "all the squares to be filled with consecutive figures". To this is added the general proviso that I have already mentioned. It has been said that many informal votes have been cast in previous

elections because a voter has voted by figures instead of by crosses, being accustomed to voting by figures in Commonwealth and State elections. Therefore, under our present system, many votes have been informal. It is claimed that the proposed new system will make what was previously an informal vote formal; it will help reduce confusion and thus reduce the number of informal votes. That was an argument used in support of this Bill during the second reading stage. I am of the opinion that the new provisions will cause more confusion than has ever occurred in the past and, because of that confusion, more informal votes than ever will be cast. That is apparent if we turn to clause 33, which provides that the voting paper shall contain an instruction to the voter that he must place a figure in every square. Clause 33 amends the Fifth Schedule of the principal Act. We observe that the voter must place a figure in every square, and there is no reference at all to voting by crosses, despite the other clauses of the Bill. Form No. 4 of the Fifth Schedule is definite. The new wording in clause 33 is:

Where only one candidate is to be elected the voter must place the figure 1 opposite the name of the candidate for whom he intends to vote. Where more than one candidate is to be elected the voter must place the figures 1, 2 (and so on as the case requires) within the squares opposite the respective names of the candidates for whom he intends to vote. In either case the voter must then place opposite the respective names of all the remaining candidates the figures 2, 3, or 4 as the case may be 3, 4, 5 (and so on as the case requires) in numerical sequence.

That is in absolute conflict with the previous provisions of this Bill and the proviso to clause 6 in relation to voting at municipal elections.

The Hon. N. I. Jude: It is merely a let-out clause. The schedule must set out something definite as this is a let-out clause.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I submit that there can be challenges to it because of the schedule. The voting paper states that one must do this and, although there are provisos earlier in the Bill to say that a voter can do something as an alternative, his voting paper states that that is what he must do; and, if he does not do it, there can be challenges irrespective of the results of the election. Because of the conflict here, there could certainly be challenges. I understand that this matter was considered by the Local Government Advisory Committee, which said that it believed that preferential voting was not desirable. I can appreciate that, and this legislation does

not provide a preferential system; the preferential system that we know is totally different from what the Bill proposes. I think that more informal votes than ever will be cast, and this opinion is strengthened by the amendments to sections 126 and 127. If, because of the amendments to the principal Act, a voter believes that he must place a cross in each square, and if there are four candidates but only two are wanted, the vote will be informal. However, a voter may be under the impression that he must place a cross in each square. I think this will happen under the provisions of this Bill.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: He will not read the Act.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Of course he will not. He will not know the first thing about the Act, so he will be guided by what appears on the ballot paper issued to him.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He will not do that.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think he will.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Then it will be all right.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If he reads it he will be under the impression that he must place a figure in every square for his vote to be formal. However, someone will perhaps tell him that he does not have to do that, that he has to vote "1" and "2", or that he has to vote by crosses. Who will read the Act to find out what is meant? The only person who will do that is one who is advanced in these matters and wishes to be conversant with the position. The ordinary voter will not do this. I think the provisions of this Bill will create more confusion in municipal voting than has ever been known before. There should be a uniform system. If it is decided that a preferential system is the best, let us have it everywhere, but I will vote against it. If it is decided that voting by crosses is the best method, let us have that in all elections. We should have one system instead of the dual system we now have. Many people will not understand this, and more informal votes will be cast than ever before. There is nothing wrong with the present municipal voting system, which should not be departed from.

Clause 4 inserts new clause 287a, and this provision is important for local government. Section 287 at present enables a council to contribute up to £250 a year to any organization that has as its purpose the furtherance of local government in its area. I believe this

new section has been introduced because of representations made by a particular organization but whether the operations of this organization are in furtherance of local government in this State is debatable. I think this matter emanated in the South-East, where councils have been approached recently and asked to subscribe to an organization known as the Portland Hinterland Development Committee, which is based in Victoria, for developing Portland as a port. I believe pressure has been brought to bear on the Mount Gambier Council.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: As far away as Robe.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, I know that, because the Robe council agreed to subscribe. So far as I know, it was the only council that agreed to subscribe. However, when it found that no other council agreed, it complained about the matter. The organization would perhaps bring an advantage to Mount Gambier, because the hinterland would perhaps be developed more than it is now, but it is obvious that the intention of the organization is to develop Portland as a port and to induce people in the South-East to send their products there for export to other States and overseas. However, all the benefits would go to Portland, and to Portland only. There is nothing to prevent a council from refusing to subscribe to any of these organizations. If councils in the South-East do not wish to subscribe, they need not. However, we must consider all the ramifications of the provision, because if the legislation is passed it will be binding on every council in this State.

Other councils subscribe to organizations based outside South Australia. I am referring particularly to councils along the Murray River, which I believe subscribe to the Murray Valley Development League, an organization that has done, and I think will continue to do, a good job to the advantage of places along the Murray. Although the Minister has said that this legislation will not have any detrimental effect on councils subscribing to that league and that it will be able to continue to do its good work, I do not think there is anything in this Bill to stop this from happening. The Minister said that the intention of the provision was to deter a council from contributing to an interstate organization. I suggest that any deterrent that applies in the South-East must apply in Murray River districts also. Earlier the Minister said that that would not be so, but, according to my interpretation, it would.

The matters contained in this Bill are important and they should have been brought before members earlier so as to give them the opportunity to consider their effects properly. Clause 11 deals with an important matter for metropolitan councils. Under the clause they can subscribe money to the Housing Trust in connection with the purchase of land within their boundaries for development or redevelopment purposes. I suggest that this cuts across the Housing Improvement Act of 1940. Members should peruse its provisions before deciding how to vote on this clause. The Act contains many sections and under it the housing authority (the Housing Trust, and actually the Government) has absolute authority to buy land, develop or redevelop it, and demolish or order the demolition of condemned or substandard houses. In fact, under the Act it can do almost what it wants to do. Surely the Housing Trust already has all the power and the capital needed to develop an area, and I feel sure that it would consult metropolitan councils about the types of buildings to be erected. It has been openly said that the recommendation for this clause has come from the Walkerville council, which desires to have flats built within its area. The trust has already purchased the land and the council has asked the trust to agree to build flats. It appears that the trust has agreed, provided that the council subscribes to the trust 45 per cent of the purchase price of the land.

If the clause is passed in its present form I suggest that it will apply to all metropolitan councils. We all know that the trust holds a considerable area of land for development purposes. Earlier today, in a reply to a question in this Chamber, it was said that it was not expected that land held by the trust in one area would be developed for two years. Land held by the trust covers areas in many council districts, and, in consequence, all councils could be affected by the clause. The trust could buy land and not develop it, yet hold metropolitan councils to ransom. A council could ask the trust to develop land by the building of flats and the trust could say it was prepared to develop the land provided the council paid 45 per cent of the purchase price of the land. Also, the trust could buy land at a very high price and hold it for years before deciding to build on it, but the council concerned would be expected to contribute 45 per cent of the purchase price and not of the then value of the land.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The councils are not obliged to do it. You suggest that they will be held to ransom.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am suggesting that it would be possible for the trust to hold land for many years without developing it and then when a metropolitan council wanted the trust to develop it the trust could say that it would do so if it received a subsidy from the council. If the council wanted the land developed it would not get the development until it suited somebody else to develop it.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The council would get a benefit from the additional revenue from rates.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, but after paying 45 per cent of the purchase price of the land the council, without owning anything in the area, would get only a benefit from the rates. While the land was held by the trust the house rents would have been paid to the trust, and the trust would have paid rates to the council. I am submitting that the Housing Trust is a Government concern and that some day in Parliament we may have lengthy debates about the amounts the Government should pay in rates for its properties inside metropolitan council areas. The 45 per cent of the purchase price of the land is ratepayers' money. They are the people who have to find this money, not the council, because the revenue of the council is derived from the ratepayers. The Bill empowers the councils to borrow money to purchase or subsidize the land without regard to the ordinary provisions governing loans under the principal Act. The ratepayers will not have a voice regarding a loan, though it could amount to a considerable sum, especially on present-day valuations. The council may borrow the money without consulting the ratepayers. Under the provisions of the clause the Minister must approve the purchase price of the land, or the land proposed to be purchased, but that means little to me.

I know that the Minister will not take this personally, but how can he have any control over the price of land that has already been purchased and perhaps held for two, three or four years by the Housing Trust? This Bill refers to land that has already been purchased. The provision whereby the Minister must be consulted means very little in the circumstances. I submit that it is the responsibility of the Government and not of the council to provide houses for the people.

It is the responsibility of the Government and the Housing Trust, and they have all the authority needed. The Housing Trust has built many flats and will undoubtedly build more flats. Some of them are let even before they are built. The Housing Trust will continue to build them where it is desirable that flats should be built for the betterment of an area. If the trust considered that it would not be in the best interests of the people to build flats in an area they would not be built there, irrespective of any representations that a council might make that it would like flats erected in the area. Another clause in the Bill enables a council to purchase houses for its employees. It can borrow money for the purchase of a house or perhaps to build a house for an employee. In some country areas the council would find it hard to obtain the services of a town clerk if it could not provide a house.

Because of the points I have brought forward and because we are near the end of the session, the Bill should be fully investigated before it is passed. It should be withdrawn now and redrafted. Bills to amend the Local Government Act take months in many instances to prepare, but such Bills are usually brought down late in the session when honourable members do not have an opportunity to give full consideration to the amendments. It may be necessary to return next year to amend this Bill now before us. I oppose this method of legislation, and I have given notice of my intention to oppose the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill, which, as other honourable members have said, is largely a Committee Bill, and one that will be dealt with in detail at that time. I do not intend to say much about it now, nor to deal with it clause by clause as though in Committee, as my honourable friend has just done. The Hon. Mr. Bevan in opposing the Bill has said that year after year an amending Bill is brought into the Chamber dealing with the Local Government Act. The Government brings these Bills down in a sincere desire to improve the Act, and I can see no reason why any honourable member should oppose a Bill that seeks to improve legislation. Surely that is our task.

In referring to one or two matters in the Bill some honourable members preceding me referred to clause 3, which seeks to amend section 42 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection giving certain powers to a magistrate in regard to investigations. The

Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that in his opinion the question of the costs, or fines, should be referred to the Minister. I gather that the Minister would have been in favour of the matter of the fines being passed on to him, as Mr. Gilfillan at first said, but I am aware that what my friend meant was that they should be referred to the Minister for further examination. However, with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I consider that it is not necessary to bring everything of this nature before the Minister and I would be happy for a magistrate to make the order as to costs. Clause 4 alters the latest date for nominating representatives of a company from March 31 to May 31. I support this amendment.

Clause 5 is a similar amendment in regard to owners. The Hon. Mr. Bevan said that, in his opinion, there should be only one vote for a company. I could not support that, as a company represents several people, and sometimes many people, and I believe three nominees and three votes to be reasonable in the case of a company that is a ratepayer. Clause 6 introduces the method of using numbers for voting instead of crosses. I support this. I cannot see that more confusion will arise from the operation of this clause, as Mr. Bevan predicts, because this means that electors at local government elections will vote by numbers, just as they vote by numbers in Commonwealth and State elections. They will not read all the detail that Mr. Bevan considers will confuse them. It is an improvement to introduce a system of voting by numbers. It will minimize confusion. I am inclined to support Mr. DeGaris when he suggests that it may be wise to introduce preferential voting in council elections. I am aware that on occasions there are only two candidates. That, of course, obtains also in State and Commonwealth elections. On other occasions there are three or four candidates. I cannot see that the introduction of preferential voting would be other than an improvement in arriving at a resolution in council elections. The Hon. Mr. Bevan was concerned about clause 11—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am concerned about the whole Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: —and the fact that a metropolitan council “may expend its revenue in paying to the South Australian Housing Trust such portion as the Minister shall approve . . . in accordance with conditions approved by the Minister”. I think that those two clauses—“such as the Minister

shall approve" and "in accordance with conditions approved by the Minister"—will ensure that there will be no abuse of this provision to be inserted in the Act.

I support the amendment to section 449c, to which Mr. Gilfillan referred, which inserts a new subsection enabling councils to provide houses for staff. I agree here with Mr. Bevan that it is highly desirable that councils should, under certain conditions, be able to provide quarters for a district clerk or members of their staff. There are a number of other clauses on which I could speak but I think the Bill will be dealt with in detail in Committee. I support it.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): Mr. President, I was about to move a contingent notice of motion but I understand that the Hon. Mr. Bevan wishes to move first.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I cannot move a motion until the Bill has been read a second time. It has not been read a second time yet.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Mr. President, I now move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee for inquiry and report.

On the motion being put:

The PRESIDENT: There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON: I ask leave to withdraw my objection to the Hon. Mr. Bevan's motion.

The PRESIDENT: In that case, if all honourable members agree, I shall put again the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Bevan.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I now move:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee for inquiry and report.

I have already given my reason why I, and I am sure other honourable members, feel that further inquiry should be held into this Bill and further investigations made. There should then be a report back to this Council on the effect of the ramifications of this Bill, which contains important clauses. It should not be rushed through without full investigation into the matter, and this is the only way in which we can have a full investigation: a Select Committee would report back to this Council on the whole Bill. There is a consensus of opinion that all we can do is move amendments to

the various clauses. An honourable member will move an amendment to a clause and all we can do at the moment is look at the Bill in front of us and the proposed amendment; we cannot go into its ramifications and its effect on the principal Act if carried. But we must fully consider the impact of this amending legislation. Anyhow, the time has arrived when the principal Act should be looked at and rewritten, and suitable amendments made to it. Many provisions in the present Act should not be there at all.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I am amazed at this rather unusual procedure. As all members have said, this is essentially a Committee Bill dealing with several specific matters. What more select committee can we have than one consisting of you, Sir, in the Chair and all honourable members here, many of whom have had many years of experience in local government. I suggest that to have a few members, some of whom may not be as conversant as are other members with local government affairs, on a Select Committee is illogical. The honourable member is entitled to object to some provisions, and the Committee of the Council will decide whether to accept them or not. This Bill should be dealt with clause by clause, and the various matters it deals with should be considered carefully by the most appropriate Committee we have in this State. I oppose the motion.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (3).—The Hons. S. C. Bevan (teller), A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard.

Noes (13).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, N. L. Jude (teller), H. K. Kemp, Sir Lyell McEwin, Sir Frank Perry, F. J. Potter, W. W. Robinson, C. R. Story, and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole Council on this Bill that it have power to consider an amendment to section 667 of the principal Act to empower councils to make by-laws to regulate the carriage of logs and sawn timber.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Proceedings on day of election."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the interests of uniformity, I think local government elections

should be conducted with a preferential system of voting. The Hon. Mr. Bevan, during the second reading debate, said that we should have uniformity in voting. I believe he was referring particularly to voting at council elections.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There should be only one system of voting.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, and it should apply in all elections held in Australia. I have amendments to clauses 6, 7 and 8. I suggest the amendments to clause 6 be dealt with and the Minister be good enough to postpone consideration of clauses 7 and 8. I move first:

In paragraph (a) before "by" second occurring to insert the words "indicating the name of each candidate for whom he intends to vote".

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I have considered this matter since it was raised by the honourable member. It was rejected by the Local Government Advisory Committee and given serious consideration by the Government. I have since examined the docket and find that a number of people support Mr. DeGaris's idea. In order that I may be able to give the matter further consideration I suggest that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

FAUNA CONSERVATION BILL.

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It repeals the present legislation on the subject of animals and birds protection, and is designed to make more effective provision for the conservation of the fauna of South Australia. The Act now in force was passed in 1919 and was based on policies which had been accepted since 1875. New legislation is clearly required. One reason is that, as a result of amendments and additions over the years, the present legislation has become confused and difficult for the general public to understand. It is also unnecessarily difficult to administer, and a substantial degree of simplification is possible. The most serious criticism, however, is that the present Act does not make adequate provision for the conservation and management of the South Australian fauna. It was designed to deal with shooting and trading rather than with management and conservation. Today, with the constant extension of land development, a more

vigorous policy of conservation and management is required to ensure survival of our native animals and birds.

For this reason the Government decided to introduce the Bill and let it be publicly known that it was willing to consider the views of interested persons and associations. Numerous conservation societies, sporting organizations, scientists and other persons made suggestions. While it has not been possible to include all of them in the Bill a substantial majority are included. There are conflicting interests in connection with fauna conservation—mainly, of course, between those interested in shooting and those interested in science and conservation—but the Government has been pleased to find much mutual understanding between the groups. In particular, the Field Sportsmen's Association has displayed a sympathetic attitude towards protection of animals and birds and this has helped the Government in devising a generally acceptable policy. The Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee has also given the Government advice on the problems dealt with in this Bill, and I believe that it agrees with the principles set out.

I will mention one other general matter before explaining the details of the Bill. If we are to achieve greater success in conserving our native animals and birds it is essential to have the co-operation and help of private land-owners. In recent times many farmers and other primary producers have displayed an enthusiastic willingness to take measures for the conservation of fauna. In order to assist them in this matter the Government is now proposing extended powers for the creation of fauna reserves and sanctuaries on private land, as well as Crown land. In these areas native animals and birds of all kinds will receive a high degree of protection against any interference, and positive arrangements will be made to ensure their survival.

I will now give members a short summary of the various Parts of the Bill. Part I contains the usual preliminary matter about repeals, definitions, and the scope of the Bill. The proposed definition of "animals" limits that term to mammals, so that reptiles are excluded; but, if it should be found necessary, reptiles or any other animals not classed as mammals could be included by regulation. Other definitions make it clear that the word "land" includes waters which are subject to the legislative power of the Parliament. Thus, areas of the sea or tidal flats, as well as

ivers and lakes, could be included in sanctuaries and reserves. Part II contains the administrative provisions. The Minister of Agriculture will be the responsible Minister, as at present. The principal administration officer, now called the Director and Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game, will be called the Director of Fauna Conservation. To assist administration, power is given to appoint honorary wardens in addition to the inspectors. The wardens will have power to demand names and addresses and the production of licences by suspected offenders, but no powers of search or arrest. Inspectors are given the usual powers to require names and addresses and to make searches in case of suspected offences. They also have power to detain suspected offenders pending the ascertainment of their names and addresses, but not otherwise. While these powers are similar in principle to those which inspectors in this State have had for many years, and to those granted in other States and the Northern Territory, they have been drafted with restrictions to ensure that they are no wider than is required for the effective administration of the Bill. Suspected offenders are required to give their names and addresses to inspectors or wardens on demand, and holders of licences and permits must also produce them on demand.

Part III contains the clauses specifically providing for conservation and control of animals and birds. The first group of clauses, namely 21 to '33, deals with the various types of reserves and sanctuaries which may be created. Under the existing Act there are provisions for two types of protective areas, namely, the closed area and the prohibited area. The closed area is an area in which all or some birds or animals are always protected. The prohibited area is a closed area in which entry by human beings is also controlled. There are, however, no provisions in the present law to ensure the management of these areas as reserves; and the provisions for protecting animals and birds in them are inadequate.

The Bill provides for four types of reserves or sanctuaries. The first is the prohibited area, the conditions for which are in clause 21. This is an area for the permanent conservation of animals and birds and from which it is deemed necessary to exclude human beings as far as possible. The fauna reserve provided for in clause 22 is somewhat similar to the prohibited area, except that the control of entry by human beings is not regarded as necessary.

Before a fauna reserve can be created the Governor must be satisfied that the land is not likely to be used for purposes inconsistent with the conservation of the fauna.

A fauna sanctuary, as provided for in clause 23, can be created where it is considered desirable to protect animals and birds, but without restricting the use of the land for other purposes. The last type of protection area is the game reserve. These reserves can only be created on land not likely to be used for purposes inconsistent with the propagation of the animals and birds therein, and where it is possible, by management, to increase the annual yield of animals or birds. No prohibited area, sanctuary or reserve can be created, whether on Crown or private land, except with the consent of the Minister, or the private owners and occupiers as the case may be. However, when a fauna sanctuary or game reserve has been created on private land the owner has a right to request that the whole or part of the land shall cease to form such a sanctuary or reserve and, in that case, the Governor will make an appropriate proclamation of revocation.

A common feature of all prohibited areas, sanctuaries and reserves is that all animals and birds in them, whether protected or unprotected elsewhere, are protected, although the right to destroy vermin is retained. No open season will apply to a prohibited area, fauna reserve or fauna sanctuary, and no permit to take any bird or animal from them can be granted except to the Museum Board or the Director. In game reserves an open season will apply to the extent proclaimed; but otherwise animals and birds in a game reserve will be safeguarded in the same way as in a fauna reserve. The lighting of fires in prohibited areas, fauna reserves or game reserves without consent of the Crown or the occupier of the land is forbidden, and the Bill also controls the use of guns and other devices in those areas, sanctuaries and reserves.

Clauses 34 to 43 set out the basic scheme of protection. All native animals and birds fall within one or another of two main categories—protected or unprotected. The unprotected are those set out in the Second Schedule or any variation thereof made by regulation. These species are those which are regarded as pests, or which exist in such great numbers that no protection is warranted. All other animals and birds are protected. With minor exceptions, protected animals and birds can only be taken by authority of a permit, or in accordance with the terms laid down in a

proclamation declaring an open season. Permits can be granted for purposes falling under four headings, namely, scientific, research, marking and tagging, destruction of pests, and other miscellaneous purposes deemed by the Minister not to be inconsistent with the objects of the Bill. Proclamations declaring open seasons will be made for ducks, kangaroos, and other animals and birds for which an open season is deemed necessary, and such proclamations will set out the conditions and limitations governing the taking of animals and birds as allowed thereby.

There are two other clauses allowing protected animals or birds to be taken. Clause 41 provides that full-blooded Aborigines may take animals and birds without permits for food for themselves and their families, but not on prohibited areas, sanctuaries or reserves. Another clause (42) provides that magpies which have caused or appear likely to cause personal injury may be taken without a permit. Clauses 45 to 55 control the use of guns, devices and poisons for taking animals and birds. Most of the rules proposed on these subjects are substantially the same as the present law, but there are some new clauses. Clause 50 prohibits the use of poison for taking protected animals or birds except with the consent of the Minister. Clause 52 makes it an offence to shoot at animals or birds from a boat moving at more than five miles an hour. This is aimed mainly at reckless duck-shooting from fast motor boats. Clauses 54 and 55 contain two new provisions. Under clause 54 the Governor is empowered to declare prohibited species of animals and birds. The legal effect of such a proclamation will be that no-one will be entitled to have animals or birds of a prohibited species in his possession. Clause 55 empowers the Governor to declare controlled species of animals or birds. Controlled species will be those which persons are entitled to have in their possession, but must not release. Both these clauses are aimed at preventing the multiplication of animals or birds which may become harmful pests.

Part IV of the Bill regulates the keeping, selling, importing, and exporting of protected animals and birds. Experience has shown that a certain measure of control over the possession and disposal of protected animals and birds is essential if the control of taking is to be effectively policed. The present Act and regulations prescribe a rather complex system of dealers' licences authorizing the purchase of fauna, permits and Ministerial consents to

sell, and game licences which authorize taking and selling. In this Bill only one form of licence is proposed, namely, a licence to keep and sell protected animals or birds. A licence of this type will be required for the keeping of more than nine animals or birds, or for any sale. No control is proposed over the possession of less than 10 animals or birds, provided they are lawfully taken. If however they are unlawfully taken, possession of them will be an offence and no licence will authorize such possession. Clauses 57, 58 and 59 provide for the licensing of imports and exports of protected animals and birds, as well as carcasses, skins and eggs. The present law provides for a similar control, except that there is no control over the imports of skins and eggs. When granting licences the Minister is required to satisfy himself that the proposed transaction is in accord with the laws of the other State or country concerned, as well as those of South Australia.

Part V deals with royalties. In general the scheme is the same as that now in force. The law has, however, been rewritten to simplify it and make it indicate more clearly the accepted administrative practice.

Part VI contains the general provisions governing all licences and permits under the Bill, and other clauses dealing with legal procedure and regulations. They are machinery provisions not affecting policy. I think I should draw honourable members' attention to clause 73, which prescribes a special penalty for offences involving the unlawful taking, keeping, selling, exporting or importing of protected animals and birds. In these cases the court is empowered to impose an additional fine besides the fine prescribed in other parts of the Bill. This additional fine is based on the number of animals or birds involved in the offence. In the case of proclaimed rare species it will be an amount between £5 and £20 per animal or bird, and in other cases an amount between £1 and £5. In the past it has been found that certain classes of irresponsible offenders are difficult to detect and are persistent in their disregard for legal restrictions on the shooting of protected animals or birds. Furthermore, in some classes of offences substantial profits are made from the sale of animals or birds illegally taken. For these reasons a power for the court to impose substantial penalties is necessary in order to secure observance of these laws proposed in this Bill. The same principles are embodied in the existing legislation.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1182.)

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): I asked that progress be reported on this clause because a query had been raised about its drafting, whether it meant what it purported to mean. The matter has since been referred to the Director of Mental Health and to the person who raised the query. As a result both have been satisfied that the drafting in the Bill is correct to cover what is meant.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Admission of intellectually retarded person to training centre."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This clause refers to a "prescribed form". I know that this purpose can easily be achieved by a prescribed form by regulation, but a person looking in the schedule for the prescribed form will find many forms mentioned there. It would have been better if one system or the other had been applied in regard to the forms: either all the forms to be prescribed by regulation or all the forms to be found in the schedule. Then anyone looking for a form would know where to find it. Perhaps something can be done to achieve uniformity in that regard.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have looked at this point. Whether there is any merit in going further with it I do not know, but the answer is that the Government has power under section 172 to prescribe forms where none is set out in the schedule. It is better to use this method than to set out a form in the Act itself. The modern practice is to leave the forms to be prescribed. In those circumstances, this clause as drafted will perhaps be more suitable than trying to set out the prescribed forms in the schedule.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 and 10 passed.

New clause 10a—"Power to detain and recapture persons received into institutions."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I move to insert the following new clause:

10a. Section 43 of the principal Act is amended by striking out "or receiving ward," therein and inserting in lieu thereof "receiving ward or training centre".

I referred to this matter during the second reading debate, pointing out that because of the amendment to section 76, which would bring the mentally retarded person admitted to a training centre under the provisions of the Act regarding trial leave, an amendment to section 43 would be necessary also. Sections 77 and 78 provide for the return to such a centre of a person who does not return after his trial leave. If a person must be returned when he has left a training centre on trial leave, there should be a similar provision to deal with a person escaping from a training centre without being on trial leave. My amendment is necessary to bring section 43 into line with the section dealing with trial leave.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member is correct in this matter. It was an omission in the drafting and was meant to be included in the Bill. I need not labour the point further. I accept the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (11 to 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1172.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): This Bill enacts what I think is a wise amendment to the principal Act, section 21 (2) of which provides:

Whenever, in the opinion of a constable, any animal is so weak, disabled, or diseased, or as the result of an accident, or from any other cause, sustains such injury that the animal ought to be killed, the constable may, with the consent of the owner of the animal, or, if the owner is not in the immediate vicinity of the animal, without the said consent, immediately kill the animal. If the owner is in the immediate vicinity of the animal and refuses to consent to the killing of the animal, the constable may, nevertheless, upon an order of a justice, kill the animal. No compensation shall be recoverable against any justice or constable in respect of any killing pursuant to this subsection.

In the definition section, "constable" includes "special constable". I remember instances of severe cruelty to animals in recent months that have been the subject of much publicity and controversy in the newspapers. These incidents were in connection with the transport of very young calves to market and of wild horses or brumbies to killing works to be slaughtered for pet food. The Royal

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has done good work over the years to alleviate the suffering of animals. I have spoken to the Secretary of this very fine organization in this State about this Bill, and he has informed me that his society supports the measure and believes that it is most worthwhile. I believe the Secretary is a justice of the peace and that the inspectors of the society are special constables within the meaning of the Act.

This measure simplifies the procedure to be followed when mercy killings of animals are necessary. It is desirable that veterinary surgeons shall also have the same powers in this regard as those conferred by the Act on constables and special constables, with the same protection from claims for compensation as they have. In the knowledge that the society approves of the Bill, I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of the Bill, which provides a short amendment to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. In many ways it is a most desirable amendment, as it seems to me that a qualified veterinary surgeon should be more experienced than a constable or even a special constable appointed under the provisions of the Act to make a decision about whether or not an animal should be destroyed. The Bill contains desirable amendments to the principal Act, and one wonders why perhaps it was not introduced many years ago. I am sure all members will support it.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1177.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): This is another Bill that the Opposition cannot support. I shall give our reasons; it is very short, but nevertheless very important.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Bill, or the reasons?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Bill, and the reasons, too. Although the Opposition has not been pleased with everything the principal Act has done, it thinks that this measure is not fair to the State-owned railways. Since I have undertaken Parliamentary duties and have had some responsibilities thrust upon me, I have

been most concerned about what the railways have cost. In 1962-63, the State Government supplemented railway revenue by over £4,200,000, and in 1963-64 by over £3,000,000. As people are permitted to carry goods from place to place in competition with the railways, railway revenue must be further reduced. Possibly the agitation that led to this measure being introduced resulted from the attitude of the Transport Control Board in refusing to grant permits or licences where it has been necessary, particularly in the interests of primary producers, to transport produce by road. I do not know whether the ton-mile tax that has been imposed on hauliers will increase revenue sufficiently to compensate the railways for the loss of revenue, and I do not know that anyone can forecast that.

Under this measure, anyone who wants a permit to deliver cargo from one place to another must be granted the permit unless someone already has a permit to carry goods over that route. I understand that some parts of the State have controlled routes and others have not and that people in those parts which have no controlled routes, after this legislation is passed, must be granted a permit forthwith if an application is made to the board. Clause 3 inserts new section 40 in the principal Act, which reads:

40. (1) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act any person may operate a vehicle for the carriage of goods for hire on any road in any part of the State: Provided that a person so operating a vehicle shall not except in accordance with a permit issued by the board pursuant to subsection (2) of this section pick up for carriage for hire any goods or set down any goods carried for hire on any road or within any township in respect of which a licence or permit to operate vehicles for the carriage of goods for hire is for the time being in force. Penalty: Fifty pounds.

I take that to mean that a permit cannot be granted for the carriage of goods on a road in opposition to persons already licenced to carry goods on that road. Subsection (2) states:

(2) The board shall, upon application therefor, promptly issue to an applicant a permit authorizing the applicant to pick up or set down goods to be carried, or carried, for hire, on any road or within any township in respect of which a licence or permit is for the time being in force, except when the issue of any such permit would operate to the detriment of the holder of a licence or permit for the time being in force. If the board refuses to issue a permit under this subsection, it shall forthwith make a report to the Minister setting out details of the application and the reasons for its decision.

I understand that some licences have been held for a long time, but that all licences will expire in 1968. This is a matter that should have been looked at by the Minister. As I understand it, after that year it will be possible to carry goods on any road in the State, and if that is so there must be a detrimental effect on railway revenue.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There may be a good effect.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the position could have been met in a different way. If the Railways Department were sufficiently enterprising it could also undertake the road carriage of goods. I know that people in the district represented by my friend (Hon. C. R. Story) have not had fair and reasonable service from the Transport Control Board. Each time I have been there in the last few years I have heard of the difficulties placed in the way of growers by the board, especially when ships were available for the export of their produce. I believe this is one of the reasons why the Government has decided to allow everybody within a few years to transport goods when and how they wish to do it. The Bill must affect railway revenue and the subsidies paid by the Government to the department will become larger as the years go by.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Should not the roads be available for service to the people?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is our duty to see that the railways do not lose too much revenue. Carriers should not be able to pick the cream of the trade, as it were, and let the Railways Department handle only the uneconomic trade.

The Hon. C. R. Story: No-one will close the railways.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, but the State Government will have to find more revenue for the department while road carriers will be able to make nice profits. It will be a retrograde step if we pass this Bill. We should have a more satisfactory way of solving the problems resulting from the activities of the board.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is only doing its job.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have not had much to do with the board, but if it is not doing its job in accordance with Government policy the Government should take some action. In this Chamber only Government members have brought the matter forward, but they are country members and therefore they are affected by this Bill. I have been here for

several years, and not one session has passed without someone criticizing the board for not doing its job in accordance with Government intentions.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Some people are free to talk, whereas others are bound by resolution.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know about that. If Labor were in Government and a board was not giving effect to Government policy, suitable action would soon be taken.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: You would be in the same position as we are now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the Government has taken the wrong action. The correct action would be to retain the board and tell it to be more considerate in issuing permits in areas where the railway service did not meet the needs of those areas. I know Government members believe in free enterprise, and they do not care whether State instrumentalities pay or not, but I believe our instrumentalities should be protected up to the hilt. If one is not giving the service desired, the people in the area affected should have the right to transport goods in any other way they wish.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They will be able to do that under the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but they will have more than that, because after 1968 there will be open competition on the roads. If I am wrong the Minister can tell me. Then each carrier will have the right to pick and choose to the detriment of the railways.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you prefer to have closed roads?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I believe that where the railways can provide an adequate service to meet the needs of a community that service should be used. Is there anything wrong with that? If the railways cannot give the service desired, the people should have the right to use the road service.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: How is the bus service out your way?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is nothing wrong with the bus service, which I use occasionally.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: A subsidy is paid in connection with that service.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is all right, but there is no open competition from other bus services. I am only saying that the railways should have the protection of the Government where they provide a service that meets the needs of the community.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Where do they give it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In many places. In the South-East, for instance, nobody could complain about the railway service. The railways give a good service in many parts of the State, and it ill becomes the Minister to say that they do not.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: I said that your members complained of it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Well, perhaps the service is not quite up to the mark at times, but generally speaking the South-East is well catered for. Would the Minister agree with that?

The Hon. N. L. Jude: I do.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Then why should private carriers be given the right to enter into competition with a State instrumentality that gives a good service?

The Hon. N. L. Jude: You have no reason to say that they will go into open competition with the railways. They may not be able to afford it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope that the Minister and I will live long enough to see the result of this. In time the chickens will come

home to roost. The railways, in areas where they serve the community so well, will have competition from road hauliers, and I say that it is not right. Where the railways are giving a service that meets the needs of the community they should have the sole right of cartage.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I thought you were opposed to monopolies.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not opposed to State instrumentalities. I believe there should be more of them.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It does not matter how inefficient they are!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member has never heard me say that. I have said previously that the railways serve the needs of the community in many places. Where that is not done competition should be allowed, but where efficient service is given the railways should not have to compete with private enterprise. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 7, at 2.15 p.m.