

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, January 26, 1966.

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

PETITIONS: ROAD TRANSPORT.

The Hon. C. R. STORY presented a petition signed by 967 electors and residents of the House of Assembly Districts of Angas, Barossa, Chaffey, Gawler, Gouger, Light, Murray and Ridley in the Midland, Northern and Southern Districts of the Legislative Council. It stated that any further restrictions on the use of road transport by taxation legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State and that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in country areas and discriminate against the residents of those areas. The petition contained the respectful prayer that no legislation to effect any such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. C. R. STORY presented a petition signed by 318 electors and residents of the House of Assembly Districts of Light, Chaffey and Ridley in the Midland and Northern Districts of the Legislative Council. It stated that any further restrictions on the use of road transport by taxation legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State and that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in country areas and discriminate against the residents of those areas. The petition contained the respectful prayer that no legislation to effect any such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN presented a petition signed by 363 electors and residents of the House of Assembly Districts of Eyre and Flinders in the Northern District of the Legislative Council. It stated that any further restriction on the use of road transport by taxation legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State and that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in country areas and discriminate against the residents of such areas. The petition contained the respectful prayer that no legislation to effect such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 252 electors and residents of

the House of Assembly Districts of Mount Gambier, Millicent and Victoria in the Southern District of the Legislative Council. It stated that any further restriction on the use of road transport by taxation legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State and that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in country areas and discriminate against the residents of such areas. The petition contained the respectful prayer that no legislation to effect any such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN presented a petition signed by 119 electors and residents of the House of Assembly Districts of Rocky River and Frome in the Northern District of the Legislative Council. It stated that any further restriction on the use of road transport by taxation legislation or otherwise would be detrimental to the interests of the State and that the cost of any such legislation or control would add to the cost of living in country areas and discriminate against the residents of such areas. The petition contained the respectful prayer that no legislation to effect any such control, restriction or discrimination be passed by the Legislative Council.

Petitions received and read.

QUESTIONS

MENTAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question follows on a question I asked of the Chief Secretary in October last. Has the Public Buildings Department been instructed to commence designs, etc., for the building of Strathmont Hospital at Hillcrest? If so, will construction commence next June, as was implied by the Minister on October 13, 1965, and has the Government any assurance that Commonwealth Government financial aid will be available on both this hospital and Elanora Hospital after June, 1967?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question is rather involved. Rather than hazard a guess, I will try to have an answer tomorrow or next Tuesday. There has been some consideration of priorities and I wish to get an up-to-date answer for the honourable member.

SWIMMING POOLS.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Education and relates to the use of swimming pools in departmental schools during summer vacations, apart from the learn-to-swim campaigns, a matter raised by me previously in

this Chamber. During the summer vacation 1964-65, a plan for organized recreation in swimming games, athletics, etc., was carried out as an experiment for three weeks by the Education Department in five metropolitan schools. This proved a great success, having been enthusiastically supported by hundreds of children and their parents, physical education staff and physical education students. The then Minister said, "I am confident that next year the plan will be adopted on a very much wider scale." In view of this, and in view of the publicized statements of the present Minister of Education at the opening of the conference on Australian physical education recently, I ask the Minister if he will supply the following information:

1. Why was the period of operation during this vacation reduced from three to two weeks?
2. Why did the Education Department not expand a scheme which had been proved successful?
3. Why was one metropolitan school with a swimming pool, which was used last year, viz., Burnside, excluded from the scheme this year?
4. Why was this facility not introduced into any country area, when at least 14 country schools are equipped with swimming pools?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the question to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and obtain a reply as soon as I can.

VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question concerns the underground water supply being extensively used for irrigation in the Virginia area, where an increasing portion of the supply of vegetables for the metropolitan area is grown. The Minister of Mines will be aware that there has been a deterioration in the supply of water, particularly in view of the increased usage and the dry seasons we have had. The situation has now become, in some instances, somewhat desperate. I know of one particular case, which I understand is by no means an isolated one, whereby the supply of a grower of tomatoes was reduced from 15,000 gallons an hour to 5,000 gallons an hour, just by the turning on of someone else's pump half a mile away. The situation is becoming desperate and the ruination of these people is possible, with consequent loss in the production of vegetables and perhaps higher costs of those commodities, if some alternative is not provided. In view of these facts, about which we are all concerned, will the Minister on his trip overseas investigate the use of effluent to see whether large

quantities of it may be brought into the Virginia area for the irrigation of both lucerne and vegetables, having in mind that it may in some cases be necessary, in the production of some types of vegetable, to use what may be termed a shandy of the effluent and the underground water?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As the honourable member has stated, we are reaching a serious situation in the supply of water in what is generally known as the Gawler Basin. As the honourable member has stated, the position there is deteriorating each year, and this has caused me some concern. I have had some investigations made into this matter, and it appears to me that the only remedy at this stage is some form of restriction upon the use of water there to protect the growers and the gardens at present in operation. Some preliminary investigation has already taken place into the use of effluent water for the purposes of bolstering up supplies in this area.

At the moment, those investigations have shown that the use of the effluent by itself is not suitable for some types of vegetable. As a matter of fact, one can kill them more quickly by this means than by using weed poison on them because of the saline content of the effluent. Whilst I am overseas I will see whether there are ways and means of obtaining information on the appropriate way of treating effluent for general use. If I can obtain information that will enable us to use the effluent for the suggested purpose, I shall be only too happy to do so.

SEWAGE EFFLUENT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: My question is in a somewhat similar strain to that of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins but I direct it to the Minister of Labour and Industry representing the Minister of Works. I understand that a committee has been set up to inquire into the use of sewage effluent and that this committee has presented its report to the Minister of Works. However, after examining the report, he referred it back to the committee with the request that it present him with a report in language that he could understand. Can the Minister say whether a report in layman's language has been made available, and, if not, when the Minister expects it will be made available?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Works. I doubt

very much whether the report has been sent back to him in exactly the terms he desired, but I will get an answer for the honourable member.

PEKINA IRRIGATION BLOCKS.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question is directed to either the Minister of Mines or the Minister representing the Minister of Works, because it involves both departments. It refers to an area adjacent to Orroroo known as the Pekina irrigation blocks. They were developed some years ago by the provision of concrete channels that were supplied with water from an underground artesian basin. The area supported a number of families until trouble was encountered with sand in the artesian bores. Following a successful bore at greater depth on an adjacent property, and representations to the Mines Department from members representing the district and local residents over a period of some time, the Mines Department has investigated the area and I understand has successfully put down a deeper bore that has a good supply. I also understand, from information received, that the department is confident that the sand problem can be handled by a new type of screen developed in America. In view of the importance of this area for the development of the local district, does the department intend to put down further bores in order to develop the area to the maximum benefit of the community?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I cannot give the honourable member a complete answer now, but I will call for a report from the Mines Department and give the honourable member an answer on receipt of the information.

LAND TAX.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: In view of the increase in land tax this year and the consequent anxiety of a number of landholders about budgeting for the ensuing year, together with the tendency to delay land transactions because of the alterations in values and the increases in taxation, will the Chief Secretary inform this Council when the new quinquennial assessment pursuant to section 20 of the Land Tax Act, 1936-1965, will be made available to landholders generally?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It must be obvious that I do not have an answer to this question now. It may be a matter of policy. If the honourable member puts it on the Notice Paper I will secure the information for him.

LEIGH CREEK HOSTEL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have been approached on behalf of a number of families desiring to obtain accommodation for their children so that they can attend school at Leigh Creek. I understand that the matter of hostel accommodation has received some consideration by the Government. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Education inform me of the decision of the Government on this matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The matter has been under consideration but I do not know the final result. I will convey the question to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

SCHOOL BUSES.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Education and concerns school transport in country areas. For some years it has been the policy of the Education Department, where possible, and with the consent of local parents, to close small schools and transport the children to larger centres by road bus. This policy has worked successfully with advantage to the children concerned. However, minimum requirements have been drawn up for the provision of a bus service, and they stipulate that there must be a minimum of 10 children more than three miles from the school and that most of the children must live five miles or more from the school. Similar requirements apply to a subsidized bus service, but the number of children is seven instead of 10.

In many areas, particularly the fringe areas, due to changes in the population of young people on farms and older people with children about to be married, the numbers of children fluctuate and it is often difficult for some districts at different periods to meet the minimum requirements. We have the position where

one district has been provided with a bus service but an adjacent area has not. In view of the fact that education is so important these days, and that the necessity for education of individual children remains the same whether the numbers are seven or 10, will the Government seriously consider lowering the minimum requirements of both departmental and subsidized bus services? If this is not possible, will the Government consider raising the daily travelling allowance to children from the present very low figure to a figure more in keeping with that paid to parents on a subsidized bus route?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the question to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and report to the honourable member as soon as possible.

CLOTHING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: My question is directed to the Chief Secretary, who represents the Premier. It is in the form of a complaint by the wife of a grazier in a country district in South Australia who went into a shop in a country city for the purpose of purchasing a pullover suitable for wearing on the beach. She was shown a white garment with a tag firmly stitched to the collar. The tag said:

Casmir mothproofed knitwear 100% pure merino wool.

Attached to the tag were two cardboard labels. One of them said:

Cashmilon high bulk 100 per cent acrylic yarn.

It would appear that there is a case here of fraudulent labelling. Nowhere on the garment was the country of origin mentioned, but it did show the name of the Australian distributors. I believe that under Commonwealth law there would possibly be a case for a prosecution, but I ask the Chief Secretary whether, if I make this information available to him, he will confer with the Premier and ascertain whether any action should be taken under the provisions of our Prices Act, or other relevant Act?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the honourable member supplies me with the information on the complaint, I will refer it to the appropriate Minister, whether he be the Premier or the

Attorney-General, and let the honourable member have a report.

COBDOGLA SCHOOL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Minister of Roads received a report on the proposed bridge over the Murray River at Kingston and, if so, do the approaches involve any of the property of the Cobdogla school?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have received no report whatever from the Highways Department relative to the second bridge over the Murray River. I think I have pointed out already in this Council that it has not been determined that the second bridge will be at Kingston. The matter of the appropriate place is being investigated by the Highways Department and other authoritative engineers and I have not had a report on the progress made in that investigation. However, I shall ask the Highways Department for a report on whether the location of the second bridge has been determined and, if it has been determined that that bridge will be at Kingston, I shall obtain the information the honourable member wants in relation to the Cobdogla school.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You indicated January in your previous reply, and that is why I asked the question.

ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to restore co-ordination of transport in the State. In 1930 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into and report on the State railway system. One of its terms of reference included an inquiry into "the causes of the heavy and increasing losses in the railways". One of the main causes decided on by the Commission was road motor competition by carriers and private vehicles. Evidence tendered showed that the motor operator found his greatest field of activity between towns connected by rail and, generally speaking, in commodities most highly rated in the railway classification, thus weakening the power of the railways to carry wheat, coal, etc., at low rates.

The annual losses on the railways, deriving from the uneconomic competition of motor vehicles plying for hire regularly on routes parallel to the railways, were estimated to be

between £100,000 and £200,000 a year. Considering the purchasing power of money in those years, the economic loss to the community was considerable. As a consequence of the Commission's deliberations, legislation relating to the control of road transport by the Transport Control Board was enacted. In a subsequent Royal Commission report in 1938 the Chairman of the Transport Control Board claimed that during 7½ years of road controlled railway revenue had benefited by traffic diverted from roads to the extent of about £1,125,000.

The Royal Commission constituted in 1947 stated in its report, when referring to intrastate transport: "The co-ordination of the various transport agencies operating within the State with the object of evolving a duly integrated transport system is essential." It follows, therefore, that to implement such a policy it would be necessary to have some sort of transport control. Transport control in South Australia in the past was administered under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act. This method established controlled routes and diverted the freight to the railways in most circumstances in respect of these controlled routes. It established co-ordination of transport by licensing carriers to operate between country centres and the metropolitan area. The Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act of 1963, and the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Act, 1964, abolished transport control and even though some licences exist until 1968 the roads are, in effect, now free for all carriers.

This State is now the only State which does not exercise control over transport. Control in Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania is exercised by limiting road transport, while in New South Wales and Queensland transport is allowed to operate in competition with the railways, but on the payment of substantial fees. Statistical information shows that, although the State's percentage of population to the national total is slightly increasing, the percentage of State railway gross earnings to the total of all States is falling. Furthermore, the average earnings a net ton-mile of freight fell from 3.8d. in 1962-63 to 3.69d. a net ton-mile in 1963-64. This was the lowest figure of all States. (Victoria registered the lowest figure in 1962-63, with South Australia next.)

The Government knows that the previous system of transport control was not popular in South Australia. The unpopularity did not arise from any question of the integrity of the members of the Transport Control Board at

any time, but from the application of the Act whereby licences for operation on controlled routes were issued on a restricted basis, and only the licensed carrier could operate on the controlled route for which he was licensed. This, together with directions that goods should be carried by rail where a rail service was available, apparently came up against the Australian desire of freedom of choice—theoretically a good thing, but not necessarily so in practice.

The Government has carefully considered the manner in which transport control should be reinstated. The alternatives are a restricted system as previously operated or an open system whereby permits would be readily available but where a fee would be payable when road transport was operating in competition with the railways. After mature consideration and after considering methods of control in other States, it has been decided that what I shall call an "open" system—based on readily available permits associated with the payment of a ton-mile fee, calculated on carrying capacity, when competing with the railways—is the one most suitable to this State.

The permits will be available at the Transport Control Board's head office and in appropriate country centres, most likely through a police station or local court staffed by a public servant. There will be certain classes of goods exempt from any fee and varying scales up to a maximum of two cents per ton-mile in respect of other goods. The charges for these goods will be fixed by regulation and exemptions can be made by a board order. The fee will apply in respect of journeys over all or any part of a controlled route, with exemptions in the following circumstances: (a) for journeys completely outside the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office where a total distance of 50 miles will not be exceeded in competition with rail; (b) for journeys outside the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office where use of rail or combined road and rail would exceed by more than 50 per cent the mileage by road direct; and (c) journeys within the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office except in respect of any goods which may, as a result of a board order, be restricted to rail transport only.

I strongly emphasize at this stage that the charges can only apply in circumstances where a road transport operator is operating over all or part of a controlled route and will not apply in any circumstances where goods are being carried to the nearest railhead. It was

earlier proposed that a permit would be required at a nominal charge of four dollars for twelve months, or one dollar for up to one month, in respect of these exempted journeys. During the adjournment of Parliament the Government has given consideration to the action that could be taken to:

1. Establish equity in the length and location of controlled roads.
2. Assist primary producers.
3. Assist decentralized small industries.
4. Accord a measure of easement in ton-mile fees for distant areas.

It has been decided that permits will be made available at a nominal fee of \$2 per annum, which will authorize the operation of a vehicle over any controlled road where the whole journey will be outside the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office, without the payment of any ton-mile fees, even though a situation of competition with rail may exist. The applicant for such a permit, however, will be required to give an assurance to the Transport Control Board that the permit will not be used for or associated with the cartage of goods into or out of the area within a 25-mile radius of the General Post Office, Adelaide. Provision for this type of permit will be made in the regulations fixing fees. I can assure honourable members that the Government will take this action and Parliament will be in a position to see that this is done when the regulations are laid before both Houses.

In effect this means that control will only operate in respect of goods carried out of and into the area within a 25-mile radius of the General Post Office, except that there may be some bulk commodities such as grain, super-phosphate, petroleum products and cement, particularly suited for rail transportation in country areas, which may not be covered by this relaxation of control. Any of these bulk commodities could still be carried by road subject to the payment of a ton-mile tax and the exempt journeys provided for in clause 5 (d) of the Bill. This is a considerable relaxation of the Government's intention and would mean that this permit, obtainable at a cost of \$2 per annum, would allow goods to be carted from, for instance, Mount Gambier to Port Augusta or Ceduna, provided no road within the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office was traversed, without the payment of a ton-mile fee.

Primary producers would be able to use their own vehicles or engage carriers to transfer livestock from property to property, to shift

agricultural machinery and plant, and obtain stores and supplies from any point outside the 25-mile radius of the General Post Office, the only charge applying being the holding of a \$2 annual permit. The primary producer would only be required to pay this permit fee if his vehicle exceeded a load capacity of 8 tons. Similarly, small country industries established basically for manufacture of goods and articles required in country areas could avail themselves of this nominal fee permit.

From the time the Road and Railway Transport Act became operative in 1930 until control of freight was abandoned in 1964, a system of restrictive control functioned. Under these restrictions only limited numbers of roads were controlled and, due to South-Eastern traffic by geographical necessity being forced to travel *via* one of the Mount Lofty Range roads with a river crossing in the vicinity of Murray Bridge or Tailem Bend, very few roads were controlled in the South-East. In the North, where more avenues were available for travel, more roads were controlled. To implement the ton-mile proposals, reorientation of the controlled road structure is necessary and, in the interests of equity, all roads will be controlled within the 150-mile radius of the General Post Office, Adelaide, excluding Kangaroo Island, Eyre Peninsula, and points south of a line drawn west of Clinton on Yorke Peninsula. In the North the 150 mile perimeter will be near Melrose, and in the South-East, near Bordertown. As the ton-mile charges apply only to travel over controlled roads, the maximum distance chargeable on any single journey to Adelaide when fully competitive with rail will be approximately 175 miles.

I might inform honourable members that this will be abundantly clear to them if they peruse the map which, with the President's permission, I have hung on the notice board in the Chamber.

As formerly announced, the aim of the Bill is to improve railway revenue. The railways carry commodities of vital concern to the primary producer at rates far less than those applying in other States. To be able to maintain these low rates it is essential that the railways obtain a better share of the more profitable traffic. I have prepared two tables comparing this State's charges for the transport of wheat and manures by rail with the charges applying in other States. I ask leave to have those statements included in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Miles.	<i>Wheat.</i>					
	S.A.R.	Vic.	N.S.W.	Qld.	W.A.	
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	
25	14 9	18 0	18 0	22 6	24 0	
50	24 3	31 0	32 0	38 9	36 0	
75	32 3	41 0	43 6	52 0	39 6	
100	35 9	47 0	54 0	61 0	43 0	
125	38 6	53 0	62 6	68 0	46 6	
150	41 3	56 0	69 0	76 3	50 0	
175	42 6	59 0	76 0	84 6	53 6	
200	43 6	62 0	83 6	91 0	57 0	
225	45 3	65 0	87 0	97 6	60 6	
250	47 3	67 0	91 0	103 6	64 0	
Average	36 6	49 11	61 8	69 6	47 5	

Miles	<i>Manures.</i>					
	S.A.R.	Vic.	N.S.W.	Qld.	W.A.	W.A.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	Jan.-June.	July-Dec.
25	8 9	10 0	18 0	17 3	22 10	19 2
50	12 9	16 0	28 6	25 3	34 2	28 10
75	16 6	20 0	36 0	37 3	37 6	31 7
100	19 3	25 0	38 0	43 0	40 10	34 5
125	22 0	28 0	40 0	50 6	44 2	37 2
150	24 9	31 0	41 6	57 0	47 6	40 0
175	27 6	34 0	44 6	64 6	50 10	42 10
200	29 9	36 0	46 6	70 0	54 2	45 7
225	31 3	40 0	49 6	72 9	57 6	48 5
250	32 0	42 0	51 0	76 3	60 10	51 2
275	33 0	46 0	52 0	79 9	63 8	53 7
300	33 9	48 0	53 0	82 9	67 0	56 5

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The average rate on wheat in South Australia is 36s. 6d. a ton, whereas the average rate in regard to other States is 57s. 1d. a ton. The average rate in regard to manures in South Australia is 24s. 3d. a ton, whereas the average of the other four States is 43s. 6d. a ton. During 1964-65 the railways carried 780,918 tons of wheat and 403,748 tons of manures.

The legislation will come into operation after the introduction of decimal currency. Goods which by nature of their perishability or other special circumstances should be carried by road will be exempted from any charges whatsoever under the provisions of section 3 of the principal Act. It is envisaged that exemptions will cover: cream (fresh); fruit (fresh); fish (fresh and frozen); grapes being carried from vineyards to distilleries or wineries; H.M. Mails; whole milk; bees and apiarists' equipment; all classes of exhibits being carried to and from Agricultural Shows; crushed rock, gravel, sand and earth filling required for road construction or repair being conveyed to the site of such road works; goods required for road works being conveyed from a country depot to the site of such road works within a thirty mile radius of such depot; meat (fresh and frozen); plants, seedlings

and trees, etc.; poultry (live or dressed); rabbits (fresh and frozen); vegetables (fresh—all types); wine in bulk when moved from distillery to distillery for blending purposes; any vehicle being towed or in any other way moved otherwise than under its own power from a place where it has become immobilized due to accident or mechanical breakdown to a place of security; fat lambs; calves up to 4 months old; pigs. This is an extension of the list of exemptions mentioned in another place. I also have here a proposed list of the charges for the carriage of goods by road under the provisions of the Bill. This list is a tentative one which has been prepared because members have said to me that the arguments used in opposition to this Bill in other places and outside of this Chamber are based on the premise that everything is at the maximum charge of 2c. There are a number of items not included in the list which are at present the subject of consideration by the Government as to whether charges will or will not apply. Examples of these are wine and spirits and petroleum products. I ask that this list be included in *Hansard* without the necessity of my reading it.

Leave granted.

Goods for which Permits are Issued at 2 Cents Per Mile for Each Ton or Part Thereof of the Load Capacity.

- Acids in bulk
- Ales and aerated waters
- Bitumen, bitumen emulsion and tar
- Canned fruit, fruit juices, jams, vegetables, etc.
- Cement—bagged or in bulk. Cement clinker
- Concrete beams, blocks, bridge sections, copings, kerbing and posts
- Dried fruit
- Electrical equipment, cable, etc.
- Firewood
- Flour and mill offal
- General merchandise
- Groceries
- Grain and agricultural seeds
- Iron and steel also iron and steel products including fencing materials
- Industrial chemicals and gases, including soda ash, sulphur, etc.
- Limestone, lime and lime products
- Lead
- Manufactured hard or soft boards
- Ores, concentrates, barytes, pyrites, gypsum, talc, clay and minerals, etc.
- Plaster in bags
- Paper products, including paper pulp and wastepaper
- Salt
- Sacks, wool and grain, new or secondhand
- Sandstone blocks
- Stock and poultry foods
- Sugar
- Tallow in bulk or drums
- Tiles—steel, linoleum, mosaic, plastic, rubber, asbestos or acoustic
- Timber, piles, logs, sawn or unsawn, dressed or undressed, including shooks
- Wool

Goods for which Permits are Issued at One Cent per Mile for Each Ton or Part Thereof of the Load Capacity.

- Aluminium alloy, tubing, door and window frames and spray piping
- Asbestos cement (fibro) sheets
- Boats
- Bottles (new or secondhand)
- Bricks (cement, clay or fire)
- Butter, cheese, margarine and smallgoods
- Cement and terracotta garden tubs, pots, ornaments and roofing tiles
- Chaff
- Concrete culverts, ditches, grease traps, septic tanks, etc.
- Ductwork—for air-conditioning
- Eggs
- Explosives
- Fertilizers including agricultural lime
- Fibrous plaster sheets, cornices and mouldings
- Glass—plate or sheet
- Granite, marble or other stone, dressed including gravestones
- Gyprock sheets
- Honey—from point of production to market
- Joinery
- Machinery—agricultural, earth-moving, oil drilling, etc.
- Mattresses
- Motor vehicles and bodies (new or secondhand)

- Pipes—asbestos cement, earthenware, concrete, steel and cement lined
- Piping (Polythene or plastic)
- Prefabricated buildings
- Radio sets, radiograms and television sets
- Refrigerators
- Scrap rubber, intended for reclamation
- Slagwool
- Terrazzo slabs and facings
- Theatrical scenery
- Washing machines
- X-ray equipment

Goods and Livestock for which Permits are issued at Half Cent Per Mile for each ton or part thereof of the Load Capacity.

- Fruit, vegetables (frozen packaged)
- Ice Cream
- Newspapers, magazines and periodicals
- Stone, metal, sand or screenings
- Hay
- Livestock—other than fat lambs, calves up to four months old, and pigs

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In the administration of the Act, due regard will be had to the policy of decentralization of industry. Where small secondary industries are established in the country, according to the merits of the case some exemptions from charges will be granted in the cartage of raw materials, and in the distribution of finished products in circumstances where the use of rail has disadvantages as against road transport, such as comparative cost and the need to meet rush orders at times when a rail service is not available. Regulations fixing maximum fees will empower the Minister to reduce or entirely remit fees in these circumstances or in other emergency circumstances that may arise. If it is argued that this is not co-ordination of transport but solely taxing of road transport, I make it clear that in the Government's view it is co-ordination between the main sources of transport, rail and road, whereby steps are taken to channel movement of freight to rail where adequate rail facilities exist and where the railways are competent to carry such freight. It is on this basis that exemptions and the scale of fees will be determined. As I said before, the old form of transport control was not popular, but under these proposals road transport will be free to operate without the licensing of individual carriers for certain nominated areas.

The benefits to be received from this legislation will be in increased railway earnings. It is not expected that the fee involved will produce revenue in excess of £200,000 a year. It is expected, however, within the first full year of operation railway revenue will be increased by £1,000,000, half of this increase being clear profit. The position should improve still further in subsequent years. It is possible to

administer the Act in the way proposed by making the operative sections of the Act those relating to the issue of permits instead of the licensing sections. It is also proposed to extend control to the ancillary carriers, most of whom operate vehicles of such a capacity

that they do not even make any payment in respect of road maintenance contributions.

A check by inspectors of the Transport Control Board has revealed the following figures on two roads in respect of ancillary carriers:

Location.	Date.	Time.	2-8 tons.	Over 8 tons.
Glen Osmond	28/4/65	9.30 a.m.—4.30 p.m.	151	16
	29/4/65	7.00 a.m.—12.30 p.m.	49	17
Cavan	28/4/65	9.30 a.m.—4.45 p.m.	201	15
	29/4/65	7.00 a.m.—12 noon	120	19

All other States have for many years found it necessary to control the ancillary carrier, and action in this direction in South Australia has for a long time been recommended by the Transport Control Board and the Railways Commissioner. The Royal Commissions that inquired into State transport services in 1938 and 1947-51 were firmly of the opinion that, in the public interest, the ancillary carrier should be controlled. The 1947-51 Commission did not recommend control at that stage because of the labour and materials shortages following the war years. It did envisage, however, that the ancillary carrier should be controlled as soon as post-war conditions were stabilized.

It would be fair to assume that if the Commission reported today it would come out strongly in favour of ancillary vehicles being controlled. Ancillary vehicles having a carrying capacity not exceeding four tons will be exempt, as will primary producers' vehicles having a carrying capacity not exceeding eight tons in circumstances where primary producers are carting produce of their own land or goods required for personal use or use on their own property. A further provision in the Bill is that the revenue derived from the issue of permits will, after the deduction of administration costs, be paid into a railway improvement fund to be used either for meeting railway deficits or for capital improvements, such as rolling stock,

both freight and passenger. This will give some flexibility and opportunity to make improvements beyond those possible within the limited Loan funds available.

Capital investment in the South Australian Railways exceeds £60,000,000 and present railway losses are approximately £3,600,000 per annum. The Government has a duty to see that this large investment is utilized to the best advantage and to take all possible steps to reduce losses. Whatever can be done in this regard is to the benefit of every citizen in South Australia, as he is the one who finally has to meet the bill for these losses. It must be said that past Royal Commissions have recognized that the State has a duty to take all proper steps to safeguard public investments in railways, and to do this the Government is of the opinion that transport control must be reinstated. To illustrate my remarks I table statements giving comparisons for (a) mean population, each State and Australia since 1953-54; (b) gross earnings for each State railway system for 1963-64; and (c) Australian railway gross earnings and South Australia's percentage thereof and population percentage since 1953-54. I ask permission to have the statements incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mean Population, each State and Australia, 1953-54 and 1959-60 to 1963-64.

Year.	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.	Western Australia.	Tasmania.	Northern Territory.	Australian Capital Territory.	Australia.
1953-54	3,405,414	2,422,839	1,300,464	785,981	630,705	309,416	15,930	29,595	8,900,344
1959-60	3,796,452	2,819,650	1,478,129	933,619	717,316	344,111	24,573	50,013	10,163,863
1960-61	3,875,921	2,893,417	1,503,703	957,136	729,770	350,077	25,673	55,232	10,390,929
1961-62	3,948,380	2,959,167	1,526,959	980,108	745,805	356,686	26,566	62,433	10,606,104
1962-63	4,015,463	3,021,792	1,551,304	998,971	764,426	362,111	27,604	69,217	10,810,888
1963-64	4,086,489	3,090,956	1,573,410	1,020,098	782,203	366,187	30,061	77,229	11,026,633

*Government Railways: Gross Earnings (a)
and Average Earnings Per Net Ton-Mile of
Freight, Each State, 1963-64.*

State.	Gross Earnings (a). £'000	Average Earnings per Net Ton-Mile of Freight. d.
New South Wales ..	101,244	4.05
Victoria	46,389	3.70
Queensland	42,130	4.62 (b)
South Australia .. .	14,748	3.69
Western Australia ..	17,301	4.39
Tasmania	2,834	5.41

(a) Excludes Government grants.

(b) Excludes Queensland portion of uni-
form gauge railway.

Government Railway Gross Earnings (£'000).

Year.	All States.	S.A.	S.A. % of Total Revenue all States.	Population S.A. % of total population.
1953-54	166,461	12,718	7.64	8.83
1959-60	188,836	12,758	6.76	9.19
1960-61	202,187	13,870	6.86	9.21
1961-62	201,243	13,924	6.92	9.24
1962-63	205,397	13,836	6.74	9.24
1963-64	224,646	14,748	6.57	9.25

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I now deal briefly with the various clauses of the Bill itself. Clause 2 provides for its commencement on a day or days to be fixed. Clause 4 strikes out the definition of "hire" in section 2 of the principal Act and inserts a new definition of "operate", which will include all forms of carriage of passengers or goods whether for hire or reward or other consideration or in the course of any trade or business, thus bringing the control of ancillary carriers within the provisions of the Act. It is considered that without the control of ancillary carriers satisfactory co-ordination of road and railway traffic cannot be achieved. The clause also defines "load capacity", "primary producer" and "railway".

Clause 5 (c) will exempt the carriage of goods within a 25-mile radius of the General Post Office, subject to regulations; the carriage of goods outside a 25-mile radius in certain circumstances, and the carriage of passengers or goods for hire on any route within 10 miles of the boundaries of any town proclaimed by the Governor. Paragraph (d) of clause 5 provides exemptions for certain primary producers and other persons otherwise than for hire. It also empowers the board to exempt particular classes of vehicles from the Act.

Clause 5(a) and (b), clauses 6, 7, 8, 9(a), 10(b) and 14(f), which may be taken together,

will give the Minister some control over the operations of the board, making it a requirement that in the exercise of its powers the board will generally act only with the Minister's approval. This is considered desirable, it being the policy, as honourable members know, of this Government that the administration of State affairs should be subject to the oversight of Ministers of the Crown responsible to Parliament. Clause 9(b), (c) and (d) are consequential upon the inclusion of a general definition of "operate" in section 3 of the principal Act, which covers the carriage of passengers or goods for hire or reward or in the course of any business. Clause 9(e) provides for a minimum fine of £25 for a second or subsequent offence in relation to the operation of unlicensed vehicles on controlled routes.

Clause 10(a) removes from section 17 the provision that in granting licences the board must give preference to applicants already carrying on business as carriers. It is considered that it may be desirable to leave room for new entrants into the transport industry rather than extend the licences of existing operators. Clause 11 inserts a penalty into section 18c of the principal Act, which requires a holder of a licence or permit to produce it on demand; while this section constitutes an offence it does not appear to

provide any penalty. Clauses 12 and 13 will remove references in the principal Act to licence discs and disc fees. While these provisions may have been of some value when comparatively few vehicles were operating under the control of the board, it is considered to be unnecessary under present-day conditions. Many permits are issued for short periods and it is not practicable to supply the owners with discs prior to commencement of operations. Hundreds of permits are issued annually for as short a period as one day. In any event the fee of 2s. 6d. a disc does not meet the cost of administration.

Clause 14, by paragraph (a), provides for payment of prescribed fees for permits for the carriage of passengers and, by paragraph (c), removes the limitation of £25 upon permit fees for the carriage of goods, with a proviso that the Minister may direct the remission wholly or partly of the fee in special circumstances. Paragraph (f) empowers the Minister to give directions to the board with regard to the issue of permits. Paragraph (e) provides for a minimum penalty of £25 and a maximum of £200 for a second or subsequent contravention of a provision of a permit, this provision being in line with that relating to operating a vehicle without a licence in section 14 as amended by clause 9 (c). Paragraphs (b) and (d) make consequential drafting amendments.

Clause 15 amends section 25 (1) (b), which requires the board, before granting a permit, to satisfy itself as to the state of the roads over which the vehicle is to be used and also as to the necessity to meet the requirements or convenience of the public. There will be exempted from this requirement cases where a person applies for a permit to use a vehicle for carriage or delivery of his own goods or goods sold. Clause 16 removes sections 27f to 27q inclusive dealing with payment for use of roads by unregistered vehicles: these sections were held to be invalid some years ago. Clause 17 will exempt Tramways Trust vehicles or vehicles licensed by the trust for the carriage of passengers within areas subject to the control of the trust.

Clause 18 relates to section 30 of the principal Act concerning proof of a licence. The amendment will enable permits to be proved in the same manner as licences. Clause 19 repeals existing section 37, which established a Transport Control Board Fund that has been closed for some time. It is proposed, however, that the new revenue of the board should be paid into a railway improvement fund to be applied by direction of the Governor in Council

to current or capital railway expenditure. Clause 20, which is the most important clause, repeals the sections included in 1963 and 1964 respectively, virtually removing transport control throughout the State. The effect of the amendment will be to re-establish control. I commend this Bill for the serious consideration of members.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SERVICE).

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Education Act, 1915-1962, so as to provide that where a person has been or is appointed, whether before or after the commencement of this legislation, as a teacher of the South Australian Government and his service as a teacher is continuous with his service—

(a) as a teacher under the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology or the South Australian School of Mines or the Townsend House for Deaf and Blind Children; or

(b) as an employee (whether as a teacher or otherwise) of the Commonwealth or of any State,

the continuous service of that person under any such body or government shall, for the purposes of long service leave under section 18c of the principal Act, be regarded as service as a teacher. In other words, the amendment to section 18c of the principal Act contained in clause 3 ensures that a person appointed as a teacher in this State, who at any time before his appointment was employed by any of the bodies or governments abovementioned, should retain his accrued long service leave privileges. The amendment is designed to apply to persons already in the service of the State who have transferred from such bodies or Governments, as well as the persons who transfer in the future.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from January 25. Page 3499.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I oppose this Bill and support my colleagues in so doing, as I believe that it is a bad Bill.

In the terms used by the Leader of the Opposition, it is something in the way of a fraudulent measure. In his policy speech in February of last year the then Leader of the Opposition undertook to introduce concessions on succession duties. I consider the Government has carried out its promise only in relation to the third undertaking of that policy speech, which was to place much greater rates of tax on the very large estates. In that sense the Government has carried out its promise. However, the Government promised other concessions but now it intends to take another £750,000 from the general public. Of course, it is not possible to take anything like that amount from the very large estates because there are not enough of them. Therefore, it follows a considerable portion of that sum will have to be obtained from estates of moderate size, and even fairly small ones. I oppose this measure because I do not consider that the Government has a mandate for such a Bill. As I have said, the Government had a mandate to introduce some concessions and, as my Leader said, members would look at another Bill that did what the Government said it would do in this matter.

In my opinion, the Government is greedy and grasping, because it has sought a double rise. It has sought two bites at the cherry on two or three other measures, and it is, in effect, seeking to do the same thing here. The Government has done it with water, because it increased the charges and at the same time reduced the quota, so that the increased charges came at an earlier stage. It also sought to do the same with land tax. It wanted to increase the rates combined with the cumulative effect of the new quinquennial assessment, which, if it follows the history of the last 25 years, will certainly mean an upward adjustment.

These things have happened close together and, with the cumulative effect, possibly would have doubled land tax but for the intervention of this Chamber, which reduced the anomaly at least for the time being. I believe that the Government is seeking to do the same thing here, in effect, because the large increases in valuations of land here automatically give the State—thus far—a continuing increase in revenue from succession duties. The increased charges in many cases are embodied in the Bill. They have been quoted in detail by my colleagues, and I do not intend to repeat them.

I think it was the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan who said that over the last three or four years the revenue from succession duties had risen from a little over £2,500,000 to £3,000,000, and then to something over £3,250,000, by the

process—or what today seems to be the normal process—of increases in valuations. I believe it was the Hon. Mr. Hart who said it was possibly difficult to cover any fresh ground in discussing this Bill because honourable members who had spoken had done an exceedingly good job. On the other hand, I believe it is incumbent upon all members who consider this a bad measure to state their objections to it.

I wish to underline and endorse some of the views expressed by my colleagues about the Bill, from the aspect of the primary producer. I oppose the Bill on this ground, if on no other ground, because I believe that the Government in its policy speech promised to give a living area to the primary producer without the payment of succession duties. What do we find? We find the Government considers a living area to be one valued at about £5,000. To my mind, this means the Government, in making those promises, was either completely insincere and cynical or completely out of touch with the problems of the man on the land, because a living area valued at £5,000 is completely ridiculous. It is not possible today to buy a moderately-sized house for that amount. It is completely ridiculous and iniquitous that the then Leader should have promised in his policy speech a living area, not merely with reduced succession duties, but without succession duties, and that the Government should then provide this cynical and completely inadequate amount of £5,000 as a living area for a primary producer.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is £5,000 in addition.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In addition to what?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: In addition to the present amount.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is still a completely inadequate amount and is the first step in reducing the primary producer to the position of a peasant. Doubtless, if one carries Socialism to its logical conclusion, one finds that the Socialists want it that way. It could happen that we shall get completely inadequate and uneconomic units yielding less production and causing increased costs and that the overall results to the State will be less gross revenue, many people in difficult circumstances, and a slowing down, if not a complete stopping, of the State's advancement. This State needs to advance, as it has been doing for the last 25 years, in both primary and secondary production. Therefore, this provision of £5,000 for a living area is completely cynical and completely unrelated to fact.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is more than they get now.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My friend says that it is more than they get now, but the non-use of aggregation in succession duty, which my honourable friend is so anxious to bring in, is what they get now, and the Government is anxious to grab from the primary producer and anyone else who has some money.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you believe in equity?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe in a person being able to get the results of his labour. I believe in the parable of the talents, but I do not think that any Socialist would continue to be a Socialist if he read that parable and worked out what it meant. My honourable friend, Mr. Gilfillan, has referred to a living area worth £30,000. With respect to the honourable member (and I have great respect for him and for his opinions), I consider that he took the lowest value for a living area. Of course, the value varies according to location and the way in which land values have increased in certain areas. Some areas in one part of the State that are worth £30,000 would be worth twice that amount in another part, even though the production value in both places would remain the same.

I hope that the Government will heed what I am saying, because it would be helpful if the Government realized some of these facts. A well-known agricultural authority that I know (and he would not be on his own, by any means) advises parents that £40,000 is needed to enable them to set up their sons on the land on reasonable living areas. No doubt the parents, if it is possible for them so to do, will provide some of the money but much will be left for the young man to pay off in his lifetime. In my view, a living area is one worth about £40,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In some forms of production it is less than that, of course.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, it depends on the location of the property concerned and the type of production but I am trying to give an average. Inflated values, about which we unfortunately are unable to do anything, are bringing increased revenues to the State Treasury. Nevertheless, this Government wants still more. I have been sorry to see this Government, over a period of less than 12 months, seeking to take an additional £5,000,000 a year in the aggregate from the people of South Australia. I have said before and make no apology for

repeating that, although we were told hundreds of times before March last to live better with Labor, that slogan was ironical when one looks at what has happened in that period. The situation is not one where we are living better with Labor, but one where we are paying more with Labor, and that is the real objective of the A.L.P.

Whether farms are worth £30,000, £40,000 or £50,000 today, I think that, generally speaking, they can be said to pay two or three per cent on capital. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, in rare cases they pay 4 per cent, but properties that pay that much are good and well-managed ones. I submit that that is the exception rather than the rule and that that would be the case with particular farms near the city of Adelaide or the country cities or in the more closely settled areas. This 2 per cent or 3 per cent is not a measure of the farmer's inefficiency; far from it. It is mainly a reflection of these inflated land values to which I have referred, and I have said that we have little or no control over that aspect.

I think my friend the Hon. Mr. Hart referred to the costly capital asset that is needed nowadays. Many of these medium-sized farms are only partly paid for, as I have stated. If a man is able to put his son on the land, he has to leave a large amount for the son to pay off over his lifetime. A good farmer will improve his property and, in the course of events, as we have seen during the last 20 or 30 years, the value inevitably increases. Even properties that have not been well improved have increased in value, but more so when a man has done a good job and been a good farmer, keen to improve his property, refence the place and build up its fertility. The property becomes considerably more valuable.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That man is taxed on his talents.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Quite so, but when he dies a considerable overdraft still has to be paid off plus a large amount of probate. A man I knew bought a property and paid as much as he could off it, leaving a considerable balance still to be paid. He went quietly ahead paying it off and improved the place considerably and then, unfortunately, died. With the overdraft still to be paid off and the probate, his widow was left with a sum of over £30,000 to find, and this is the sort of thing that makes aggregation, which I will refer to directly, so iniquitous. What happens under those conditions? Either the widow is left to struggle under great difficulties for very many years or she has to sell

part of the property or, as I think the Hon. Mr. Octoman said, the property has to be sold. This means that experienced people are forced off the land and often people of less experience and ability take over. As a result, we have this same situation about which I spoke when I was discussing uneconomic units. We get a lesser production on the same land, and that, in the aggregate, is bad for the State.

Regarding the aggregation, we find that the Government without any doubt is going to take more money from medium-sized estates. I said earlier that there is no possibility of being able to get the amount of money that the Government envisages securing from the larger estates, as there are not enough of them. Therefore, it is going to take more money from medium-sized estates and even from relatively small estates.

I lodge a very strong protest at the removal of Form U and at the aggregation proposals which have contradicted everything that has been laid down in the Succession Duties Act in this State for the last 70 years. I also protest at the completely iniquitous provision for including insurance in the aggregation. I had a telephone call this morning from one of my constituents who was very concerned about this and who felt that he could not go on with his insurance as it would not pay him to, so he thought he would turn it into a paid-up policy. I believe that the provisions on aggregation are very bad; they are a penalty for thrift and for being a good businessman and for trying to put his affairs in the right order so that his widow or sons may be able to carry on.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Any mug can spend money, but it is a bit harder to get it together.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, and when you do get it together, it is nice to be able to pass a little on and leave somebody in the position of being able to continue to advance, and that is necessary from the point of view of the State. Instead, this Bill puts people in the position where they have to struggle to pay off an overdraft while in possession of old equipment (as they have not the money to buy new) and that slows down the advancement of the State.

I have concentrated on the effects that this Bill will have on primary production; other honourable members have dealt with other aspects of it. Some honourable members have quoted various examples, which I am not going to repeat because they are reported in *Hansard* for all to see. Suffice it to say that the provisions of this Bill also strike at many city

dwellers with modest estates, at people who are engaged in secondary industry or small businesses, and at people engaged in the professions who have built up small estates. It will strike at the widows of former supporters of the Government as well as people in primary industry. The aggregation provisions will see to that. This, of course, is what the Socialists would like—to take from the haves and give to the have nots, thus making sure it is difficult for people to own and retain for their families the rewards of their toil. In the advancement of the State it is highly important that a man should be able to pass on something of his achievement.

Soon after the Government came into office early last year it announced that it was going to discourage the freeholding of land. A man could formerly take up land that was relatively valueless and build it into something worthwhile and be able to pass it on to his son; now he will hesitate about working for half his life and building up an asset because it may be taken away from him. If it is leasehold land he will not know when it is going to be taken away from his successors. This Succession Duties Bill is another example of the possible destruction of an estate built up out of nothing. The owner can make no adequate provision for it to be retained by his family.

My friend, the Chief Secretary, for whom I have a personal regard, quite often says, "We are doing all right". If he really believes that, I submit that his head is well and truly in the sand at present. He will either persuade the Government to withdraw this very bad Bill with the reprehensible provisions for retrospectivity (which are some of the worst provisions of the Bill in my view) and bring in a more reasonable one, or if he feels that the Government is doing so well, he should persuade the Government to make an issue of this Bill.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think he means he is doing well.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Perhaps, but I assure him that the Government is not doing very well at present. If he likes to take this to the final adjudicators, they will soon tell him what they think. As I have said previously in this Chamber, in a democracy such as ours, there are approximately 40 per cent of the people who are always solidly to the right, approximately 40 per cent who are to the left, leaving approximately 20 per cent who are swingers. I believe that most of the swingers went left last time (and we congratulated the

Government on that). However, I suggest that if the Government decided to make an issue of its sorry record in the last 12 months, it would find out it is a sorry record.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are not sorry. We are doing extremely well.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Not only will most of the 20 per cent who were taken in by the "Live Better with Labor" slogan—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We got some of your 40 per cent last time.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I will tell the Chief Secretary, if he likes to come and get a judgment, that he will be very surprised to find how many normally hard-core Labor supporters will disapprove of its sorry record with regard to this Bill and with regard to the so-called achievements of the last 12 months.

I do not wish to say very much more. I noticed the other day in regard to this matter and also a number of other matters that a Labor columnist had the effrontery to say that this Government had done more good for South Australia in the last 10 months than the previous Government had done in the last 32 years. How blind or how one-eyed can you get! He had his head in the sand more than my friend the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How do you know it was not the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It could have been. I venture to suggest that this Government's record in the last 12 months is far from good. So far from doing good as the columnist suggests, it has done more damage in this period that it would have seemed possible for any Government to have done in so short a time.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How do you know that the columnist was not the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: He could be; their thinking is so much alike. I believe Mr. Story may have something there.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I give honourable members a complete undertaking that the columnist is not the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Then he has certainly taken lessons from the Chief Secretary in that regard. In concluding my remarks, I refer to an advertisement to which some of my colleagues have already referred in some detail and refuted. It is misleading in a number of its statements.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Is it a Government advertisement?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I should imagine it is run by the Government, anyway. The figures stated are similar to those put out by the Attorney-General on December 4 last in an article that did not take into account the concessions at present available before aggregation. I do not wish to refer to this article in detail, because it has been dealt with already, but I want to mention something that has just as much effrontery as this man had in his statement the other day about the Government's doing so much good. The final words of this advertisement—they having put their side of the case, as Sir Arthur Rymill interjected yesterday, in some instances with no reference to the truth—are, "Don't let the Liberals go on robbing you." Who is robbing whom? After all is said and done, the Labor Party has the effrontery to put it out that it is doing good, yet during the last 10 months it has sought—and it is doing a wonderful job, according to the Chief Secretary—to rob the people of South Australia of £5,000,000 per annum and more. Therefore, I feel we cannot do other than oppose this Bill, which has so many objectionable features. I strongly oppose it.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's message that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6, but had disagreed to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 be not insisted upon.

I do not intend to go into detail now but merely remind honourable members of the position. The reason given by another place for disagreement to these amendments is that they nullify the efficacy of the essential provisions in the Bill. There was a keen debate on all the amendments when they were before this Chamber on November 23 and subsequent days. Each amendment was fully discussed and reasons were put forward why the Government desired their rejection. The reasons were canvassed in a lengthy debate. On one or two occasions at least progress was reported when the amendments were before the Committee. It is not necessary for me to go into detail about

what happened during the debates. If honourable members desire to refresh their memories, they can read in *Hansard* what was said on the occasions when the amendments were being discussed. I have no serious objection to progress being reported now if that is desired but if we debated the amendments again we would merely be travelling over ground already covered. I did my best at the time to answer questions put to us by the Opposition. We divided on all the amendments and the Committee decided whether or not they should be rejected. I can only repeat what I said before, that it is not my intention to go into detail.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It would be good practice for you.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not need any practice. I think I can foresee the fate of this Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I oppose the motion. I do it because, as I see it, there would be no point in this Council reversing its decision on the amendments, having debated them at length and considered them carefully. It is interesting and encouraging to note that at least another place thought we were right about one of our amendments because it has accepted it; and it was a most important one. All honourable members who took part in the debate will recall the great attention given to each of the amendments when they were before the Chamber. Several speakers stressed their importance. For my part, I see no reason

why we should reverse our decision. Since the amendments were accepted by this Chamber I have received several favourable comments on them from leading members of the legal profession, so all honourable members who supported them can be happy that they did a good job in examining the Bill to the extent they did. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Hon. Mr. Potter's remarks. The Chief Secretary said that this matter was extensively debated previously, and that is correct. As a definite vote was given by this Chamber on the amendments, I do not see any purpose in discussing them. I therefore oppose the motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (4).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Noes (14).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, Sir Lyell McEwin, C. C. D. Octoman, F. J. Potter (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, and C. R. Story.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived; amendments insisted upon.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, January 27, at 2.15 p.m.