

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, January 27, 1966.

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

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITIONS: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. HALL presented a petition signed by 416 electors residing in the Gouger District. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Mr. FREEBAIRN presented a petition signed by 161 electors residing in the Light, Gouger and Burra Districts. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 273 electors residing in the Victoria, Millicent and Mount Gambier Districts. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Petitions received and read.

QUESTIONS

LAKE LEVELS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last Friday at Meningie a meeting was held of people who irrigate from Lake Albert. They were extremely concerned at the levels prevailing in the lake and with the problems with which they are confronted in maintaining adequate water supplies to their pastures. They are a little upset that the Minister of Works complained that they were ignorant of the facts of the matters concerning them. In fact, they now call themselves V.I.Ps.—‘Very Ignorant Peasants’. As their concern will be increased by the construction of Chowilla dam, will the Minister of Works obtain for me a full report on how the dam will affect the availability of water in the lower levels of the Murray River system, particularly the levels in Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert, which are not covered by the River Murray Waters Agreement? Can the Minister say whether this will

mean difficulty for these people in maintaining the existing pool levels in the lakes (over which there has been so much contention and about which the meeting to which I have referred was called), and whether it will mean also that consideration should be given at an earlier date than had been expected to a study of the possibility of reclaiming Lake Albert? If this is so, can the Minister say what provision will be made to protect the interests of these people whose livelihood now depends on this source of water for irrigation?

Mr. Jennings: How many questions is the honourable member going to ask?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have already given the Minister notice of my question, as he will indicate when he replies; he knows the text of the question.

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

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say, first, what effect Chowilla dam will have on the pool levels of barrages at Lake Alexandrina? Secondly, will this mean that there will be difficulties in maintaining Murray River levels and that Lake Albert will have to be drained? If this is so, what provision will be made to protect the interests of those people who rely on Lake Albert for water for irrigation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is true, as the honourable member said, that he told me he would ask this question. He was good enough to hand me a written copy of his question, which I forwarded to the department. However, as the honourable member will appreciate, his question is complicated and much work must be done to provide a detailed answer. I should be able to supply a detailed answer on Tuesday next week. I make it clear that there was no suggestion that the people were ignorant in the general sense. However, we felt that they did not fully understand and that they were under a misapprehension regarding the whole problem. We believe that some of the statements were made because those people did not have full knowledge of the facts. I take this opportunity of saying that I deeply appreciate, first, the attitude of the honourable member, who did his utmost to see that the meeting was conducted in a spirit of co-operation. Although I have not received an official report, I have had verbal reports that the chairman of the council was most helpful and co-operative, and I believe that the meeting finished in a very satisfactory atmosphere, with the department and the settlers agreeing to co-operate in the interests of all.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: My question (which, in the absence of the Attorney-General, I address to the Premier, representing the Minister of Health) relates to the dust nuisance created for residents of Marino by the Marino quarry. Complaints have been made about this nuisance for a long time, but no complaint as yet seems to have produced any significant improvement. I had brought to my attention this morning the fact that one family had sold their house and were moving to another district because of the effect on the health of one of the sons who suffered from asthma. One local doctor has been quoted to me as saying that asthmatic sufferers in this suburb seem to suffer much more severely than do those elsewhere. Apart from the health hazard, of course, there is also the general nuisance created in the additional cleaning of houses, and so on. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether something cannot be done to ensure that the managers of the Marino quarry take appropriate preventive measures to eliminate this dust hazard?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will place the matter before my colleague, and as soon as I have a reply I will give it to the honourable member.

ROAD TRANSPORT CONTROL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In view of the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Transport regarding the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, will the Premier explain whether this represents a change in the Government's intentions concerning this legislation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think that some of the views that have been expressed have been contrary to the Government's intentions in this matter. If, when the Bill was introduced, we had had a map showing what was proposed in this legislation, I doubt whether there would have been the controversy and the misunderstandings that have occurred. It is not a question of this Government's endeavouring to depart from the policies that we had in mind on this matter. I assure the House that we considered we had to earn more money through the Railways Department. I frankly admit that after the Bill left this House it was necessary to further explain this important matter, and in another place yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order! Yesterday my attention was drawn to Standing Order No. 145. This Standing Order is still enforceable,

and therefore I cannot allow a reference to a debate in another place. I did not hear the full context of the question, but an honourable member cannot refer to current debates in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As the reported statement by the Minister does not seem clear, can the Premier say whether persons carrying stock in vehicles of over eight tons from Murray Bridge to the Loxton market will have to pay tax?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not all the details of the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill with me, but I will obtain a reply to the question.

Mr. HEASLIP: I desire to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, because I am in some doubt about your ruling in relation to a question asked by the member for Alexandra about road transport control. Yesterday the member for Adelaide asked the member for Frome a question regarding road transport control, and the member for Frome said he had addressed a meeting at Orreroo. He also said:

I can say unhesitatingly that once this whole matter was explained truthfully to these people the reaction of the meeting was one of amazement at the misinterpretation of this legislation by members of the Opposition at past protest meetings.

Would I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in addressing a question to the member for Frome, who evidently knows all about this matter, who can truthfully tell us what this Bill means (members of the Opposition are absolutely in the dark about it), and who can give the people of South Australia the true facts?

The SPEAKER: I think members will agree that this is a hypothetical question, and I cannot give any answer except that which is provided in Standing Orders, which provide that the honourable member is entitled to ask any other honourable member a question, but it is entirely at the discretion of the other honourable member whether he answers or not. Standing Order 145 refers to debates in the other House or to any measure impending therein, but it does not cover the question mentioned by the honourable member: that is, the meeting at Orreroo.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yesterday, in reply to the honourable member for Adelaide, the honourable member for Frome said that he had addressed meetings at Orreroo and Yunta on the subject of road transport control. The honourable member went on to say:

I can say unhesitatingly that once this matter was explained truthfully to these people

the reaction of the meeting was one of amazement at the misinterpretation of this legislation by members of the Opposition at past protest meetings.

We have had one explanation in this House regarding this Bill, and we have had another explanation in the other House. We have to rely on the second reading explanations of Bills, and if anything we repeat is misrepresentation I say that the second reading explanation must have been a misrepresentation. If the honourable member for Frome can truthfully and factually give information that we do not have, will he do so now to enable us to tell our constituents and the people of South Australia truthfully and factually just what is contained in this Bill and what it means?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Frome wish to reply?

Mr. CASEY: I would be only too delighted to answer the honourable member's question here and now, but I think that under Standing Orders I would be prevented from doing so. However, I am willing to stay in Adelaide tomorrow and explain to the honourable member for Rocky River the whole workings of the Bill as I explained them last week at Orroroo to the people of his district, together with some people from my district. If the honourable member is prepared to accept my offer, then I shall be only too happy to comply with his wishes.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Premier will not have at his fingertips the information that I now seek, but perhaps he will be good enough to get it for me. My question concerns a light engineering works at Eudunda which specializes in the manufacture of diesel and petrol fuel tanks and bulk grain bins and like products. A large percentage of this factory's output in the past has been transported to Adelaide by road transport. I understand that the manager of the firm is not opposed in principle to transporting his products by rail, but the loading facilities at the Eudunda railway station are just not adequate, and a new type of mobile loading gear would be required there to enable this factory's production to be loaded and transported by rail. Can the Premier say whether the Railways Department has plans for the installation of an improved type of loading gear at this station?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from the Minister of Transport, and make it available as soon as possible.

PHYLLOXERA BOARD.

Mr. CURREN: Recently, I received a letter from a growers' organization in the Upper Murray requesting information about the operations of the Phylloxera Board. Can the Minister of Agriculture say, first, which Minister is responsible for the operation of the Phylloxera Board; secondly, how the operations of the board are financed; thirdly, whether an annual report is available from the Phylloxera Board; and fourthly, whose responsibility it is to see that run-down orchards and vineyards are cleaned up or destroyed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me yesterday that he intended to ask this question. First, the Minister of Agriculture administers the Act. Secondly, the income from investments provides the finance, and this amount is reported on in the Auditor-General's Report. Thirdly, the reports are available at the office of the Phylloxera Board, and the honourable member or any of his constituents may see them there. Fourthly, run-down orchards are controlled by the board, and are covered by section 37 of the Phylloxera Act.

CAMBRAI-SEDAN WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I am pleased to read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Government intends to construct a main from Swan Reach, on the Murray River, to Stockwell, in my district: many parts of South Australia will benefit from this main, and this action seeks to give effect to a proposal outlined in the policy speech of Sir Thomas Playford early last year. Also, I advocated this work during the Loan Estimates debate in August of last year. For some time the Minister of Agriculture and I had tried to obtain a reticulated supply for parts of the Murray Plains in our respective districts, the areas in my district being Cambrai and Sedan. I understood that it was the intention of the previous Government, assuming the proposal for a main from Swan Reach to Stockwell had eventuated, to supply the Cambrai and Sedan areas from this main. It seems from the press report that the proposed main will pass five miles north of Sedan. Can the Minister of Works say whether the terms of reference to the Public Works Committee about the proposed work are wide enough to cover an investigation into the feasibility of and the need for a supply for the Cambrai and Sedan areas? If they are, and if the recommendation of the Public Works Committee is favourable, will he say whether it is intended to place a line

for this undertaking on the 1966-67 Loan Estimates?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot answer these questions offhand, but I shall have investigations made, discuss with the Treasurer the matter concerning the Estimates, and let the honourable member have a reply later.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last year the Minister of Works said that proposals for a reticulated water supply from a bore for the township of Watervale were not satisfactory and that the department would investigate the possibility of supplying the township from either the Auburn or the Clare main. Will the Minister ascertain from his department how far these investigations have proceeded?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, last year in reply to a question I indicated that, following a report from the Mines Department, the bores that had been sunk in the area had proved to be unsatisfactory in regard to a water supply, and that the department was investigating the possibility of constructing a main. I know that these investigations are proceeding and I shall be happy to obtain a progress report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

FIRE BRIGADE.

Mr. LANGLEY: A recent fire in premises between Opie Avenue and Park Street, Unley, was promptly and efficiently attended by officers of a fire brigade. As this State has rapidly expanded, industrially and in other ways, and as the fire brigades receive assistance from other organizations, will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, inquire whether all fire stations are sufficiently staffed to meet the demands of both industrial and residential areas?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Fire Brigades Board has made a long study of fire protection requirements. One of the most recently erected fire stations is situated on the South Road at St. Marys and, although it was at one time expected that it would be erected nearer Oaklands, the board found that it would be more appropriate to erect the station where it now stands. Some doubt at present exists about requirements in areas such as North Adelaide and Islington. However, I shall obtain a report on the matter raised by the honourable members as soon as possible.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether work will be continued on the Flinders Highway and, if it will, what will be the extent of the next contract to be let?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT REVENUE.

Mr. McANANEY: Last September the Treasurer introduced a Budget containing certain estimates of expected revenue, and told members what were the plans of the Government to raise money. Since then, however, through the generosity of the Treasurer, through the pressure of public opinion or the Opposition, or as a result of certain conferences held between the Houses, adjustments have had to be made by the Government in its estimates of revenue. (Incidentally, we are at last obtaining some facts about the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill about which we were not informed earlier.) Will the Treasurer say just how much these adjustments will affect the estimated revenue? Further, as he budgeted for a deficit, will the Treasurer say from what sources he expects to obtain the necessary finance to meet the additional deficit?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Certain people seem to be taking every opportunity to delay the Government in its efforts to obtain revenue. If further information on the matter can be made available, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say what has happened to the suggested Bill relating to the metropolitan drainage scheme? When I asked this question on November 17 the Minister was good enough to indicate that legislation was being prepared, and that he would introduce a Bill to set up a metropolitan drainage authority along the lines of that proposed by the previous Government. Therefore, will he say when this legislation is likely to come before the House and, if and when it does, whether it is likely to cover floodwater drainage in the Enfield, Prospect and Hindmarsh areas?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter is now being handled by the Minister of Local Government, from whom Cabinet has received reports stating that, because of misunderstandings that arose in earlier discussions between the councils and the previous

Government, he is experiencing difficulty in drafting legislation. Another conference is still to be held so that the legislation to be drafted will be acceptable to everyone concerned. However, until that conference has been held it is impossible to say what form the legislation will take. I assure the honourable member that I am just as hopeful as he that the Government will be able to assist as originally intended, namely, on a 50/50 basis.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you try to expedite action?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

WHARFAGE CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee say when the report of his committee relating to increased wharfage charges (subject to a motion for disallowance only until February 3) will be available? Further, will the evidence given on that regulation be provided for the information of honourable members?

Mr. McKEE (Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee): The business regarding wharfage dues should be dealt with next Wednesday, but the committee will decide whether the evidence will be tabled.

SEAVIEW DOWNS WATER TANK.

Mr. HUDSON: On June 17 last year, when I asked the Minister of Works about the commencement of the Seaview Downs water scheme, he said that the Seaview Downs tank would be completed by the end of October and that after a one-month test it would be put into commission. The Minister also said:

In the meantime the department will commence the laying of mains in the subdivision and it is expected that these will be completed by the end of November, 1965.

The water tank has been completed but I am not sure whether the laying of mains has been completed. In any event, the scheme is not yet operating. Will the Minister have this matter investigated with a view to expediting the commencement of the scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to do as the honourable member requests and let him have a report.

KYBYBOLITE RESEARCH CENTRE.

Mr. RODDA: Last year I asked the Minister of Agriculture about the appointment of a permanent officer-in-charge of the Kybybolite Research Station. Has he that information?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Executive Council, this morning, appointed Mr. T. A. F.

Quinlan-Watson, M.Sc., who will commence duties next Tuesday. The appointee has outstanding ability, having been a practical farmer as well as a scientist. At the age of 16 he managed a large property in the Upper South-East. He then went to the Melbourne University, whence he graduated to specialize in animal physiology. He worked with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization for 10 years during which period he obtained his master's degree. After this, he took up land in the South-East, at Robe, where he still owns property which, I understand, his son is working. At present he is a research officer with the Bush Fire Research Committee and has proved valuable in that field. I am sure that he will be an asset to the Kybybolite Research Centre and that he will be of great value to the department in helping other officers further their knowledge.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Highways Department is currently widening the Grand Junction Road. Work has advanced to Northfield and is proceeding towards Strathmont, which, of course, is in the Enfield District. Once this work crosses Dry Creek, which is near the junction of Nelson Road and Grand Junction Road, it is in the Barossa District. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads how far it is intended to widen this road and when the work is expected to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague and bring it down as soon as possible.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns Parliamentary privilege as it is affected by the reply given earlier by the member for Port Pirie as Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. In the past (at least for the past 30 years, to my knowledge) it has been a practice for all evidence of committees of this Parliament to be freely available to the Parliament, except where the witness specifically asks that his evidence be regarded as confidential. It now appears, however, that a new rule is to be made so that the evidence will be available for the perusal of honourable members only if the committee decides that the evidence shall be available. Although I do not believe any Standing Order applies to this, can you, Sir, say whether this practice is in accordance with the practices of the Parliament

and, if it is not, what action members should take to have the practices carried out?

The SPEAKER: Having regard to all the circumstances, I should like an opportunity to consider the question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It now appears that the people in my district and others who live within 150 miles and beyond a radius of 25 miles from Adelaide are to be asked to carry the main burden of making up the Railways Department's deficit. In view of these new disclosures, can you, Sir, say whether any protection is afforded under Standing Orders or in Parliamentary usage to ensure that members shall receive full and accurate explanatory details in Ministers' second reading explanations?

The SPEAKER: Ministers and members alike are responsible for the accuracy of any statements they make in the House. I cannot take the Standing Orders any further than that.

TOD RIVER MAIN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I have heard on the political grapevine—

Mr. Ryan: There is no such thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member desire to make a statement to explain his question? If he does, he must ask for the permission of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I ask your permission, Sir, to make a brief explanatory statement. I have heard on the political grapevine—

Mr. Ryan: What is the crop like this year?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must appeal to honourable members to help me maintain the decorum of the House. It is not in order to interject whilst a member is asking a question. The honourable member must ask for the permission of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House before he makes a statement.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I have already asked your permission, Sir, to make a statement. Have I your permission?

The SPEAKER: It is not a matter for the Speaker alone. A statement can be made only with the permission of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House. The concurrence of the House is given by members maintaining silence. If silence is not observed, that concurrence is not forthcoming. Does the honourable member for Eyre ask for the permission of the Speaker and the concurrence of members to briefly explain his question?

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been a cut in moneys allocated for the

Western District water projects, and, if there has been, whether this will mean a curtailment of work in progress on renewing and enlarging the main from the Tod River to Minnipa?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineering and Water Supply Department generally has a certain difficulty in getting sufficient funds to carry out all the works it would like to do. However, I have no knowledge of whether there has been a cut in the moneys allotted for the district referred to by the honourable member. I am fairly confident that there has been no such cut, but in view of his question I will investigate and obtain the information for him.

STOCKWELL MAIN.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: My question relates to the proposed Swan Reach to Stockwell water main, which has been announced in the press today. Can the Minister of Works say whether the settlers adjacent to the main will be able to obtain a supply from the main? Can he also say what will be the charge per 1,000 gallons?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the honourable member will appreciate that it would be inadvisable to answer this question off the cuff, so to speak. However, I will obtain a detailed report and let him have it as soon as it is to hand.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Minister of Works recall making a statement some time ago regarding the Islington sewage farm (which is to be closed down on the completion of the main to the Bolivar sewage works), when he said he expected that Islington would be vacated in about June, 1966? In view of the planning that is now proceeding for educational purposes, for housing, and for industry in that area, following the plan announced by the Premier for this work, can the Minister now say whether this target date of June, 1966, can be achieved?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I discussed this matter at some length with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and with Mr. Hodgson, the engineer largely responsible for the project. The work is expected to be completed on or about the target date, and every endeavour is being made to achieve this. Of course, one never knows what mishaps will occur, but we are very hopeful that we will be able to adhere to the forecast completion date.

BORDERTOWN POLICE STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Earlier this session I told the Minister of Works that the police

station at Bordertown was a combined residential and police office, with the residential section on the top floor. I asked then whether consideration could be given to providing screens on the office windows so that these windows could be opened without allowing insects and flies to enter the building and get into the residential section upstairs. I was at Bordertown the other day and observed that this work had not been done. As I believe that policy is involved, will the Minister look into this matter again to see whether or not it would be possible to put screens on the windows of the office section at this police station?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I remember this matter being referred to me, but I know of no policy difficulties with respect to it, although there may be. I believe that this is a reasonable request, and I will make every effort to ensure that the work is carried out as soon as possible.

AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Education say when the reference concerning the Agincourt Bore School will be submitted to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot give that answer immediately, but I shall inquire for the honourable member and let him have the information next week.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Irrigation) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Remark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936-1963.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to provide for further grants and loans to the Remark Irrigation Trust in connection with its irrigation works. The Bill also makes other amendments with which I deal first. Clause 3 which is introduced at the request of the trust, alters the present arrangements in connection with the annual retirement of members of the trust. Section 14 of the principal Act provides for the retirement of half of the members each

year, or, if the number is uneven, a majority of one. The trust has pointed out that in practice this provision operates unfairly, and has proposed that the section should be amended to provide for the retirement of one-half of the members if the number is even but on each occasion when there is an uneven number of members a minority and majority shall retire alternatively. Clause 3 accordingly repeals section 14 and enacts a new section to meet the wishes of the trust.

Clause 4a makes a minor amendment to section 123 of the principal Act, which provides for approval of certain works by the Minister of Lands. It has been pointed out that it is the Minister of Irrigation who administers the Act and accordingly the words "of Lands" after the word "Minister" are struck out. The remaining provisions deal with financial arrangements. Certain discussions were held between the trust and the former Government in 1964, and with the present Government in May, 1965. Following these discussions, the Government invited the Auditor-General to investigate the finances of the trust and, in particular, the financing of a proposed new pumping plant and rising mains and channel rehabilitation. The Auditor-General recommended that the Government finance the pumping station in the first instance up to an amount of £560,000, two-sevenths of which should be by way of grant and the remainder by way of loan repayable by the trust with interest at 5 per cent over a period of 40 years. On the assumption that the total cost would be £560,000, the amount repayable by the trust would be £400,000. Clause 5 enacts new section 123a of the principal Act making the necessary provision in this regard.

The Auditor-General also recommended that the Government provide up to £500,000 on a pound-for-pound subsidy basis towards the cost of channel rehabilitation and additional drainage. New section 123b makes the necessary provision in this regard. New section 123c enables the Treasurer to make the necessary arrangements for giving effect to section 123a and 123b while new section 123d requires the trust to keep a special bank account for the receipt and disbursement of the monies granted and lent under the provisions of the Bill. The Auditor-General also recommended that the existing drainage loan of £175,000 be repaid over a period of 40 years instead of 18 years as at present. Clause 4(b) of the Bill so provides.

The Auditor-General has expressed the view that with careful financial management the trust will be able to meet its commitments under his proposals. Temporary increased charges are considered to be inevitable, an additional sum equal to £2 an acre being required until completion of the scheme. After careful consideration of all aspects, the Government decided to approve the Auditor-General's proposals, and the trust has informed the Government that it accepts them. As this is a hybrid Bill it will require reference to a Select Committee in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, and for this reason I do not, at this stage, go into the provisions of the Bill in any great detail.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Irrigation indicated to me earlier this week that he would introduce this Bill, and was good enough to give me a copy of the second reading explanation that he has just read. Standing Orders provide that this Bill has to be considered by a Select Committee, so that in those circumstances I do not desire to delay its passage.

I think the Minister will agree that the Bill contains two provisions that are not of any great moment, but, as the measure has been introduced, it has been considered advisable to correct one or two small anomalies. As they have not much bearing, I do not intend to discuss them. The main provisions are financial provisions, which are extremely important. They arise in the first place, I think, because the Renmark Irrigation Trust was established long before the Government settlements and has been run as a separate trust operated by the settlers over a long period. After some initial difficulties had been overcome, the trust carried out its functions effectively. It has contributed enormously to the development of the upper river and the State. I suggest that the operations of the trust were used in many respects as a pattern for establishing the Government irrigation settlements after the Second World War.

I make it clear at the outset that the Opposition supports the Bill and commends the trust for the work it has done over many years. The fact still remains, however, that people in the trust's area, like some people in Victoria, are undoubtedly at a disadvantage compared with settlers on Government blocks. Anyone who has any doubt about that has only to examine the Auditor-General's Report to see that the latter have carried on over many

years with heavy losses. I do not complain about the losses, as there are compensating advantages, but the fact still remains that Government settlers probably lose on balance about £250,000 a year, whereas the Renmark Irrigation Trust, until recently, had no Government support but had to carry the burden of capital works, drainage, development and everything else. That meant that over the years it increasingly felt the competition from Government irrigation areas and experienced difficulties in meeting its obligations and liabilities and in carrying out its functions. I think everyone appreciates the fight it has put up to meet its obligations.

Some years ago the trust approached the Government of the day and as a result the Government recommended to Parliament that financial assistance be given. Parliament accepted this recommendation without, I think, any opposition. However, the assistance then recommended was to meet the specific problem of drainage and seepage, which had become extremely urgent, and it was necessary that work be carried out to enable the trust to maintain its area in production, because seepage over a period in any irrigation area ultimately becomes a serious problem. The trust raised the further question of the general rehabilitation of its area. I do not want to go into the problems that confronted it, but there were several, particularly in regard to obtaining the best quality water possible. This makes it necessary to have an almost completely new set-up in the trust's operations, and obviously this will cost a large sum. This Parliament and the people of South Australia, who have received tremendous benefits from the operations of the trust over the years, should, I think, make some contribution.

The Opposition favours providing money to enable the trust once again to operate an efficient area, and to be able to maintain its services to the settlers whom it controls and who elect it. I have not had much time to analyse the Bill and compare it with the provisions which I previously discussed with the trust, which I indicated would be made available to the trust, and which the trust accepted. I think the provisions of the Bill are probably not so generous as those provided by the agreement entered into with the Government before the last election, as I believe there has been a considerably different approach to the matter. As members opposite are probably aware (certainly those representing irrigation areas are), every year a rate is proclaimed by the Minister for

Government areas. This rate is to pay for so many ordinary irrigations, for special irrigations, and for drainage. In relation to these areas, departmental officers have prepared each year a comprehensive statement (I presume this still obtains) which takes into account prices, crop possibilities, market outlets and anything that relates to what is a fair payment by the settlers. As honourable members know, the Minister has properly fixed the charges at a figure recommended by his departmental officers after a careful examination, and in one or two years after consultation with representatives of settlers. It is no use fixing a rate above what a settler can afford. The previous Government's proposals were designed to keep the charges relating to the Renmark Irrigation Trust parallel with those in respect of Government settlers. The Auditor-General was brought in to investigate a fair charge. However, I am perturbed to hear today that the new arrangement will involve the settlers in an additional charge of £2 an acre a year, which will be that much more than the sum paid by Government settlers who have already had their costs assessed by competent officers.

It may well be that the Select Committee should examine whether the settlers in the area can properly meet the proposals in the Bill. I believe it would be unwise to enter into a financial agreement with the trust which could not withstand the test of time and which would be beyond the settlers' capacity to pay. It would be wise to examine the whole question of whether the additional charge was practical because, after all, that is the basis of the Bill and of a 40-year agreement. The Opposition supports the Bill. Indeed, I commend the Minister of Irrigation for acknowledging the necessity to give financial aid to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I believe that if the committee fully investigates the matter it will be able to report favourably to Parliament. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, the Hon. D. N. Brookman, Messrs. Casey, Curren and Millhouse; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on February 10.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SERVICE).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from January 26. Page 3550.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I agree with the Minister of Education that this is important legislation: it will have far-reaching effects on the development of the State and on the development of the arts and sciences in South Australia. However, I am not sure that I agree entirely with his statement that the Bill is non-controversial. The Minister said it was non-controversial, and he hoped it would be dealt with quickly. While he gave a good account of the proceedings that led to the present situation, I think he overlooked the fact that right from the very beginning this matter was regarded by members of the Labor Party as being very controversial. In fact, when I examined some of the statements made in connection with the matter, I was astounded to see how far the Labor Party has drifted from its original stand.

When it was announced early in the history of this issue that the Government contemplated making available an area of land at Bedford Park as an annex to the University of Adelaide, the matter was promptly taken up by members of the then Opposition, and it is surprising to see how quickly members who made certain remarks in the early stages have changed their views on the matter. On May 19, 1960, I announced that Bedford Park had been suggested as a site for the extension of the University of Adelaide. On the same day the *Advertiser* quoted Mr. O'Halloran (the then Leader of the Opposition) as saying that the Labor Party did not favour the establishment of a second university in the metropolitan area or at a place too close to the present university. That is a complete statement of the Labor Party's views on the matter at that time. On August 19, 1960, after the Universities Commission had said that it was prepared to recommend that financial help be given to the development of the Bedford Park site, the *Advertiser* quoted the then Leader of the Opposition as saying that the transfer of Bedford Park to the university would prevent for many years the establishment of a country university. The present Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) was quoted as saying that he strongly opposed the use of the land at Bedford Park for university expansion, and that the area should be retained by the Hospitals Department for the care of the mentally sick. Even the

member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) had some comments to make on this aspect, and again his comments were adverse to the project.

Therefore, it can be seen that whereas the Labor Party condemned this project outright at the outset, as the project has developed and as extensions of the university have taken place, it has decided that this would be a good thing to expropriate. Now we find that the Minister of Education has come into the House with an entirely new idea: he has said that we will have a university at Bedford Park! I do not blame him for this, because, quite frankly, it is necessary for every Government to do some good things from time to time. Therefore, I do not mind the expropriation of this idea. However, I suggest that when it was handed over by the previous Government the planning and provision of capital for the university were at an advanced stage. Had the Opposition been successful at the last election, I doubt whether it would have taken the step now being taken by the Government. However, I realize that developments have reached such a stage that it would be worse than bad sense to oppose this measure and, therefore, we do not oppose it.

There are two things affecting this matter. First, what Mr. O'Halloran said is undoubtedly true: that the establishment of a second university in the metropolitan area takes away all chance for many years of the establishment of a university outside the metropolitan area. What the member for Port Pirie previously said about this matter showed that he was much better informed than he is now, and he was entirely correct in what he said on the previous occasion. I believe that the whole of the education system should not be centralized in the city of Adelaide and that any decentralization possible is desirable. The University of Adelaide has been generously supported for many years by large bequests from eminent people in the State, and it has fairly substantial resources of its own. However, it is obvious that for many years the new university will be established and supported almost entirely by subventions from the State and Commonwealth Governments, plus the small sum that will be collected by way of fees and charges. I believe that it is necessary that the university should not be confined to catering for people of only one class; it should be available for all to use. Nevertheless, as the new university will be supported by the subventions of the State, I believe it is essential that the State consider placing a

university where the greatest advantage to the State as a whole can accrue.

When the Opposition was in Government it started to consider this matter. Honourable members will recall that the School of Technology was extended to conduct courses at Whyalla. When that decision was made I said that I hoped that that would be an opportunity of putting major advanced education in a country area. Although the Minister of Education may feel that he should not sponsor it, with its growing population and with the facilities that will be available, I believe that there is a strong case for advanced education at Whyalla. Some years ago the Public Works Committee recommended that a large up-to-date hospital should be established at Mount Gambier. That hospital should ultimately be in a position of becoming a teaching hospital, and that is one of the main facilities that should be available for the establishment of a university in a country area. I do not think it would be a pipe dream, when considering a site for a new university, to examine the South-East. Such a university could also cater for a considerable number of students from Victoria. Therefore, Mount Gambier could be considered as an initial site for a second university. I agree with the statement made by Mr. O'Halloran at the time, that we would have to look very carefully at the provision of a second university in the metropolitan area, for the reasons that I have mentioned, for it does, in my opinion, take away from the country the opportunity for advanced education for many years to come.

However, there is another reason which I believe has to be considered in this matter. I know that the establishment of a second university in another State led to endless friction between the two authorities located close together. I believe that inherent in this Bill are one or two factors which would lead to friction. In the case I am quoting, just as the new university was established close to the old one, so it was established under different circumstances, and there immediately set up a competition for staff between the two universities. There was friction as to which had the support of the State Government, and it was a most unhappy period for both universities for a considerable time.

I see in this Bill something that I personally would not like to see, because in the establishment of this new university, the new council (I am not certain whether that is the correct name) is totally dissimilar from the Council of the University of Adelaide. I have not checked

the Minister's second reading explanation with the Bill, which I think was placed on the file only a few minutes ago, but from what I can understand of the Minister's explanation I should like to set out the difference between the two authorities which will be running the two universities side by side in the same locality. I ask honourable members whether the set-up is conducive to smooth running between the two organizations, or whether it will not in itself have an inherent weakness that could lead to difficulties.

The University of Adelaide was established many years ago, and the council of that university consists of the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor *ex officio*, five members appointed by the Parliament and 20 persons elected by the University Senate. All the members of that council are persons completely dissociated from the Government. I believe the University of Adelaide, in respect of any outside control, can claim to be the most free university in the world. I do not believe there is any university in the world that has a greater academic freedom than has the University of Adelaide. Only five members of the council are elected by Parliament, whereas 20 are elected by the University Senate. I think the University Senate in itself consists entirely of graduates from the university. There is no Government representation upon it, merely Parliamentary representation. That representation over many years has been non-Party and, I believe, has fulfilled a most useful function for it has enabled members to get information about the university, and it has probably saved needless debate about any provisions of the university.

Let us examine the new council, if I may describe it as such. We have the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor *ex officio*. We also have the Director of Education *ex officio*, and the President of the Students' Representative Council. We have three members of Parliament elected by Parliament, two professors of the university and two members of the academic staff, and three members appointed by the Governor. Also, three members can be co-opted by the council and eight members elected by convocation, which I think is the equivalent of the Senate of the University of Adelaide. We see that there is a big representation of the Government in the new university. The Minister of Education's chief officer, the Director, is *ex officio* a member. I believe that if we are going to have the Director of Education *ex officio* a member of the council of this university, in order to prevent what can be a source of

unrest he should also be *ex officio* a member of the Council of the University of Adelaide. I do not think there is any doubt about that. The money will be provided by the Government, and there is not the slightest doubt (unless times have changed very much) that the Director of Education will have a tolerably good say in the preparation of the education budget, for he has always done so in the past. Therefore, I would say that, if it is a good thing to have the Director of Education as an *ex officio* member of one university council, it would also be a good thing to have him represented on the other.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I would agree with that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Secondly, why is it necessary that we go into this formula of having people appointed from outside the university? Why do we not keep to the simple formula adopted by the University of Adelaide? According to the Minister (and I believe this opinion can be substantiated by the reputation it holds throughout the world), this formula has been successful over a long period of years. Why should all sorts of political organization be represented on the council? Why is it necessary to bring in political representations, other than the representation of Parliament, which has been non-political from the Party point of view? For instance, why is it necessary to include the Chambers of Commerce and Industry and the Trades and Labor Council in the representation? Are we going to bring active politics into the council? That appears to me to be highly undesirable. In my opinion, the composition of the new council is not an improvement on the composition of the Council of the University of Adelaide.

I accept what the Minister has said regarding the question of the Director of Education being appointed to the Council of the University of Adelaide, for I have always held views along those lines. When one considers the members of this council, it is interesting to note that, although additional representation is given to everyone else, for some reason that has not been explained, it is being taken away from the Legislative Council. That, surely, must be an omission, because while representation is being given to the Trades and Labor Council it is being taken away from the Legislative Council. Parts of the Minister's second reading explanation were so ambiguous that I took the trouble to ascertain what the Bill provided. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

By subclause (5) it is provided that those members of the council who are nominated by industry and labour and those elected by the academic staff as well as the President of the Students' Representative Council are not to be regarded as delegates of the bodies by which they are nominated or elected.

Why are they there? Apparently, the Minister, realizing the weakness of the set-up, said that, although they would be nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, they would not be representatives of that council.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I said nothing of the sort.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This paragraph is a gem, and should be considered fully.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On a point of order, Sir, I did not refer to the particular people as representatives of those bodies, and I ask the Leader to withdraw that statement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understood the Leader to say that the Minister said they were not to be representatives of the bodies.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I did not refer to them as representatives on any occasion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I have transgressed Standing Orders in any way I willingly withdraw my statement, but I do not believe I have. However, I shall withdraw the statement. That will make it easy for the Minister, but I shall quote again from his second reading explanation and try to analyse what he said, because I consider it to be ambiguous. He said:

By subclause (5) it is provided that those members of the council who are nominated by industry and labour and those elected by the academic staff as well as the President of the Student's Representative Council are not to be regarded as delegates of the bodies by which they are nominated or elected.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's right.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If they are not representative of the bodies, why are the bodies allowed to nominate?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A delegate is not a representative.

Mr. Jennings: How asinine can you get?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Why provide for nomination in this way if they are not representatives? If they are not delegates of the organization by which they are nominated, why are they there?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A delegate is not necessarily a representative, or *vice versa*.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously the people are there to state the views of the respective bodies, and the Minister

can object to that until he is black in the face but I shall not withdraw it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You can twist things, can't you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No-one has heard of a representative of the Chamber of Commerce putting anything but that organization's views, and the same applies to the Trades and Labor Council. This is the most stupid provision for the membership of a university council. I remember attending a public function at which several members of the Commonwealth Parliament proceeded to break into a bit of politics, and Sir Arthur Fadden said, "These boys would bring politics into the Lord's Prayer." I believe the Government is trying to bring politics into the university and I deplore that, because it is unwise and unnecessary and does not help the best development of the university. In his second reading explanation the Minister continued:

By comparison with the Council of the University of Adelaide (which, apart from the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, has five members elected by Parliament and 20 members elected by the University Senate), the Flinders University has, it will be observed, fewer persons in these two categories of membership but on the other hand includes three members appointed by the Governor, of whom two will represent industry and labour . . .

However, just now he said they were not representatives. When I read this I thought there was something crook about it and resolved to look at it closely. Do they represent labour and industry or do they not? I do not know. In the same paragraph of the Minister's speech they don't, and then they do. The whole provision is bad, and the Minister when writing his second reading explanation, found himself in difficulties in explaining this provision. The Minister continued:

. . . four members elected by the academic staff, and three members co-opted by the council itself. It will be noted that the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Director of Education and President of the Students' Representative Council are *ex officio* members of the council.

On the council there will be *ex officio* the President of the Students' Representative Council: there is no doubt about that. Is he going to be a representative of the students or not? Apparently, the Minister does not know.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I will answer you in good time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am pleased about that. I again quote what

the Minister said in his second reading explanation of this non-controversial Bill. He said:

Clauses 5 and 6 which deal with the election of members of council by Parliament and their time of appointment and tenure of office, closely follow the pattern of the corresponding provisions in the University of Adelaide Act. But they don't. The University of Adelaide Act provides that there shall be five persons elected by Parliament—three elected by the House of Assembly and two elected by the Legislative Council. This Bill provides for two to be elected by the House of Assembly and one from the Legislative Council, and that certainly does not closely follow the provisions of the University of Adelaide Act. As a matter of fact, it goes unnecessarily out of its way, in my opinion, to belittle Parliament as a whole, and one Chamber in particular. Is it suggested that the five members that have represented Parliament on the University Council have not done their job? Is it suggested for a moment that it has not been advantageous to have those members there? If the answer is in the negative (as I think it must be) why has it been found necessary to take two members from Parliament in order to give the Government the right to appoint other members? Now, the Government is to appoint just as many members as Parliament has. I object to that.

This provision is extremely controversial, and needs to be well examined. In any university I believe it is necessary to have a council which will function effectively but which will not be subject to outside strains and stresses. If the Minister of Education does not believe that, then I hold up to him the Adelaide university's example: for many years it has held a high reputation as a seat of learning not only in Australia but in the outside world; its degrees have been accepted all over the world; its students have received world-wide recognition. They certainly did not have to have all these miscellaneous people to direct their education; it was directed by the university itself, and the Minister knows that. Why do we have this interference which can ultimately lead only to what happened in similar circumstances in another place? I have previously raised with the Minister of Education the question of auditing and reporting the university's accounts. The Minister kindly gave every honourable member a copy of the university's report last year, attached to which were the certificates of the auditors concerned.

Mr. Jennings: Yes, and when you were in power we never got one.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The reports were always here, but members opposite did not take sufficient interest in them.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They were not always here.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have checked with the Clerk today, and he assures me they are tabled every year. It is no use the Minister contradicting that. I am not suggesting that any discrepancy has existed in the university's accounts or that any laxity or irregularities have existed in the audit. If we examine the report supplied by the Minister we shall find that the auditor's certificate comprises a few words to the effect that he has examined the accounts and satisfied himself of their correctness. However, when we look at the Auditor-General's Report, we see that the certificate is not confined merely to those words; he makes the most valuable comments and comparisons, giving much detail which enables a comparison of progress to be made, and which is entirely lacking in the auditor's report of the university's accounts.

The Auditor-General segregates the amounts, particularly in relation to the purpose for which they should be applied. I regret that the Minister did not make provision for the Auditor-General to audit the university's accounts. At the outset, most of the fees concerned will be paid by the Government, because they will relate largely to the Education Department. As so much Government expenditure is involved, why do we not have a report similar to those generally relating to other Government expenditure? The Minister could just as simply have said that the accounts shall be audited by the Auditor-General as saying that they shall be audited in such a manner as the Government prescribes, or words to that effect. I repeat: why do we not have the valuable comparisons of expenditure from year to year, similar to those in respect of almost every Government department?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It's a wonder you haven't done it over the last 20-odd years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Opposition never asked for it, or I would have given the matter prompt attention. The Opposition was not particularly worried at the time; its only concern was that the Government was not spending enough money on the university. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that all the planning work had been carried out and was being proceeded with, except in relation to the halls of residence, which have been the subject of questions asked by my

colleague the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), as well as of a question that I asked. The halls of residence involve two problems. First, I believe that the offer of money by the Commonwealth Government has lapsed and that the money is lost.

Mr. Hudson: That's not so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: To clear up any doubts on this matter, I have a letter from the Commonwealth Minister dealing with the subject.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The member for Glenelg says that the money is not lost.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a letter which was conveyed to me by the member for Sturt (Sir Keith Wilson) in the Commonwealth Parliament. I asked him to obtain information from the Commonwealth Minister. Sir Keith wrote to Senator Gorton; Sir Keith sent the reply to me and it is over Senator Gorton's signature. It is a rather lengthy letter and I shall refer to the last paragraph, which states:

The South Australian Government at the beginning of the triennium agreed to match the Commonwealth grant for recurrent purposes of £4,730,400. They have agreed to match the grant of £340,800 for teaching hospitals. They have now also agreed to match the grant of £148,530 for special research projects, but in agreeing to do so have also indicated that they would ask the universities to forego some of the grant for general recurrent expenses to which they had previously agreed. In short, they have indicated a desire to reduce their grant for ordinary recurrent expenditure in order to match the grant for special research projects. How much this will involve or whether it will be persisted in, I do not know. I understand the matter is being discussed by the South Australian Government with the universities, but I have no knowledge of their discussion.

I believe the figure involved is about £60,000. I understand that, when approval was given for certain work to be undertaken, it was indicated that £60,000 might have to be withdrawn from the next year's finance provided for the university. The question not answered in the Bill (and a question I should like to have answered) is this: who loses the £60,000? Will it be the university at Bedford Park or the University of Adelaide? I do not know whether the Minister has examined this problem, but it is one of the smaller problems that will undoubtedly arise in connection with the Bill.

From time to time the university promulgates regulations that are subject to allowance by the Government, the Governor being the visitor of the university (which practice I notice will

be continued under this Bill). Provided the regulations meet with the approval of the Government they are promulgated and become law, and Parliament is unable to scrutinize them. If the Government does not like the regulations they are not promulgated and do not become law. Therefore, under the present provisions, the university is subject to control by the Government in respect of its regulations, but it is not subject to control by Parliament. I believe it should be the other way around. If university regulations are to be subject to control, then I believe that the control should be by Parliament rather than by the Government. I do not intend to take the matter any further than to suggest to the Minister that he might examine it.

It would be worthwhile to have one set of regulations scrutinized by Parliament—the regulations dealing with fees to be charged by the university. I think all members believe that the university should be readily available to students, as far as is possible within the financial resources of the State. However, all members know that the financial resources of a State Government are limited. Members of the Government Party are now aware that most of the taxation powers are in the hands of the Commonwealth Government. The State Government has many expensive functions but not many avenues from which it can raise revenue to discharge them properly. Therefore, it is inevitable that fees will be charged at the university. For many years the University of Western Australia charged no fees but, at the direction of the Commonwealth authority, it had to revert to charging fees. However, I believe all members would view fees as sympathetically as possible. If my Party had brought down a regulation increasing fees when it was in Government, I would have expected Opposition members to challenge such a regulation strongly, and if the Government brings down a regulation increasing fees I can promise that it will receive such attention. If regulations increasing fees were subject to disallowance by Parliament this would have the effect of keeping fees as low as possible. I say advisedly that this House would not be competent to look at the syllabus of various courses, nor would it be desirable for it to do so. However, as the State and Commonwealth authorities are making the major financial subvention to the university, regulations affecting fees should be considered by Parliament.

I am concerned about another provision in the Bill. I notice from the second reading explanation that the Minister is giving the

university power to mortgage property. I cannot for the life of me understand this. Is this university going to function by raising money on its capital assets? If that is the position, I think it is entirely wrong. Is this an indication that the university is not going to be properly financed? I see no reason at all for provision to be specifically made for the mortgaging of the assets which have been made available freely by the State. I think the assets given by the previous Government would probably amount to about £1,000,000. Why do we start off by founding a university and saying that it can mortgage its property? It does not seem to me a very happy way of developing a new university.

I do not complain about the name of the university. I notice that the name is different from that advocated by the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition—the University of South Australia. The Premier was quite definite about that. Flinders was a great explorer and undoubtedly was a person who had tremendous capacity but, although we are indebted to him, he was not specifically associated with South Australia. He explored part of the coastline, but we had other great explorers who explored under very much more difficult conditions and who were much more closely associated with this State. However, I do not question that. I accept the title, although personally I think it was probably hastily conceived, and, strangely enough, it is different from the title so forcibly advocated by the Premier.

Summarizing, I believe this Bill is probably premature. It is interesting to see that the convocation of the new university is to be appointed by the old one, and this is strange because there do not appear to be the people to make that appointment. I believe that more mature consideration would have led to decentralizing in the form of leaving Bedford Park as an annex to the University of Adelaide and setting out to plan another university that would not be so closely associated with the University of Adelaide and therefore not so liable to get the type of friction which we have seen in other States. I believe that the composition of the council of the university is not wise. I think it has been hastily conceived, and I believe the Minister himself had difficulty in explaining it to the House. I quoted the Minister's words to show the problem that arises in this matter. I believe the new university should have its accounts audited by the Auditor-General, and

that the same provision should also apply to the old university.

Finally, notwithstanding the hurried establishment of the university and the hurry to give it a separate entity (I believe this action is at least four or five years premature, if ever it should be given a separate entity), I hope, on behalf of the Opposition, that this will become a great seat of learning, and that it will be operated successfully. I am sure that the young people who graduate from it will play a conspicuous part in the development of this State. Although I have been critical on some aspects of the establishment of the university, I make it clear that I believe the future of Australia will depend largely on the efficiency of the young people of this country. I do not believe it will depend on Socialism: I believe that it will depend on enterprise and efficiency, and that those things will arise out of higher standards of education being made available freely to everyone. I support the second reading.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): We hear many weird and wonderful speeches in this House, and an occasional silly one, but if the speech we have just heard is not the silliest speech for some considerable time, then there must be something really defective in my hearing.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know if it is your hearing.

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader's speech displayed ignorance and, while through most of the speech the Leader endeavoured—to use a phrase—to put the mockers on the new university, he ended up wishing it all the best. The Leader commenced his speech by playing politics, as usual. He suggested that the Minister came to this House with an entirely new idea which he (the Minister) had expropriated. Now, as the member for Mitcham will no doubt tell us later, it was not a new idea: it was part of the election policy announced by the Government that Bedford Park should be a separate university, independent of the University of Adelaide.

I should like to say right at the outset that, with the physical shift of staff to the Bedford Park site (which is taking place at present) and with new students being admitted to Bedford Park this year, now is the time to establish Bedford Park as a fully-fledged university—the Flinders University of South Australia. That fact was fully recognized by the University Council and by the special sub-Committee the University Council appointed to advise it on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to say something about the name of the university?

Mr. HUDSON: I am happy to tell the honourable member that I would have preferred the university to be named the Kingston University. However, there was certain opposition to that name, for reasons that I will not go into in great detail, and the name of the Flinders University of South Australia was suggested instead. I am happy with that, for I think it is a good name. It carries the weight of history from our past, and I think it is a name that will be acceptable not only to those at the university but to everyone in the community at large. The Leader of the Opposition tried to suggest that the Minister had expropriated the idea of establishing Bedford Park as a university, whereas the establishment of it as a separate university at this time is common sense and, if it were not made independent now, friction between those at Bedford Park in the university college under the aegis of the University of Adelaide, and those at the university would occur and would become a difficult problem. I recall my own experiences regarding the relationship between university colleges and the parent university. I was at the Canberra University College when it was under the University of Melbourne. Later I transferred to Melbourne, and spent two years seeing the relationship between the university college and the parent university from the other angle and both from the point of view of the University of Melbourne and from that of Canberra University College, that relationship was most unsatisfactory and led to much difficulty and friction.

When a student at the University of Sydney I occasionally met students who completed part of the course at the New England University College before it became independent, and it was clear from their experience and comments that the relationship between the University of Sydney and the New England University College was unsatisfactory. When I came back from England, for my sins I had one year at the University of New South Wales, and I gather that the Leader was referring this afternoon to the University of New South Wales when he spoke about friction between two universities established close together. The University of New South Wales has a number of university colleges under it, the main one being the Newcastle University College, but the relationship between the University of New South Wales and the Newcastle University College, as I experienced it while on the staff

of the University of New South Wales, was most unsatisfactory and led to much friction. In every single case throughout the history of university education, wherever for any length of time there has been a university college established under a parent university, friction has developed and an unsatisfactory relationship has existed so that pressures have continually built up, as a result of this friction, to make the university college independent.

The New England University College has been made an independent university; Canberra University College became independent of Melbourne and became the undergraduate school of the Australian National University; and it will not be too long before the Newcastle University College becomes independent of the University of New South Wales. Those three institutions, when they became independent, were much smaller than the Flinders University of South Australia will be within five years. The new university which is starting off as a fully fledged university, will have more than 2,000 students within five years. It is starting with academic independence and with courses arranged differently from those at the University of Adelaide. The people controlling this new university will need to take different steps; they may have to adopt different attitudes in the way they employ staff; and they may want to vary the procedures that have applied at North Terrace. If this university remained under the control of North Terrace, it would have to follow a general pattern at that university and the opportunity of experimentation and variation would be lost. It was clear, when the subcommittee of the Council of the University of Adelaide reported to the council, that that subcommittee fully recognized the importance of securing independence for what was then Bedford Park. This was a convenient time to do it while physical transfer of staff to the site at Bedford Park was taking place. I congratulate those associated with the establishment of this new university for the magnificent job of planning that has been done. I think Professor Karmel, the new Vice-Chancellor, in particular, deserves great praise for the role he has played.

I had hoped that, in view of the sensible discussions that had taken place over some years and in view of the magnificent start the new university looked like getting, this Bill, when introduced, would have been treated with dignity and respect by the Opposition, but we have been given the most asinine display of ignorance by the Leader of the Opposition. Before dealing with the remarks he made about

the University Council, let me explain a few things about the composition of the Council of the University of Adelaide. As the Leader said, five members are elected by Parliament and 20 by convocation. What is convocation at the University of Adelaide? It consists of all graduates of the University of Adelaide, and I hope that all members are aware that when every new member of the staff comes to the University of Adelaide he takes out an Adelaide degree *ad eundem gradum*, becomes a member of the University Senate, and is entitled to vote at elections for these 20 members of the council.

The staff members who attend the annual meeting of the senate to take part in that vote are one of the important groups in determining the nature of the council. The other important group is that of teachers, and that is the largest group of graduates that seems to take an active interest in the proceedings of the senate. It is largely as a result of the views expressed by the staff members and the teachers that the ballot for positions on the council is determined. Does the Leader of the Opposition suggest that we should now set up a council for the new university consisting of five members of Parliament and 20 members of convocation elected mainly by staff members at North Terrace? What immediate interest should staff members at North Terrace have in dominating or trying to dominate the council at the new university, which is supposed to be a university independent of the University of Adelaide? What is the sense in that arrangement? What is the sense in the remarks of the Leader? How stupid can you be? Because there are no graduates of the new university, special arrangements have obviously to be made from the beginning in order to ensure a wide representation from the community as a whole on the new council.

If the pattern at the University of Adelaide is used for the new university, with 20 members elected by convocation, and therefore by graduates of the University of Adelaide, there is no opportunity to get the wide representation from all sections of the community on the council of the new university. We would be making a serious mistake if we did that, and could be charged with not paying proper attention to the needs of the new university. If members take the trouble, which the Leader of the Opposition obviously has not done, to look at the Bill and to consider how the council is to be composed, and then to compare that with what is done in other States, they will see that great care has been taken to establish a council which will

represent all sections of the community, and which will be an independent council—fully independent of the Government. What rubbish we heard when the Leader spoke about the Government having a big representation on the University Council! The Government at most will have two of its own officers out of 25, namely, the Director of Education and one of the three appointed by the Governor in Council. The other two of those three are to come from the Trades and Labor Council, the Chamber of Manufactures, and the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Coumbe: Why is the Director of Education to be *ex officio*?

Mr. HUDSON: Because the view has been taken that he is responsible, has a certain statutory independence in relation to education matters, and should be there, because the relationship between university education and primary and secondary education is absolutely vital.

Mr. Coumbe: I agree he should be there.

Mr. HUDSON: To make him an *ex officio* member ensures that he is there all the time. If we had four people appointed by the Governor in Council, some other Government could come along and say it did not want the Director of Education there. Including that provision in the Bill means that the Director cannot be taken off the council unless the legislation is amended. The Leader of the Opposition's claim is a complete fabrication. He seemed to have some doubt about whether the President of the Students' Representative Council should be a member, but let me point out that in some other Australian universities the President of that council (or some other student) is a member of the council or senate. The Sydney university has an annual election among students to elect a student member of the senate, and he is fully privileged to participate in the councils of the senate. The University of Melbourne has two; Tasmania has one; New South Wales has one; the Australian National University has two; Monash has two, and the University of New England has one. The Leader of the Opposition made a great song and dance about the President of the S.R.C. being a delegate of the S.R.C. (or going under instructions from that council to the University Council).

He referred to the representative of the Trades and Labor Council on the University Council and, again going under instructions; he mentioned the representatives of the Chamber of Manufactures, all of whom, he claimed, would find politics in the Lord's

Prayer (although he was probably referring to the latter two). He said those organizations would issue instructions to their representatives, but I am sure that he would find that if they did they would be most unsuccessful in securing the ends they wished to secure. The University Council consists of 25 members; if the Trades and Labor Council were to instruct its representative to vote in a particular way on a certain matter, that would represent one vote out of 25. The Trades and Labor Council has a number of representatives on other bodies in the community and, by and large, those representatives act in their own personal capacities. For the Leader of the Opposition to suggest otherwise is merely trying to make political capital out of the fact that he is really rather peeved that Bedford Park is to become an independent university.

He would really like to oppose the Bill outright, because he did not think of making it an independent university; he believed that it should stay a university college of, say, 5,000 students, and that when a university college was eventually established in a country area, he would be able to say that that was the second university in South Australia. If he said that, however, it would be complete fiction. We on this side are a little more honest; the Labor Party, as a result of a full investigation into the matters associated with the second university, has recognized the crying need in the community for a university to cope with the greatest number of students possible—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It has been done with the closest collaboration of the university authorities.

Mr. HUDSON:—and at the lowest cost to the community. Everybody who has gone into the matter recognizes that, as much as we may desire to establish a university college at, say, Mount Gambier, we simply cannot afford to do it at this stage, because we need to provide these facilities for the students; we have restricted funds and can only satisfy the need to provide the required facilities by establishing a second university where the population is to be found, where the famed industrial development achieved by the Leader has led the 67 or 68 per cent of the population to live within an area bounded by Gawler in the north, the hills in the east, and Reynella in the south. While the Director of Education will be a member of the University Council, and while it is possible for the Governor to appoint another State employee as a member of the council, that need

not happen, for only one member need be a Government employee. The position relating to the other universities of Australia is considerably different from that. Sydney has four of its senate appointed by the Governor; Melbourne has eight members of its council appointed by the Governor; Queensland has 50 per cent of its 28 members appointed by the Governor; it is six out of 26 in Western Australia; and in Tasmania four out of a council of 19 to 21 are appointed by the Governor.

Although the Leader started to refer to the University of New South Wales, he did not mention it specifically by name, but talked about friction. That university has 22 out of 40 as members appointed by the Governor, so that the State Government can secure a majority on the council of the University of New South Wales. Let us remember also that the University of New South Wales started off as an extension of the Sydney Technical College, became the New South Wales University of Technology and ultimately the University of New South Wales. It has had an entirely different development from that which has taken place at Bedford Park. Apart from that, the fact that this development has been so entirely different and so heavily loaded on the technical side has meant that the source of friction between the University of New South Wales and the University of Sydney has been there from the word "go". The University of Sydney was the old, established university with its old, established academic institutions. Then came the brash newcomer, heavily loaded on the technical side, which branched out on courses such as wool, commerce, journalism, and goodness knows what else. The very nature of the two was bound to ensure friction. Furthermore, when it comes to competing for the Government's favour it should be remembered that the University of Sydney had four Government members out of 26 whereas the University of New South Wales had 22 Government members out of 40. I suggest that the University of New South Wales had a little advantage.

The Australian National University, the council of which is now maintained by a Commonwealth Liberal Government and the legislation governing which is under its control, has 12 of the 38 members of its council appointed by the Governor-General. At Monash, the second university in Melbourne, seven out of the 37 members are appointed by the Governor. At New England, six out of the 24 members are appointed by the Governor. The new university will have three out of 25 members appointed by

the Governor, and this is a smaller ratio than any of the universities apart from the University of Adelaide. In addition, two of the three members in question will not be Government employees. This feature has been included in the Bill because of the problem created in trying to secure a wide representation from the community as a whole on the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia. This could not be achieved by copying the constitution of the Council of the University of Adelaide. I hope that other Opposition members who speak on the Bill will not be as asinine as was the Leader of the Opposition. He did not recognize the nature of the University of Adelaide Senate and the two major influences that work on the senate, namely, the Adelaide university staff and the teachers, who are graduates of the university. He therefore failed to recognize the problems that would arise if the two major groups influencing the determination of the Flinders University Council were Adelaide university staff and graduates. We should also remember that at the annual meeting of the University Senate the elections take place and people have to go to that meeting in order to vote. Therefore, members of the University Senate who live near Adelaide have the best chance of taking part in a vote for additional members of the Council of the University of Adelaide.

I have discussed the matter of friction between the parent university and the new university. If the Leader of the Opposition had taken the trouble to do some research into what has happened in the history of university education in South Australia he would have realized that perpetuating the arrangement his Government introduced at the new university would have been more likely to create friction than to establish an entirely independent university. If the former approach had been continued the new university could have claimed to be the poor relation. The claim would have been that matters always had to go through North Terrace for changes to be made. Already, before this Bill was introduced, friction had taken place between Bedford Park and the University of Adelaide. There are bound to be some cases of friction. There will be a school establishing itself at the new university and a similar faculty at the University of Adelaide covering the same subject. They will compete for students. Both universities are trying to have a common first-year enrolment so that students may apply for either or both and so that all applications are processed together. Let us imagine what will happen

when the professor of one department at the University of Adelaide and the professor of another department at the new university get together on the committee and decide who shall have which students. Friction has already taken place between the universities which could have been avoided had the new university been fully independent. These causes of friction will be avoided in the future. There has already been competition for staff. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition does not know about that. Already some people employed on the staff of the University of Adelaide have gone over to the new university. Therefore, in some cases the University of Adelaide has been left understaffed. That can occur irrespective of whether or not the new university is independent. If the Leader had bothered to think for just one second he would have appreciated that fact.

The Leader has criticized the provision giving the Flinders University Council the power to mortgage, charge or enter into any other transaction for making any of its property security for a loan, which is set out in clause 25 (1) (b). Is the Leader really trying to suggest that that provision is "crook", to use his famous over-worked term? Whenever he wants headlines he suggests that something is "crook". Does he know that the University of Adelaide had that power for all of the 27 years during which he was Premier of the State? It has mortgaged property and some of its mortgages were approved by the previous Government. How stupid can you be! It would have been far better for the Opposition to have discussed this measure in a constructive way and to have admitted that this was an honest and reasonable attempt to provide for this university.

Mr. Lawn: The Opposition has had advisers for about 30 years and now it is left without anybody to advise it.

Mr. HUDSON: That may explain it. I believe I have said enough by way of criticism. I conclude by saying something about the new university, about what it can achieve and do in the future, and about what its establishment means. I congratulate the Minister of Education on the very able way he has handled the introduction of this Bill. Outside of Parliament, outside the ratbaggery of the Opposition, there is never any trouble or any phoney criticism: there is just a constructive working together to ensure that we produce something that gives the best possible result. That is what has gone on—until today. I also point out that later (I hope not too far in the future) a further university college will have to be established. It may well be that it is

appropriate for this new university college to be situated in the country. One hopes that it will be in the country somewhere, but it may well be that it is appropriate for this new university college to be fathered in much the same way as Bedford Park has been fathered, that is, to start off in its planning stages as dependent on some parent institution and then, when it is ready to open, to be given its independence.

I think this is a very wise way of proceeding. It may well be when that time comes that the Flinders University of South Australia will be in a better position to father that new university college than will the University of Adelaide. It may well be, if the new university institution concentrates in certain fields, that the Flinders University of South Australia will be the more appropriate institution to father the new university college. Of course, that could happen only if we make Flinders University an independent body, so that in the future, when we come to establish a further university college, we will have the choice: Should it initially come under the aegis of the University of Adelaide or should it be under the Flinders University of South Australia?

As most members know, the new university is starting off with a limited range of subjects. This covers mainly Science, Arts, and Economics and, of course, there are terrific problems in establishing all these subjects, all set to go, as from the beginning of March, 1966. If any member cares to go out to the site he can see what has been done over the last two years and appreciate the magnificent start that this new university will have—a better start than any other university in the history of Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: You mean facilities?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, in terms of facilities, in terms of the nature of the academic staff already appointed, and in terms of the time they had to plan courses. In New South Wales a professor would be chucked into a department and a few months later he would be starting a new degree course. That is the way New South Wales operated. The University of Macquarie, the third university in the Sydney metropolitan area, will be commencing without permanent buildings of its own: it is just going to use whatever buildings it can find free and vacant in order to undertake classes. Monash never had the facilities or the start that this new university will have. I do not think any other university in Australia can say that on opening day it boasted playing fields that were

available to the students to use from the word "go". It certainly was not true of the University of New South Wales or of Monash.

Mr. Heaslip: This was done by the previous Government.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member for Rocky River is getting jumpy. If the Opposition can forget about politics for the moment, the main people responsible for the way this new university has developed have been those associated with its initial planning and development and, of course, the Government that was associated with that prior to March, 1965, obviously gets some credit and so, equally obviously, does the current Government. I think honourable members opposite would have been happier if something had happened between March, 1965, and today to turn the playing fields out at Bedford Park from green to brown.

Mrs. Steele: Don't be silly.

Mr. HUDSON: All I point out is that this new university, when it opens, will have had a better beginning than any other university in Australia's history, and I think that is something of which we can all be very proud. I hope this Bill achieves a rapid passage through this Parliament. I hope we can discuss it with a view to improving it wherever possible, and not with the evident anxious desire to keep on playing the worst kind of Party politics that have been demonstrated, not even ably, by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2751.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): This Bill deals with a subject that affects most people—the conduct of traffic upon our roads. It makes more amendments to the Road Traffic Act than did all the amending Bills introduced in the last several years. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

There has been no major review of the Road Traffic Act for some time. The Road Traffic Board considers that the amendments proposed by this Bill are required to make the operation of the Act more effective.

However, I point out that we had a very full review of the Act in 1961, which, after all, was only four years ago. The legislation was completely reviewed then, and since that time there has been an amending Bill each year, except 1962, so it does not seem correct to say

that there has been no major review of this Act for some time.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It depends on the definition of "major review".

Mr. HALL: As the Minister says—and he is rather particular about definitions today—it depends on that definition. This Bill does increase the power of the Road Traffic Board. In 1961, when the board was created we delegated most of the power of Parliament to it, especially with respect to the day-to-day administration. This was necessary because the administration of this Act and the control of the roads became more complicated, and it was obvious that Parliament could not keep up with the matters that had to be considered. Clause 4 amends section 21 of the Act, but I find some of these changes difficult to understand. The words that are to be deleted should remain, despite the explanation for their deletion, because school crossings are restricted to certain hours for a good reason. I should have thought that the words to be deleted should have remained, as the administration of the Act remains with the board.

I know of a flashing light on the Salisbury highway in my district that is far removed from the local primary school, yet it is there exclusively for school children and operates during the restricted hours. It may well be that a sign is necessary to warn motorists of the flashing lights, but I do not know whether this sign would be affected by this clause. The part of the section to be deleted is not restrictive and some reason should be given, as this provision aims to protect children. Clause 5 deals with arrows and other direction signs to be painted on lanes near intersections. Apparently the Act provides for "turn arrows" but does not provide for arrows pointing straight ahead so that this provision is good. Anything that increases the knowledge of motorists assists in road safety. Clause 6 gives the board power to order the removal of signs that offend against safety, and the second reading explanation states:

The board has power to order the removal of any false traffic sign or light likely to increase the risk of accident on any road. With regard to signs and advertisements, this power is restricted to those from which light is projected. A number of authorities exercise limited control over the erection of advertising signs, but this control is not fully effective, as no one authority has overall responsibility. The board has received reports that traffic hazards are being created at intersections where the presence of advertising signs restricts visibility. A sign that I consider to be a danger to traffic is located on the road between Two

Wells and Mallala. When the previous Government was in power I brought it to the notice of the Minister but the board took no action to remove it. It is a large sign on railway property that obscures the motorist's vision of the line when he is negotiating the difficult and dangerous Korunye rail crossing. The board would not acknowledge this as a difficult or dangerous sign. I have received numerous requests from my constituents that the sign be removed in the interests of safety. It is ironical that now the board is asking for powers to remove dangerous signs. The Korunye crossing was considered by the board to be reasonably safe, an evaluation that was proved completely wrong by accident statistics. It was only the personal intervention of the previous Minister of Roads that enabled signs to be obtained to make the road safer. Since these signs were erected, the number of accidents has been drastically reduced, so in this instance the board was incorrect. However, I approve that this power be given to the board and I hope that it will use it, because throughout much of the State road system too many annoying and dangerous signs are seen. If they do not obstruct the driver's views of railway lines or roads, they at least distract. Anything of that nature should be removed, and I hope the board will act wherever any danger exists.

Clause 9 amends section 43 of the principal Act, dealing with assistance to a person injured in an accident. However, I know extremely well a person who was involved in an accident, not in which people were injured but in which damage was done to the other person's car. The person I know rendered every possible assistance to the owner of the damaged car who, incidentally, was in the wrong. He even drove the owner of the damaged car home, only to receive in a few weeks' time threatening letters from him.

The matter was taken to court, and the owner of the damaged car related a complete fabrication of the story from start to finish; he won the case, and a miscarriage of justice obviously occurred. Although the person whom I knew was represented by an insurance company, he did not appeal, as he was so fed up with what had happened. Consequently, people should take care to protect their legal position, even though I agree that everyone should be forced to give as much assistance as possible, when an accident occurs. Clause 10 deals with road blockages; clause 11 deals with the certificate to be signed by the Government Analyst in respect of the alcohol content

in the blood, a provision which, I understand from a legal friend, is reasonable. Clause 13 amends section 63 of the principal Act. Obviously, if a collision is imminent the people concerned should try to give way.

Mr. Quirke: Who's on whose right?

Mr. HALL: I agree! That used to be a good question to ask in respect of the Main North Road intersection at Prospect, although lights operate at that intersection now. When is the danger of a collision obvious? Danger may exist some distance away from the probable point of collision if somebody is breaking the law or is inattentive. Throughout the metropolitan area people rely implicitly on the "give way" rule thousands of times every day, but this provision seems to weaken that rule somewhat. Although we often criticize driving in the Eastern States, the "give way" rule in New South Wales is policed much more strictly than it is in South Australia. Clause 19 deals with pedestrians; clause 22 prohibits all left-hand drive vehicles being used except by permit (and, as I saw two such vehicles in the city only the other day, that provision apparently will have some impact in South Australia). Clause 23 restricts the use of over-width vehicles to daylight hours. I think this is probably a very good provision. As many over-width loads are being used on our highways to carry loads that cannot be economically reduced in size, it is obvious that a permit should have to be given for these vehicles to travel, as some of them, although tolerable in daylight, are dangerous to other traffic at night, so I think this is a sensible provision.

Clause 24 relates to responsibility in relation to axle weights. It amends section 144 of the principal Act by striking out the passage "A person shall not drive" at the beginning of the first paragraph and inserting "An owner or person in charge of a vehicle shall not cause or permit a vehicle to be driven and a person shall not drive." Instead of the driver being solely responsible to see that the actual weight is correct, the owner is now brought in. I do not know whether that is justified or not, and possibly we shall have to wait until it has been in operation to judge. Perhaps the owner may not see his truck for weeks on end, and in such circumstances perhaps he should not be liable. On the other hand, he may order the employee to overload, and if he does so he should be responsible. I should like to see how this provision works. I take it that it will be properly administered by the board.

Clause 25, which amends section 146, alters for the first time for a long period the permissible weight that can be carried on the front axle of a vehicle. It reduces that weight from eight tons to six and a half tons. I know that this is being done in the interests of safety and that the controversial features of the provision were removed in another place, where the Bill introduced by the Government contained a provision for a 5,000-lb. axle weight to each tyre on any part of the vehicle. Although that gave an 8-ton maximum for a dual-wheel vehicle it gave only about half that limit for a front-drive vehicle, which was objectionable to many carriers. I think the measure was brought in without much thought of the difficulties that would arise. Many of the sand and metal carriers around the city operating trucks and not semi-trailers would have been affected. However, as that has been fully discussed in another place, I shall not discuss it. This provision means nothing to a difficulty in getting four and a half tons on to a front axle. Therefore, semi-trailers and articulated vehicles will not be affected, only trucks. Many operators have been able to load about seven or eight tons on to the front axle of a truck, but I think that in the interests of safety the compromise of six and a half tons is satisfactory and it has my support.

The provision that a person may be disqualified until he passes a driver's test, as prescribed in section 79a of the Motor Vehicles Act, seems sensible. Clause 30 removes a certain hardship in the case of a person who may be disqualified on his second conviction in three years. The Bill deals with many facets of road traffic control. Such provisions as those dealing with alcohol content in the blood and front-axle weights are important. In the main I believe this Bill is a genuine attempt to improve the safety of motorists. The provisions of the Bill are not included for the sake of restricting. As the controversial aspects of the Bill seem to have been ironed out in another place, I support the second reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support what the honourable member for Gouger has said. I thank members of another place for the way they have ironed out the controversial points in the Bill. I have read *Hansard* and I can see the work they did in making this Bill generally acceptable. If they had not done this we would have to spend much time straightening out these matters here. The reduction to

six and a half tons of the permissible weight on the front axle is commendable. Provision should be made to see that satisfactory brakes are fitted to various types of vehicle carrying goods. A new air brake available is based on a principle which is the reverse of the old principle. When something is wrong the brake loses air and, when there is no air, it is automatically applied. If that brake is effective, perhaps its installation should be made compulsory and then there might not be so many semi-trailers turning over in the hills.

I have seen several instances lately concerning men working alongside the road. These workmen display a warning sign, but this sign should be placed some distance ahead of where the men are working so that a driver can see it and slow down before arriving at the place where the work is being carried out. On Prospect Road recently the Engineering and Water Supply Department had the road up and had dug a hole about 4ft. deep. A "Men at Work—15 m.p.h." sign had been erected, but

it was too close to the workmen, and the motorist did not have a chance to see it or to apply the brake until he was almost on the men. Such a state of affairs could be improved.

I endorse the statement of the honourable member for Gouger regarding the various signs on roadsides. At the bottom of Germantown Hill there is a bush fire warning sign just at a spot where the motorist must take a sharp turn, whereas such a sign should be erected on a straight road so that it does not obstruct the view of the driver who is turning. There is another such sign on the Reynella by-pass at an intersection where it can confuse the driver. I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 1, at 2 p.m.