

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT 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.

### QUESTIONS

#### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Education refrain from making any further important policy decisions, based on secret information from the Karmel committee's report, before members of Parliament have had a chance to study that report?

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: As I understand it, the Minister announced at the Western Teachers College on December 17, that he would make an important policy change in the administration affecting teachers colleges, the Institute of Technology and, I believe, one or two other organizations. He also said, when making that announcement, that he was pleased that he was able to get advance information from the Karmel committee's report. I do not venture any criticism or opinion on whether the Minister was correct or not, not only because I know it would be against Standing Orders but also because the information is not available to me, and that is the point of my question. Also, as I understand it, significant members of the organizations and the student body of those organizations do not have the information on which the Minister based his decision. I believe the Minister owes the House an explanation about why he should make significant policy decisions on advance information which, to use another term, is secret information.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: For a start, the answer to the question is a flat "No". I am absolutely amazed at the question. The announcement to which the Leader refers was made in the middle of December: apparently it has taken this long for the Leader to discover what has happened.

Mr. Hall: Abuse is no answer.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: For the benefit of the Leader, let me explain what was involved regarding that announcement. The Leader may not be aware that submissions to the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education for the 1973-75 triennium were required by the end of 1970. I decided, and Cabinet agreed, that we should make submissions to that committee on behalf of all our teachers colleges to have them treated as colleges of advanced education. This would mean that, instead of receiving an outright capital grant, we would receive from the Commonwealth a \$1 for \$1 subsidy on capital projects and a \$1 for \$1.85 subsidy on recurrent expenditure. Our calculations indicated that, if the submission was accepted by the Commonwealth, the State would get an additional \$4,000,000 a year during the years 1973-75—an additional \$12,000,000 over the triennium. On financial grounds, it was clear that the submission should go ahead. Moreover, as there had been considerable pressure for greater independence for teachers colleges, it seemed to me and to the Government that immediate action was necessary on this matter. I am surprised that the Leader does not support the principle of autonomy for teachers colleges.

Mr. Hall: You're inferring something that I never said.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: However, it seemed to us that, if our submission to the Commonwealth was to succeed, it was important that we should make the necessary administrative changes in respect of teacher training and with regard to accreditation boards at teachers colleges that would bring us completely within the category that receives assistance for colleges of advanced education. It was clear that our submission to the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education would be assisted by this move.

I point out to the Leader that, after 1973, there will be no teacher-trainees in our teachers colleges doing two-year courses of training; after the end of this year, all our teacher-trainees will be doing three-year courses of training. A necessary condition that must be met to qualify for assistance from the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education is that any college of advanced education that has sub-matriculation entrance for at least some of its students, must have a minimum of three years' training past the entrance standard. It was clear that on that score also we would qualify. So

urgent did I regard the matter that not only did I make a prior announcement on these aspects of the Karmel committee's report but also, as soon as I came into office, I contacted Professor Karmel, requesting that I be given prior information on the relevant chapters of the report on these matters.

Mr. Hall: Did you consult with the Council of the Institute of Technology?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the Leader should know, the Director of the Institute of Technology has indicated publicly within the institute that I gave him the information I was to announce at the Western Teachers College on December 17. The Institute of Technology Council was informed, at its meeting on December 14, of the details of the announcement, and the people who for other reasons have been saying something to the contrary have simply not been telling the truth.

Mr. Millhouse: What are the other reasons?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know. The honourable member might be better informed on that question than I. As a result of certain statements that were made in the students' paper, last Thursday I addressed a meeting of staff and students of the institute, and discussed the matter fully with them.

Mr. Hall: Did they have the reasons from the Karmel report?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They have not got that report. Indeed, all I have had at any stage prior to the report going to the printer has been either a copy of the uncorrected galley proofs or one photostat copy of the typed manuscript, the latter relating only to the chapters in relation to which I made a special request. As the Leader would be well aware, it is not possible to release uncorrected material to the public generally. I have taken steps to ensure that the report is released at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Millhouse: When will that be?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have said I have taken steps to ensure that it will be released as soon as possible. The report went to the printer; the galley proofs were produced just before Christmas; the corrections thereto were, I believe, in the printers' hands in January; and the page proofs appeared at the end of January. The report should be out on either Monday or Tuesday of next week, and it will be released as soon as the first 1,000 copies are available from the printer. So far as the Government is concerned, there has been no hold-up in the publication of the report. If any Minister of Education had not, in the

circumstances, made an approach to the Commonwealth Government to have all our teachers colleges treated on this basis or had not made or announced the necessary administrative changes that would give the greatest possible chance for those submissions to succeed, I believe that that Minister would have been grossly negligent in carrying out his duties, because the sum involved was, as I have said, an extra \$4,000,000 a year for each of the years 1973, 1974 and 1975.

Mr. Coumbe: The three-year course was announced by Mrs. Steele, of course.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The change-over was started at the Wattle Park Teachers College by the then Minister (Hon. R. R. Loveday) in 1967. If the honourable member cares to check, he will find that that is correct.

Mr. Coumbe: But it was implemented by us.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was implemented by the former Labor Government. It has been a transition over a period of years, and if the honourable member cares to check this he will find that I am correct. Any changes affecting the Institute of Technology require the introduction of legislation. As the report will be released next week and as legislation will not be introduced before October or November, there will be plenty of time for people to make appropriate submissions on what that legislation should contain or what kind of change they would like to see in the policy already announced by the Government. The honourable Leader knows that full well and he is only trying to get on the band waggon, following the little bit of stirring that has been going on for a few weeks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Following the lengthy reply the Minister has given the Leader, can the Minister say why the Government has announced its intention to take away the autonomy that the Institute of Technology has so far enjoyed? As I understand the position (and, of course, I am very much in the dark, as we all are, through not having seen the Karmel committee's report), the Government has already decided to place the Institute of Technology under a board of advanced education (if that is what it is called) and I also understand that this is what got the Minister into much trouble when he spoke at the institute last week. According to the reports I have had of this, although admittedly the reports are secondhand, this was not well received.

Mr. Payne: That's rubbish, by the way, absolute rubbish.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My information is that the Minister was booed at some stage during his address or when replying to questions. I do not know when.

Mr. Langley: And so are some footballers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Usually for good reason, as the Minister was in this case. The Minister's reply to the Leader dealt, so far as I could follow it (and, of course, it was lengthy), with only the position of teachers colleges and, as I understand the Government's decision, those colleges are to receive a great measure of autonomy. So, on the one hand the teachers colleges are getting greater independence and the Institute of Technology is getting less. Therefore, I ask the Minister why the Government has taken the decision regarding the Institute of Technology which, apparently, it has taken.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There will be no significant effective reduction in the autonomy of the institute.

Mr. Millhouse: No significant reduction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member has said he did not understand, he must try to listen so that he can understand, if possible. He will not do that by interjecting and I suggest that he ask the member for Alexandra to explain that to him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must reply to the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The first point I wish to make is that we have decided that the Institute of Technology Act should be amended to permit the institute to award degrees. The honourable member will appreciate that once the previous technology and the pharmacy courses were taken over by the institute they ceased to be degree courses and became diploma courses. Those people who hold such awards have probably suffered a reduction in status as a consequence of that change. The problem that has arisen regarding this change has been known for a long time. The Commonwealth will not finance courses at colleges of advanced education that are degree courses unless they are accredited in some way. This means, if we wish the institute to have the right to award degrees, it will be necessary to establish an accrediting authority which will give accreditation to the awards that are made. I believe that this will ultimately become a protection for those students of the institute

who are awarded various diplomas. For instance, at present the Diploma in Social Work from the institute is not recognized by the Australian Association of Social Workers. It seems that this is a tremendous disadvantage for the students of social work, and State accreditation for that diploma course would lessen the ability of professional organizations to take restrictive action against organizations such as the institute.

Mr. Millhouse: I can't understand that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Did I hear someone say that it is not up to standard?

Mr. Millhouse: No, I didn't say that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must reply to the initial question.

Mr. Millhouse: Thank you, Sir, I hope he does.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no doubt that, without accreditation procedures, we are simply not going to get colleges of advanced education finance at the Commonwealth level in the way it has been forthcoming. The Commonwealth is insisting that there should be, in addition, a national accrediting agency with power to review the decisions of State accrediting agencies and this has been a matter of controversy between the States and the Commonwealth for many months now. Co-ordination of courses and of budgetary arrangements, which is the second general matter, takes place at present, but it is not done in a formal way: it is done effectively through the financial arrangements imposed by the Treasury, and members will have heard me quote from a letter from Dr. Evans indicating that prior to the 1970-72 triennium the budget for the institute was cut by \$450,000 by the previous Government without there being any discussion at all. So, it is not true that on financial matters any tertiary institution is completely autonomous. The overall funds available are controlled by the State and Commonwealth Governments working together through the Australian Universities Commission and the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education. What I propose, instead of the informal back-door co-ordination control exercised by the Treasury, is to see it done in a proper way by the proposed board of advanced education. The board will be carrying out a function that is already outside the control of the institute and there will be no reduction in the autonomy of the institute on that account.

The main question raised by those interested in the institute is as follows: if awards of the institute as a college of advanced education

have to be accredited in this way, why does the same procedure not apply to the universities? They are not satisfied with any answer that can be given to that question.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister says the institute will not suffer in any way regarding autonomy as a result of the proposed establishment of a board of advanced education. Will he say what will be the functions of such a board?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The functions of the board will be, first, the accreditation of awards of the colleges of advanced education in South Australia including, of course, the accreditation of awards from teachers colleges, diplomas and advanced diplomas. The other main function of the board will relate to co-ordinating developments in the advanced education area, co-ordinating submissions prior to submissions being made to the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education, and ensuring that we get the necessary co-ordination of courses wherever there can be or is likely to be any overlap. I imagine the co-ordinating function of the board will be much greater in relation to the operations of individual teachers colleges where the extent of overlap is much greater than it would be in the case of the institute. However, in so far as co-ordination is required in the interests of the State, the institute (which will have representation on the board of advanced education, I might add) will be subject to this kind of co-ordinating procedure. That kind of co-ordination procedure also goes on at present.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say whether photostat copies of the sections of the Karmel report dealing with the proposal to set up a board of advanced education are circulating within the Education Department? Since asking my earlier question about taking away a large measure of the autonomy which the Institute of Technology now has, I have seen a copy of the institute newspaper, which I had not seen then. I refer particularly to page 4 of the issue, which is dated March 5. There is a rather flattering photograph of the Minister, but that is the only thing flattering about him that appears on that page.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that was out of order, Sir. In the report on the matter the paper states:

We are to suffer at the words of this mysterious report—

that is, the Karmel report—

yet we are not allowed to see it, even though it is known there are photo copies of the relevant sections circulating about the Education Department.

In his replies to the Leader and me, the Minister said that he had seen only copies of the galley proofs, I think, and that they contained only the sections on which the Government had already made decisions. This report is directly contrary to the reply given by the Minister. This is a matter of great moment to us, as members, and to the institute. I suggest that it is desirable to know just who has had copies of this report, how many copies are circulating, and whether it would be possible (even though the report will be out within a week) to make some copies of it available.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham really ought to try to do a little better than that. When I replied to an earlier question, I said that the only thing I had in my possession was the first galley proof, and the honourable member did not listen.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, I did.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Moreover, I said earlier this afternoon that I had one photostat copy of the typescript of certain chapters before that went to the printer.

Mr. Millhouse: Why can't it be made public?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have already answered that. The reason is that it is in an uncorrected form. How can I make one copy public? The member for Mitcham is really being so pathetic. He quoted first from a story in the student newspaper at the institute that contains a pack of untruths, as the honourable member would find if he checked that information with anyone who attended the meeting. Even the people who published that matter would admit that it contained untruths. The honourable member has got to take it. He should not peddle rumours. However, it is just the kind of life he lives; he nurtures rumours as much as he can. Perhaps the honourable member would care to tell me how it was possible to issue to the public one copy of a single proof which was uncorrected and to which certain changes have had to be made. I have already said this afternoon that the Government is arranging for the printing of 7,000 copies of the report. For our sins we have decided that each member of Parliament will get a copy, including (I am sorry to say) the member for Mitcham. That report is being printed with all possible haste, and as soon as it is available it will be issued. I have already stated all this before.

## RENMARK PARKING

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last Tuesday in which I requested that he consider giving rural councils power to make by-laws in respect of parking on dual carriage-ways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Section 82 (1) (a) of the Road Traffic Act prohibits the standing of vehicles on the one-way carriage-way of a divided road unless the vehicle is as near as practicable and parallel to the left boundary of the carriageway. There is a proviso that a vehicle may be left at any angle at any place if the council has a by-law to this effect. However, section 82a (1) requires that a council obtain prior approval of the Road Traffic Board before any such by-law be enacted. It therefore follows, in reply to the honourable member's question, that councils are already empowered under the Act to pass a by-law permitting parking at an angle to the kerb or parallel to the right-hand kerb of a one-way carriageway, provided the board is in agreement. Angle parking adjacent to the left-hand kerb is dependent upon the space available and each situation is treated on its individual merit. Renmark council has not approached the board regarding a by-law on this matter. Board staff would investigate and report upon a request from the council and the recommendation to the board would depend upon traffic volumes, road widths, and environmental considerations.

## T.A.B. STAFF

Mr. WELLS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about Totalizator Agency Board staff?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not the policy of the T.A.B. to replace male shop supervisors with female supervisors, and there is no question of such a policy being implemented. All positions in South Australian T.A.B. are assessed on the qualifications needed to carry out the specific job. Because of the routine repetitive type of work associated with the running of agencies, it has been found that women are more adaptable and suited to this type of work, and they are more prepared to accept it. At present, negotiations are being carried out with the Federated Clerks Union (South Australian Branch) on the matter of an award for agency staff. The question of equal pay will no doubt be an issue raised in these discussions, and consequently the matter will be resolved under the due processes of the State Industrial Commission.

## LAND TAX

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about land tax?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The present land tax revenue from rural land is about \$1,100,000 a year. It is expected that the return to the Government under the new arrangements next year may be about \$1,000,000, or possibly a little less.

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Treasurer say in what areas have land tax assessments been reduced? The Treasurer said it was expected that returns from rural land tax would be reduced by about \$100,000. In my district, assessed land values have been increased by between 50 per cent and 150 per cent and, in some cases, by even more than that. Even after the rural land rebate has been applied, the tax to be paid will be much higher. From inquiries I have made, this position seems to apply to most areas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will see whether the Under Treasurer can give me a more comprehensive report. I have been relying on his estimate of the total return.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say when I may expect a reply to my question of February 25 about comparative land values as between hundreds?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not this week. The report I have is that the matter is still with the Under Treasurer, and it is not marked as being ready for tomorrow. I asked the Under Treasurer this morning to expedite replies to questions concerning land values, and I hope to have the reply for the honourable member next week.

## PARA HILLS WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McRAE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Para Hills water supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Laboratory tests on water samples taken in Shirley Drive, Para Hills, indicate that the reticulated water supply in this area is similar in characteristic to water currently being pumped from the Murray River at Mannum. Although this water has lower qualities, particularly with respect to colour, turbidity and tastes, the tests show that the water is still safe from the public health standpoint.

## UNION BAN

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Referring to the picture of the Minister of Roads and Transport and certain others appearing in this morning's newspaper, I should like to know

whether the Minister is making official or unofficial attempts to mediate in the dispute between the Amalgamated Engineering Union and Chrysler (Australia) Limited. In this respect, is the Minister taking over as mediator from the Minister of Labour and Industry? The Minister of Labour and Industry, when I asked him to request a union to lift a black ban on a farmer on Kangaroo Island, did nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in pursuing that line.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: So, I am naturally not surprised that the Minister of Roads and Transport is intervening here, but I should like to know whether it is an official intervention and whether the Minister has seen the company and had talks with its representatives the same as he has had with members of the union, as reported in this morning's paper.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The first premise I wish to dispel from the honourable member's mind is that it is extremely safe to go on newspaper reports. If the honourable member had read the whole report (unfortunately, he apparently read only part of it), he would have seen that the report stated that the members of the union who asked to see me yesterday afternoon did so on the basis of my being the Minister responsible for road safety. It had nothing whatsoever to do with the industrial dispute; rather, it was completely in relation to road safety. I made my position plain then, and I make it plain again now: this is an industrial matter between the trade unions affected and the company and, regrettable as it may be regarding the actions taken, it is not my function as Minister of Roads and Transport to intervene in this matter.

#### TAXI-CABS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the control of taxi-cabs in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are two types of licence, one with slightly greater privileges than the other, but this difference has been gradually reduced over the years since the establishment of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board. It is not considered that the distinction between the types of licence has any connection with the possibility of two taxis simultaneously answering the same hail. Without exception, taxis carrying either type of plate are subject to hail anywhere at any time.

#### NAILSWORTH TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. COUNBE: Can the Minister of Education give me a reply to the question I recently asked about providing an assembly hall at the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School and the possibility of establishing a co-educational system at that school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Nailsworth Boys Technical High School Council has agreed that the proposed assembly hall should be built concurrently with the new co-educational schoolbuildings and thus form an integral part of the whole complex. Plans are being made and sketches being drawn for this complex and considered by officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments, but in view of the fluctuating financial situation it is difficult at present to give a firm date for the project.

#### MAGPIES

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister for Conservation a reply to the question I recently asked about the destruction of magpies?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is lawful under the Fauna Conservation Act for any person without any permit or other authority to destroy any magpie which has attacked or is attacking any person. If the magpie referred to by the honourable member was tame, this is unfortunate, but it is considered that the sections of the Act that cover the destruction of magpies are necessary to protect people from being attacked or in those circumstances where people have been attacked. It is well known that both tame and wild magpies will attack people at certain times of the year, particularly during nesting times.

#### BUILDERS LICENSING

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, say whether, when the Builders Licensing Act operates, the licensing of electrical workers and contractors will still be in the capable hands of members of the Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Advisory Committee? People licensed by this committee must now apply to the Builders Licensing Board for approval, even though they are now licensed. Similar circumstances apply in the plumbing industry, in which licensing has been effective for years. I do not want to see jeopardized the working of the Builders Licensing Act or regulations made under it, as licensing in the two categories to which I have referred has been successful, and as there should be more control in the building industry.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Act to which the honourable member referred is the subject of a notice of motion on today's Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: The question of the member for Unley deals with legislation concerning plumbers and electricians.

Mr. Millhouse: No, he referred to the Builders Licensing Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am giving an explanation. I ask honourable members to conduct themselves as responsible representatives of the people. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no proposal to alter the situation in relation to the licensing of electrical contractors or plumbers. Because of the provisions of the other measure to which the honourable member has referred, subcontractors require licensing, and, under the practice of the board, subcontractors are often not confined to one trade. I believe this matter has been misunderstood by a section of the subcontracting industry. When the builders licensing provisions were originally brought in, the board had requested of the advisory committee that it recommended a few categories of subcontractors' licence—restricted builders' licences, as they are called under the Act. In fact, the advisory committee overwhelmingly recommended a larger number of categories. The board's view is that the categories should not be too closely defined and that anyone who gets a restricted builder's licence in any one of the categories or in more of the categories should be able to do restricted builders' work ancillary and necessary to his work within the category or categories for which he is licensed. Many of the restricted builders' licences have been issued for more than one category. Therefore, to enable someone who is doing plumbing or electrical work, but who is doing a sub-contract job which may involve him in some ancillary carpentry or plastering or restoration of plaster work as a result of installing electrical wiring, to do this other work it may be necessary for him to have a licence from the Builders Licensing Board so that he will then be able to do the necessary ancillary work to carry out what is his normal practice, and that system will continue. There will be no interference with the previously existing licensing procedure in the two cases to which the honourable member has referred.

#### NARACOORTE EDUCATION CENTRE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education say what will be the likely progress of work on an arts and craft centre at the Naracoorte Education Centre? I believe that, two or three years ago while he was in charge of technical education, Mr. Max Bone visited this school where he met the council and looked at the advisability of establishing an arts and craft centre. With the increased enrolment, there is presently much congestion at this adult education centre.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

#### ADVERTISEMENT

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider appealing to the Maughan Thiem Motor Company to cease a form of radio advertising for Ford cars that describes the product as "the beast", obtainable from "Muscle City", and concludes with an engine revving, simulating the roar of a wild animal? This kind of advertising creates an atmosphere of irresponsibility and aggressiveness that directly contradicts the emphasis which the Road Safety Council places on the need for care and courtesy by drivers in an effort to minimize the road toll. Also, such advertising gives a lead in behaviour to all agencies related to road transport in all its forms.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am disturbed to hear the report of the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: You should have heard the advertisement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not heard it. I am afraid that, because of my Parliamentary work, I do not often listen to the radio or watch television. I will certainly institute an inquiry and see what steps can be taken in the interests of road safety, to have this advertisement removed, if necessary.

#### LION PARK

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works negotiate with promoters of a proposed lion park, in which lions will run about, in the Kangarilla area to try to make sure that it is not established in the proposed catchment area of the reservoir planned for Baker Gully? The problem is that, at some time in the future, people in other catchment areas will ask why this park was allowed and point to the public toilet facilities, with their septic tanks, and to the human activity encouraged in the area, the kind of activity that we are trying to stop

in other areas. Will the Minister investigate this matter, together with officers of his department and the Minister for Conservation, before the park is proceeded with?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Negotiations are probably proceeding at this very moment between officers of my department and the promoter. The department does not wish to have this sort of development take place in the catchment areas. I will find out what is the outcome of the negotiations.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will you ensure that the cages are fireproof?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that we are talking about the location rather than about the sort of structure to be used.

#### SAFETY RUN-OFFS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about safety ramps from Cross Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although further investigation of the need for, and the type and location of, safety ramps in the vicinity of Glen Osmond is being undertaken by the Highways Department, it is considered more expedient to attack the cause of the runaway vehicles rather than to deal with their effect by the provision of additional ramps. Both runaway vehicles so far involved were overloaded with respect to the manufacturer's rating and consideration is therefore being given to legislation in this regard as well as to upgrading braking provisions, drivers' licensing classifications as well as hours of driving limitations. The Waite institute property as a site for the construction of a ramp is not considered suitable from a traffic viewpoint, and no doubt the university authorities would have some resistance to such a proposal.

#### SUBSIDY SCHEME

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works recommend to the Government that the subsidies scheme, announced by way of a press release on March 5, 1971, be extended further than to towns along the Murray River and areas in the metropolitan watershed? The Clare District Council is at present trying to get a sewerage system operating, although it is experiencing difficulties. As a definite health hazard at present exists in the Clare area, will the Minister try to influence his Government to consider helping not only towns along the

Murray River but also towns in other parts of the State to enable them to construct sewerage systems?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report I received from the Drainage Co-ordination Committee, which covered the whole State, placed priorities on groups of towns in which sewerage facilities should be provided. The difficulties being experienced in Clare have been outlined in the report. However, it is not possible at present for the Government, because of the financial limitations placed upon it, to extend the scheme all over the State. In other words, the Government is attacking the critical areas first in order to stop pollution that is now occurring. This will extend us as far as we can allow ourselves to be extended from a financial point of view. The Government will do as much as it can within its financial limitations. When making the announcement I said the Government intended later to extend the scheme to other parts of the State, and this will be done, although I cannot now say exactly when.

#### WILLIAMSTOWN SEWERAGE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on March 9 regarding the provision of sewerage facilities at Williamstown and, more particularly, regarding the provision of extra ablution facilities at the Wongalere girl guide camp?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Girl Guides Association wrote to the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding this matter on February 23, 1971, not December as mentioned by the honourable member. About 130 acres of waterworks reserve between the South Para reservoir and the Barossa reservoir has been on lease to the association since 1963, and a recent extension of the lease has been made to 1979. The request now received is for permission to erect permanent brick construction accommodation for 50 to 60 persons, a recreation hall, or community room, dining room and ablution block.

The association seeks an assurance from the department that the present lease expiring in 1979 would be extended to some indefinite date, the time being such to warrant the expenditure required to erect such a building complex. The department is not unsympathetic and has not rejected it out of hand, but is seeking further information from the Girl Guides Association regarding the proposed duration of lease that they would require before their building plan could be warranted.



### NURIOOTPA VINE COMMITTEE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on March 4 regarding the purchase of land to enable the Nuriootpa Vine Improvement Research Committee to extend its activities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the area of land available across the road from the Nuriootpa viticultural station is not all suitable for research purposes, and other land is preferred. Investigations into the prospects of obtaining additional property for research work on vine improvement at Nuriootpa are proceeding.

### WEEDS ACT

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider amending the Weeds Act so that district councils, when prosecuting an offender under that Act, can retain the fine imposed? Under the Local Government Act any fine imposed for offences involving dogs, or for flagrant breaches of by-laws, is repaid to councils to help defray the costs they incur. However, under the Weeds Act the Auditor-General has made councils repay fines collected for offences against that Act, although the district councils must bear any costs involved in prosecuting an offender.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member.

### HOPE VALLEY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department intends to close the Hope Valley Primary School upon completion and occupation of the new Highbury Primary School? The Education Department plans to replace the Hope Valley Primary School but it has been stated that, before the school can be closed, schools will be required at Highbury and Vista to serve the whole area. The Highbury school is being constructed, and is expected to be completed by the end of October, 1971. A site is being held for the provision in the future of a primary school at Vista.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to look into the matter raised by the honourable member and to bring down a report.

### RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier ask the State Bank and other banks to defer taking action against farmers who are in financial difficulties, until the new Rural Reconstruc-

tion Act comes into operation? One of my constituents has been told that a bill of sale has been taken over his property because he owes the State Bank \$1,600 in back payments on his loan. This man thought he would be eligible to obtain assistance under the rural reconstruction plan and he now wonders whether the Government would ask banking organizations to defer any action that may be pending in these circumstances.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say that no action will be taken in any circumstances, as each case will have to be examined on its merits. The Government has pointed out that many people in the rural sphere who are in difficulties will not be eligible for assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme. If there is no possibility of their becoming viable economically, they will not qualify for assistance, and we are faced with the fact that many people at present working on the basis of loans at an interest rate of 3½ per cent are unable to make a go of it. How, then, will they be able to make a go of it under rural reconstruction, for which the interest rate is 4 per cent? Let us be clear that a stringent means test will be applied to ensure that those who get assistance under rural reconstruction are economically viable.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: These are the Commonwealth Government's conditions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The conditions are quite stringent. We have done our best to obtain assistance in the matter and I hope that it is not being suggested to persons in rural areas that under this scheme blanket assistance will be given to persons in difficulties, because to suggest that would do these people a grave disservice. I cannot promise that any action will be taken until the new scheme comes in but, if the honourable member gives me details of the case he has mentioned, I will take up the matter with the Chairman of the State Bank Board to find out whether assistance can be given in this case.

### MOUNT GAMBIER HOUSING

Mr. BURDON: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, find out the position regarding the provision by the Housing Trust of additional low-rental housing in the Mount Gambier area? On August 25 last the Premier told the House that the trust was then examining the extension of its building programme in Mount Gambier. It is expected that the houses now under construction will be completed by about July this year and, because

of the many inquiries for housing that I am receiving at present, I ask the Premier whether a further tender has been let for further house building or when it is expected that a tender will be let.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from the trust for the honourable member.

#### TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether there is a disagreement on major policy items between him and the State Planning Authority? This morning's newspaper contains a statement, attributed to the State Planning Authority, that the authority has endorsed the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study proposals on the Noarlunga Freeway, with the exception of minor amendments regarding the section between O'Halloran Hill and Noarlunga. I remind the Minister that on October 9, 1968, he stated:

I have told the Premier that there are alternatives to this proposed scheme. I could draw a line for the Noarlunga freeway from the North Adelaide connector to Darlington, the route of which would require demolishing about 20 houses: it is as simple as that.

He went on to say:

This is the arrogant attitude displayed by the Government in relation to this report . . . However, I speak for the people whose houses are being deliberately taken away from them by this Government.

As the State Planning Authority has now confirmed that route, I ask the Minister whether there is disagreement between him and the authority on this major policy item.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The short answer is "No." There is no disagreement of which I am aware between the Government and the authority. The premise upon which the Leader asks the question is based entirely on a newspaper report, for which I have no authority and for which I accept no responsibility. However, the Government's policy was stated quite clearly when I presented the Breuning report to this House, and that policy was accepted by this House.

#### VICTOR HARBOR SEWERAGE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of March 10 about when the Victor Harbor sewerage scheme will be undertaken and whether the effluent from the scheme will be available for use by the Victor Harbor Golf Club?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Preliminary work on the scheme will commence in July,

1971, with actual construction to begin towards the end of 1971. With regard to the use of effluent from the scheme, experience has indicated that, in the early years of operation of treatment works incorporating lagoons, effluent salinities can be relatively high. Possible effluent utilization schemes can be considered only in the light of operational experience when indications of effluent quality are available.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry use his good offices with the unions and with management to promote peace in the motor car industry at Elizabeth? As all members of this House and the public of South Australia know, there has been much industrial unrest at Elizabeth, particularly in the plant of General Motors-Holden's, and this is, unfortunately, casting a doubt about the future of the whole of Elizabeth. I think I need not develop that matter, as there have been reports in the newspaper on it, and we know that that is the position. The Minister is, of course, a trade union man and said as much when he was successful in the ballot for the selection of the tenth Minister in this House. I know that he may say that these matters come particularly within the Commonwealth sphere but, as Minister of Labour and Industry, he cannot but be concerned with the situation that is developing for the whole of Elizabeth through the trouble that is occurring. I am prompted to ask this question by the photograph in this morning's *Advertiser* of the Minister of Roads and Transport meeting a delegation from the union concerned in the dispute at the Chrysler (Australia) Limited plant at Lonsdale. In spite of that Minister's reply that it was a matter of road safety on which they came to him, I am prompted to ask the question of the Minister of Labour and Industry because of the tremendous amount at stake for Elizabeth as well as for the whole of this State, because of the position that he holds, and because of his connections, of which he has boasted, with the trade union movement.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As Minister of Labour and Industry, my policy is to keep my door open at all times to either party if people wish to see me.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you take the initiative?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes, I think we have taken the initiative by keeping in close touch with the industry and the trade union movement. As I have said, my door is open to either party.

## UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT

Mr. COUMBE: What progress has been made with, and when does the Minister of Education intend to introduce, legislation for the proposed University of Adelaide Act?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A draft is now being considered, and it should be completed within a day or two.

## LAND AGENTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier ask the Attorney-General whether he intends to introduce legislation to stop land agents from operating branch offices without having a separate manager at each branch office? During the last Government's term of office, a Bill was introduced in the House to close this loophole, but there was insufficient time for it to pass through both Houses. The Real Estate Institute is concerned that land agents can open a branch office without having a manager in charge of that office. A land agent can have 10 branch offices, with one central office handling all the trust accounts, and it can use the name of one manager as the manager of all the offices. Several people in my district have complained about the present position. I think the Premier and the Government will realize that it is unsatisfactory that licensed salesmen should operate a branch office.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague for a report.

## SUNDAY AUSTRALIAN

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier determine whether it is correct that the *Sunday Australian* is delivered to the West Beach Airport at about 7 a.m. on a Sunday morning but cannot be picked up until mid-day, so that it cannot be delivered to newsagents until the afternoon, and, if this is correct, can he say who is responsible for such a policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, arrangements which were originally entered into between the proprietors of the *Sunday Mail* and of the *Advertiser* when the *Advertiser* bought into the *Sunday Mail* restricted the original owners of the *Mail* (News Limited) from introducing a paper in competition with the *Sunday Mail*, or for a period, indeed, in competition with the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Is this free enterprise?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I know the agreement involved some of these aspects,

but the precise nature of the remaining effective clauses of the agreement I do not know. However, I will inquire.

## PRIMARY PRODUCERS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to ascertain whether it is possible to use the resources of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act to help farmers currently in financial difficulty over the purchase of superphosphate? This may already have happened, but several stock agency managers have told me that the policy of their companies is not to provide superphosphate for the growing of cereals except where the person has sufficient liquidity in his account to enable him to come under the normal lending operations. The same thing applies in relation to banks. In such cases a farmer has no alternative but to sow his crop without using superphosphate, which I understand is being done, at substantial risk, only because no finance is available. I wonder whether, in cases where a reasonably acceptable application is made to the department for assistance, money could be made available under this Act.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up this matter with my colleagues to see whether this can be done. As I understand the Act, advances or loans can be made only where financial difficulties have been caused through a natural calamity, such as fire or flood. Under the terms of the Act it may not be possible to do what the honourable member asks, but I will confer with my colleague and bring down a report.

## SOUTH RAILWAY LINE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the south railway line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: With regard to the potential track capacity on the south line, the average number of trains working between Tailem Bend and Wolseley is 19 a day, and 13 of these are required to pass through the Coonalpyn to Tintinara and Tintinara to Keith sections in a space of 10 hours. With the present spacing of passing sidings and safe-working installations, saturation point has been reached on these two sections during that 10-hour period. Work currently in hand on the centralized traffic control project includes the introduction of two additional crossing stations, one between Coonalpyn and Tintinara and one between Tintinara and Keith. The Overland has always been classified as the

premier train and therefore must take priority over the other services. I believe this is a wise allocation of priorities.

#### MILTABURRA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about the Miltaburra Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A site of 18 acres, bordered by the Eyre Highway on the east and a road to Carawa on the south, is being obtained for the proposed new school. It is served by water and Postmaster-General's Department lines. There is a proposal to establish an Electricity Trust substation at Wirrulla within the next five years, and the proposed site would be on the route to Ceduna. The local council supports the proposed site. At the moment it is not possible to say when the new school will be established, and it will be possible to make a decision on that only when the financial situation is clearer than it is at present.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. CARNIE: In the absence of the Attorney-General, I direct my question to the Premier as a former Attorney-General. Will the Premier ask his colleague to have applications relating to prospective justices of the peace considered more frequently than has been the practice in the past? I understand that the last appointments of justices of the peace were in December, and I am told that it may be May or June before the next appointments are made. On December 3 last, I forwarded a nomination for commission of the peace to the Attorney-General in respect of an appointment for an area that had had no justice of the peace for some time. As nothing further had been heard, I contacted the Attorney-General's Department and was told what I have just stated. Today, I forwarded an application in respect of another area that has no justice of the peace. As these delays can often cause inconvenience, I ask the Premier whether he will have this matter considered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I seem to recall that only recently the Attorney-General told the member for Mitcham that an examination was being made of the procedure concerning the appointment of justices of the peace, I think I had better get a report from my colleague rather than that I should give the honourable member information on the procedure I established when I was Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: You established?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is apparently not aware that I established a quota system when I was Attorney-General.

#### FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. McANANEY: About four months ago a contract involving \$29,100 was let by the Government to obtain a report from the P.E. Consulting Group of Australia Proprietary Limited, of Melbourne, on a possible film industry in South Australia. Has the Premier obtained that report and, if he has, will he say whether it is satisfactory?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report is not yet to hand. I expect to receive a report before the middle of April, but at that stage it will be only an interim report. The final report will not be available at that stage, but it ought to be possible for us by then to examine the information and to make certain relevant decisions, since we are at present considering several projects that will turn on the result of the report.

#### ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to see whether the Adelaide abattoir sale yards can be cleaned out for next week's sales? This morning, I visited the Adelaide abattoir and was confronted by producers who, having brought stock to the yards, pointed out to me the condition of the yards. Manure was covering the yards and, while the weather conditions are dry, that is all right; but after a shower of rain the yards would be in a shocking state. The Minister is aware of the rigid hygiene requirements existing at the Adelaide abattoir, and he will also be aware that producers are asked to do everything possible to keep stock in good condition as regards crutching, etc. Although the abattoir is run by a board, I ask the Minister of Agriculture, who has some jurisdiction in this matter, to see what can be done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up this matter with my colleague, and I may even ask him to attend to it personally.

#### TRADING HOURS

Mr. HALL: As the Premier is out of the Chamber, I address my question to the Minister representing the Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: They won't know who that is.

Mr. HALL: I know there are five aspirants opposite. Will the Minister representing the Attorney-General say whether it is a fact that prosecutions against those people who were compelled by law to vote in the shopping hours referendum but who did not vote have been stopped as a result of a direction by the Attorney-General?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of my colleague on his return to Adelaide from the conference he is attending in Hobart, and obtain the information for the Leader.

#### SALISBURY TEACHERS COLLEGE

Dr. TONKIN: I understand the Minister of Education has a reply, which he is absolutely bursting to give me, to my question about the Salisbury Teachers College.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Salisbury Teachers College buildings comprise four blocks, namely:

Block 1: Administration, library, staff facilities, lecture rooms.

Block 2: Student facilities, lecture rooms.

Block 3: Lecture rooms, lecturers' offices.

Block 4: Gymnasium, change rooms, swimming pool, assembly hall.

Blocks 1, 2 and 3 have been completed and are in use. My present information is that it is expected that block 4 will be completed by about the middle of April.

#### PROSPECT DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about negotiations affecting the redevelopment of the Prospect Demonstration School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the honourable member asked a question on this matter on November 9, I informed him that there had been discussions concerning it between officers of the Education Department and the Prospect council. Following these discussions, a plan was submitted by the council and forwarded to the Public Buildings Department for evaluation. Because of pressure of work and shortage of staff, it has not been possible for any work to be done on the project by the department yet, but it is intended that an officer will visit Prospect early next week to consider the plan submitted by the council.

#### BUS STOPS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the use of yellow lights at bus stops?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have considered the honourable member's suggestion

and have concluded that the installation of distinctive coloured lights at bus stops might provide added convenience for the few passengers that travel at night, but the cost would be high: an estimated \$36,000 for all Tramways Trust stops. In view of this, and as no special difficulties appear to be caused by non-definition of bus stops at night, I do not consider that the installation of the lights is warranted at this stage.

#### BUS EXHAUST

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Tramways Trust to have an inspection made of the exhaust systems on its buses? Recently I have received from elderly citizens several complaints about excessive noise made by Tramways Trust buses, particularly during the evening. People have also expressed concern about the possible pollutional effects of the black exhaust fumes emitted by the buses; I understand this is due to the inefficient operation of the fuel injectors. Will the Minister find out whether regular inspections of the exhaust systems can overcome these difficulties?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to the trust and obtain a reply.

#### RAILWAY FINANCES

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain from the Railways Commissioner a report on the decrease in revenue earned by the Railways Department in the last few months? In about November last year the Minister claimed that there had been an increase in railway revenue of about \$1,000,000 in the first four months of the financial year. I notice the increase has now dropped to only \$200,000. In the meantime, expenses of the department have increased by \$2,800,000, or 12½ per cent. Will the Minister also obtain an explanation about this increased expenditure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that the honourable member will not be too disappointed when I tell him that, although it is true that there was a decline for a time, the last report, which I received a few days ago, shows that the revenue of the department is once again increasing. Taking all the facts into account I think it may be desirable if I obtain a detailed report on the position for the honourable member. Briefly, I believe that the major reason for the decline in revenue, compared to that in the earlier period to which the honourable member has referred, is that farmers are not using the railways to transport their goods.

## MEMBERS' INTERJECTIONS

Mr. EVANS: Can you, Mr. Speaker, say why interjections and replies to interjections are recorded in *Hansard* when, according to Standing Orders, those interjections and replies are out of order? I realize that this practice has applied for a long while. However, I believe that part of the problem we have in this Chamber at times in hearing speakers, and perhaps part of the problem you have in keeping order, Sir, is caused by interjections and, by having them recorded, we encourage them. This practice also places a greater burden on members of the *Hansard* staff. As interjections are out of order, I can see no reason why they should be recorded.

The SPEAKER: I will examine the question and give the honourable member a considered reply.

## EMERGENCY FIRE SERVICES

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to my recent question about the Emergency Fire Services?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following the deputation from representatives of interested bodies that waited on the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Agriculture regarding this matter, preliminary investigations have been made. Recently, the Minister of Agriculture took the opportunity during a visit to Victoria to discuss the organization and functioning of the Victorian Country Fire Authority with the Chairman and senior officers of that body. The Minister has studied a fairly comprehensive report on the present organization of emergency fire services in South Australia, and he expects that within the next two or three weeks he will be able to present a submission to Cabinet on this important matter. The Minister wishes to make it clear, however, that whatever type of re-organization might ultimately be decided on he considers that every care should be taken to preserve the essential character of the present Emergency Fire Services organization, which has served and still serves this State magnificently in the control and prevention of fires in country areas.

## ODNADATTA COURT

Mr. ALLEN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Chief Secretary how many convictions have been recorded at the Oodnadatta police court for each year from 1964 until now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary and ask him for the information.

## GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question regarding preparations in the northern part of the State to offset an infestation of grasshoppers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that council reports and maps of grasshopper and locust infestation are not yet all to hand. With the late spring and scattered grasshopper activity, many land-owners have found it difficult to determine the location and areas affected on their properties, and have been unable to supply detailed and meaningful information. When more information is received, this will be summarized and will form the basis on which a plan of action will be based. Even at this stage it is clear that any control operation can be aimed only at destruction of the densest populations to give greatest return for expenditure. The area reported from Hawker District Council alone, which is not the worst area, comprises about 65,000 acres. A check on plague locust hatching following recent rains will be made early in April.

## CHAIN LETTER

Mr. CLARK: Will the Premier ask the Attorney-General to have investigated what appears to be a chain letter purporting to be a money-making proposition? I have a photostat copy of this chain letter, which was given to me by one of my constituents. It is headed "Poseidon Roulette", and under the heading appears "D. Habr, 9 Welkin Street, Windsor Gardens." So that the House will know what I am speaking about, I will read the following part of this letter:

Warranty: The resale of all four letters in all chain links will guarantee the full amount of \$12,288. You'll certainly ask what you have to do to win \$12,000, too. Our answer is—not much! Your deposit is only \$9. The letter you are reading at this moment costs \$3. Enter your name and address legibly at the bottom of the enclosed name list. Then send \$3 postal orders, one filled out to the first person (No. 1) on your name list, and one filled out to Poseidon Roulette, both, and also the original name list to Poseidon Roulette.

Please don't use money orders. (The one filled out to first person on list will be passed on to this person by Poseidon Roulette.) After a short time you'll receive from us an envelope with four new letters, on which your name will already be in sixth position. Please sell these letters at \$3 a piece to four new members. By this, your deposit will be reimbursed; moreover, you'll win \$3. From the moment you have sold these letters to other members the game will take its course and within approximately six to eight weeks you'll win \$12,000.

It all sounds remarkably simple, but I suggest that it could be illegal. If I give the Premier this letter, will he ask the Attorney-General to have it investigated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

#### ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Education say whether, in the decision to create the board of advanced education, with an overriding co-ordinating responsibility, it is expected that the Ministerial control of the Agricultural College Department at Roseworthy will be transferred? Last week, in a question regarding the Sweeney report, the Minister said that in practically every case in the institutions under his authority action had taken place or was taking place to implement the recommendations contained in that report. However, he said that the Government's decision regarding areas under his jurisdiction was not necessarily a direction to other Ministers to take similar or parallel action in other jurisdictions. As there appears to have been no activity in the Agricultural College Department, I seek this information about the possibility of a different or changed Ministerial control.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The whole question of the Roseworthy Agricultural College is obviously under review because of this proposal and also because of the report on agricultural education, which has been completed and published. This matter requires serious attention.

Dr. Eastick: That report has been published?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry, it has not been published, but it is to be published.

Dr. Eastick: But is it available?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is in the process of being made available. This, together with the recommendations contained in the Karmel report, will mean that the whole position regarding control of the Roseworthy Agricultural College will have to be completely reviewed. The honourable member will be aware that there is an advisory council for the college, and I imagine that, when it was set up, it was planned that it would play a larger and larger role in its administration of the college. When the Government has made a decision and the appropriate conferences between the people involved have taken place, I will inform the honourable member.

#### BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works give a clear assurance to this House that no large-scale irrigation enterprises will be established to use effluent from the Bolivar treatment works before the needs of local vegetable and horticultural users of that water in Virginia and associated districts have been fully investigated and met? Recently, it has been reported that a multi-million dollar irrigation industry, separate from any existing irrigation industries, may be set up on the basis of effluent being supplied to it from Bolivar. The Minister will be aware that a severe economic problem is facing the district because of the diminution of underground water supplies. Rationing has been implemented this year, and it could be even more severe in future years. The needs of almost 2,000 people who are earning their livelihood in that area should be considered before any large-scale outside operator enters the field. On the basis of the needs of those already there, I put the question to the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is probably aware that an investigation is proceeding as to the suitability of the effluent for irrigation in the area that he has referred to. In addition, the Agriculture Department has been asked to examine the likely effects of irrigation in the area and what drainage work may be needed if irrigation takes place. The Leader referred to a report, which I think was published in the newspaper last week and in which publicity was given to the fact that effluent was being used at Angle Vale. It was stated at the same time that the needs of the market gardeners in the area (and this was involved in a scheme that the Munno Para council submitted at a deputation to me and the Engineer-in-Chief about six or eight months ago) were not being disregarded. Therefore, if the Leader wants my assurance that we will not disregard their needs, he has that assurance. Indeed, the investigation would not be proceeding and we would not be making these examinations if we did not intend to take action.

#### BEACH EROSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question, which is to the Minister for Conservation—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Hooray, you've picked a different one!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the honourable member for Mitcham desires to ask a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The interjection did not even make sense.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You looked directly at me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should think so, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister for Conservation say when the report of the Beach Erosion Assessment Study is likely to be available? In company with you, Sir (or, at least, I saw you at the beginning), I took part in the beachathon for the Crippled Children's Association last Sunday morning, and that involved my running along the beach from the Crippled Children's Association's premises to Grange and back. I also did this last year and, therefore, I was able to compare the change in the state of the beaches over that period.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you going to do it next year?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister sponsors me. I was able to compare the state of the beach between Somerton and Grange now with the state it was in 12 months ago, and I may say that I was absolutely shocked at the present state of the beach. In my opinion it has deteriorated, and the worst part is at Glenelg—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Over what period of time do you think it has deteriorated?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not suggesting that any specific Government is responsible for this. Over 10 years ago I raised the matter in the House, and I think that was before most other people were aware of the problem. What made it worse on Sunday morning, as you will remember vividly, Mr. Speaker, was that it had been raining and the stormwater from the drains was discharging across the beach and into the sea. This, of itself, is carrying away much sand. In some places the gutters made by the stormwater discharging to the beach and across it were about 18in. deep, thus exposing rocks, stones, and so on. I could not even find the outlet to the Torrens River as I went along the beach: it just seemed not to be there. These gutters discharging (I suppose from the discharge of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, particularly at Glenelg) are, in my view, an utter disgrace and, unless something is done quickly about this stretch of beach and if the deterioration continues at this rate, it will not be a question of saving the beach, because it will be too late and there will be no beach left. It is bad enough to get along. I ask the Minister the question, hoping that

receipt of the report will be the prelude to speedy and effective action.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member may not have been here last week when I released Mr. Culver's report to the Opposition and placed a copy in the Parliamentary Library. Since then, the report has been referred to the committee to examine it and make recommendations to the Government. The committee has met and, as soon as its recommendations to the Government are available, Cabinet will consider them.

#### NORTH ADELAIDE POLICE STATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the rehabilitation work necessary at the North Adelaide police station, which is one of the oldest police stations in this State? On September 17 last I asked the Attorney-General to get me a reply to a question on this matter and he said that plans were being prepared. That was exactly six months ago to the day, and I think that St. Patrick's Day is an appropriate day for me to ask this question of the Minister of Works. Will he now get me a report on the latest developments on this extremely essential work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do that and to see whether I can get the backing of St. Patrick to get the right reply.

#### CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education say when the new Clare High School is expected to be officially opened and ready for occupation? I understand that the school was expected to be finished and ready for occupation at the beginning of this year but in this case, as with all new projects, much tidying up must be done, but the children have packed up and are ready to move to the new school. Therefore, I desire to know when the school is expected to be ready for occupation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is expected that the school will be ready for occupation in May. I do not know when an official opening ceremony will be held and I do not intend to give any direction about it because I think this is up to the head of the school and the parents' organization to determine what they want. If the honourable member is uncertain whether he will get an invitation, he can rest assured we will look after him in that respect.



## LETTERS TO UNIONISTS

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier assure the House that the letters he is to send out to trade unionists, private citizens outside normal contact with his department, will not be sent out at Government expense and that no preparation, handling or any effort will be put into that work by Government employees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is not involved in the preparation of the material: the work was done by arrangement between me and the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, and no Government expense is involved. Since I have sent out material before which has been similarly prepared and which has been subjected to campaigns, quite ill-founded, stating that public moneys were being used, I carefully said in the letter that the letter was being prepared and circulated at private expense; but that was apparently not sufficient for the Leader.

## SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education make inquiries regarding the delivery of books to children at the Daws Road High School? A constituent of mine, who has children at the high school, has told me that many of the books paid for earlier this year have not yet been delivered. The value of these books in this case he estimates at about \$25. This is an unsatisfactory situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have already replied to the member for Fisher on the supply of books to the Daws Road High School, and I suggest that he contact the honourable member as to the nature of the reply I gave him. That reply did mention a number of specific instances and what was happening regarding them. If, after consultation with the honourable member, and studying the list of books that has been provided by his constituent, more information is needed, if he drops me a note about it I will look into the matter for him.

## COOMANDOOK SIGN

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked about the condition of a "curve" sign on the curve on the road north of Coomandook?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is assumed that the curve about four miles north of Coomandook to which the honourable member refers in his question is the curve at the Sherlock turn-off. Direction signs indicating Coomandook and Sherlock have been erected

at this location, and tests have shown that the curve in the main road can be negotiated with no discomfort at speeds up to 60 miles an hour. Accordingly, there is no warrant for the erection of "curve" warning signs, with or without speed advisory signs. This is also confirmed by the lack of an accident record at the location. However, as the junction of the Sherlock road could present its own hazards, arrangements are being made for the erection of junction warning signs at the location.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to reconsider the provision of a junction sign at the place referred to because, unless the junction sign contains a "curve" sign, it will be inadequate. For honourable members' benefit—

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

## DEATH OF MR. J. S. WALKER

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): May I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the passing yesterday of the ex-Director-General of Education (Mr. John Walker). I place on record, on behalf of members of this House and on behalf of officers of the Education Department, our feeling of loss at the passing of Mr. Walker, who, as Director-General, displayed great drive, energy and ability and filled the post with great distinction. I think it would be fair to say that the introduction of open-space units in South Australia in the Primary Division of the Education Department and the current development that is going on at the secondary level was on the initiative of Mr. Walker. Many innovations took place during his term of office and I would like, on behalf of members of Parliament and of officers of the department, to extend personally our sympathy to his family.

## LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TAX)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

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

It is designed to raise the duty upon the betting turnover of bookmakers upon courses within the metropolitan area from a present rate of

1.8 per cent to a new rate of 2 per cent operative from April 1, 1971, and to divert the extra revenues so derived for the benefit of general revenues of the Crown. For country courses the existing rate of 1.8 per cent of turnover will be retained.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation, and it must cease. The Premier is giving a second reading explanation and honourable members must not converse loudly. I ask them to take their seats.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For these purposes courses more than 20 miles from the General Post Office are treated in the Bill as country courses. Honourable members will be aware that, unlike most other taxes levied by the State Governments, the levies upon betting are shared between the Crown and the racing clubs. Moreover, the share of the levies going to the clubs is greater in this State than in most other States, and considerably greater than in New South Wales and Victoria with which States South Australia is compared by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in assessing appropriate financial assistance for this State. The reasons why this State retains a smaller share are probably partly historical and partly the rather less buoyant condition of the racing industry. The Government needs further revenues to meet its obligations for social services and in particular education, health, and hospitals. The Government would not propose to reduce the amount of the duty presently passing to the clubs but it is proposing that this small increase in levy be devoted wholly for Government purposes. The increased levy is expected to amount to about \$90,000 in a full year.

A rate of 2 per cent on bookmakers' turnover is equal to that imposed in both New South Wales and Victoria upon metropolitan and other major racecourses. It is rather less than in Western Australia and Tasmania and rather more than in Queensland and on some country courses in the Eastern States. However the Government retains between 1 per cent and 1½ per cent of turnover in New South Wales, between 1½ per cent and 1¾ per cent in Victoria, 1.2 per cent in Queensland and between 1 per cent and 1½ per cent in Western Australia and those States average much nearer the upper than the lower limit quoted in each case. The South Australian Government presently retains an average of about 0.85 per cent. These new proposals will bring an average of about 1 per cent of overall turnover made up of 0.75 per cent on local races and 1¾ per cent on interstate

races on metropolitan courses and 0.55 per cent and 1.55 per cent respectively on country courses. The levy for Government purposes will remain lower in this State than in any other mainland State. Moreover, I would warn that present comparisons may not continue wholly valid, for it must be apparent to all that the other States must shortly be reviewing a number of their levies in line with their revenue necessities.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 40 of the principal Act which deals with the commission payable by bookmakers to the Betting Control Board, by adding a provision in relation to bets made at race or coursing meetings, that the commission on such bets made at meetings held on metropolitan courses on or after April 1, 1971, shall be 2 per cent. The clause also defines the "metropolitan area" as that part of the State which lies within a radius of 20 miles from the General Post Office. Clause 3 amends section 41 of the principal Act which deals with the application of the commission raised under section 40. The existing provisions are altered so that the proportions of commission passing to the racing clubs (that is, twenty-five/thirty-sixths of bets made on races held within South Australia and on all coursing events, and five/thirty-sixths of bets made on interstate races) are retained until April 1, and then after that day, the proportions are reduced for the metropolitan courses to five-eighths and one-eighth respectively. Thus the extra commission paid to the board under the amended section 40 will be paid into general revenue as part of the balance commission paid to the Treasurer under a further provision contained in section 41. The racing clubs therefore will continue to receive the same amount by way of commission, in that after that date, they will in effect receive a lesser proportion of a greater sum.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Builders Licensing Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

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

It implements the amendments to the Builder's Licensing Act that have been previously foreshadowed by the Government. The Bill, in

association with amended regulations is designed to remove any possible remaining ground of legitimate objection to the licensing legislation. The amendments are not opposed by the various building organizations, although some associations would like to go further. Certain amendments are designed merely to tidy up the present legislation. Clause 4 (a) extends, from one month to two months, the period in which applications for renewals of licences can be lodged and will facilitate the processing of applications. A new subsection (3a) is inserted by clause 4 (b) of the amending Bill. The new subsection will allow the board more time to complete any investigations or make a decision in regard to renewal applications that may be regarded as doubtful.

Under the existing Act, if the board does not make a decision before a current licence expires, the applicant becomes unlicensed until such time as his renewal application is decided. This penalizes him in that he cannot recover in court moneys due for building work carried out without a necessary licence. It is possible that serious complaints against licensees could be under investigation at the time of renewal and subsection (3a) therefore removes pressure on the board to make a hasty decision on a renewal application before a current licence expires. The new subsection (4a) in section 15 of the principal Act removes a serious disability; section 15 (4) of the principal Act allows a period of 21 days during which it will be permissible for a licensed body corporate or partnership not to have one of its directors or partners suitably licensed. In the event of the death or resignation of the suitably licensed director or partner, the remaining directors or partners would have to move swiftly to obtain a suitable licence for one of their number.

Although an extension of the period of 21 days may be sought, it is possible that in some cases none of the remaining directors or partners will be qualified to obtain a licence. The sole remaining directors or partners may, for example, be the widows of the firm's founders and, although a competent works supervisor may be employed, it may be inconvenient to make him a director or partner immediately. Subsection (4a) provides the board with an alternative in such cases, namely, to approve of the business being continued under the supervision of the holder of an appropriate licence until such time as permanent arrangements are made. Clause 6 (a) corrects a drafting error in section 16 of the principal Act. Paragraph (b) provides,

in regard to restricted builder's licences, the same alternative as was provided in regard to general builder's licences, namely, arrangements whereby a business may be carried on, in the event of the death or resignation of the licensed director or partner, under the supervision of a licensed employee. The new subsection (6) implements the provisions of the new section 16A in regard to restricted builder's licences.

I now come to the most important amendment to the Builders Licensing Act. There have been three main objections to the legislation of which two relate to the regulations, namely, the question on the application form relating to place of birth and the regulation requiring applicants to supply any information requested by the board. These will be remedied by regulation. The third objection is in regard to the requirement for the provision of personal information by directors of limited companies. This will be overcome by the option provided by the new section 16A. Under the present Act, one of the directors of a body corporate must be the holder of a suitable builder's licence. This means that a proprietary company engaged in general building work must hold a general builder's licence and at least one of the directors must hold a general builder's licence also. It is no use licensing a well-financed company to carry out building work unless it is under the personal direction of a technically qualified person: a company is only as good as its management.

A body corporate engaged in painting work and not holding a general builder's licence must hold a restricted builder's licence for the classified trade of painting and decorating and one director must hold either a general builder's licence or a restricted builder's licence for the trade of painting and decorating. The difficulty the board experienced in dealing with applications by directors for these associated general and restricted licences was that, although the person concerned might not intend using his personal licence independently of the body corporate, there was no way of imposing such a requirement. In such cases, therefore, a technically competent but financially unsound director of a stable company could use his personal licence to undertake building work independently of the company or, alternatively, he could sever his connection with the company on obtaining his licence and venture into business on his own. In consequence the board had to treat applications by directors in exactly the same manner as applications from sole traders and this of

necessity involved the provision of financial information. Some opposition was made by directors who genuinely did not intend to use their licence as a director independently from the body corporate. They claimed with some justification that their personal assets would not be available to their company's creditors in the event of insolvency and that their personal details should therefore not be required.

The new section 16A overcomes this difficulty by enabling the board to endorse a general or restricted builder's licence with the word "(manager)". A licence thus endorsed will signify that the holder is technically qualified to control the building operations of the licensed body corporate. He will not be able to use the licence independently as a sole trader or partner. In return, he will not be required to furnish financial information to the board. This provision has been made optional, as there are instances where directors will, in fact, want to operate independently as well as in the corporate business. The option is extended also to the South Australian manager of a body corporate registered outside this State.

Partners who hold individual licences in conjunction with a licensed partnership will not qualify for this option for the following reasons: first, their personal assets are available to creditors of the partnership; and, secondly, a significant number of partnerships, particularly in the restricted trades, do not last very long and the partners then need their licences individually at short notice.

Section 8 of the amending Act adds "any person acting in the affairs of the board" to the persons liable to a fine of up to \$200 for divulging confidential information. Actually, I think this is surplusage, because I think it is—

Mr. Hall: It is all surplusage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think that is so, but the Leader has always thought that it is so, contrary to the view (the remaining view) of the building trade in this State. While it is already covered in the Act, some people have expressed unease about the general nature of the verbiage in the Act and, in consequence, it is better that it be obvious to them that there can be no conceivable loophole. I hope that this Bill will be dealt with expeditiously as it will not be possible to promulgate the amended regulations until the amendments to the Act become law. It seems unlikely that licensing can now commence on April 1,

1971, but the commencement date should not be delayed longer than necessary and it is intended to introduce commencement at an early date.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### FISHERIES BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Fisheries Act, 1917-1969, and to enact other provisions relating to the management and conservation of fisheries and the regulation of fishing, and to matters incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

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

In response to representations from commercial fishermen for more effective fisheries legislation and the department's long recognition and strong support for this obvious need, the House of Assembly appointed a Select Committee to inquire into and report on:

(a) all aspects of the survey and equipment of fishing vessels and regulations therefor; and

(b) the need for any amendments to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, considered necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources, including amendments to provide for licences for master fishermen, part-time commercial fishermen, employee fishermen, amateur fishermen and fish dealers.

The Select Committee on the Fishing Industry was appointed on October 6, 1966, and, following a reorganization of membership on November 17, 1966, the Select Committee submitted its report to Parliament on September 14, 1967. In the course of its inquiry the committee held 36 meetings and examined 137 witnesses, 64 of whom appeared before the committee as private individuals. Twenty-two associations were represented in evidence given to the committee at sittings held from Ceduna to Port MacDonnell.

Under the terms of reference part (a) referred to matters within the jurisdiction of the Marine Act, 1936-1966, whereas part (b) concerned the need for amending the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, to provide legislation for the proper management of fisheries resources and to overcome the inadequacies of the existing licensing provisions. The Select Committee expressed the opinion that the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, should be redrafted to produce legislation which would be more

precise and more appropriate for current conditions. Sir Edgar Bean, the former Parliamentary Draftsman, was retained by the then Government to consult with the newly appointed Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department (Mr. A. M. Olsen) and to prepare draft amendments to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, so as to up-date the legislation to bring it into line with modern fisheries management practices. However, it was soon realized that the whole Act needed redrafting and the present Fisheries Bill was prepared to replace the outmoded Fisheries Act.

An amendment to the Fisheries Act, 1917-1962, which provided that a fisherman, who had not engaged in crayfishing prior to September, 1967, could not be granted a permit to catch crayfish, that is, take control as master of an authorized crayfishing vessel, has been deleted. Introduced as an interim measure to aid the introduction of management practices in the cray fishery, the amendment has now been found to be too restrictive and has not been carried forward in the present Bill. The licensing provisions incorporated in the Act follow the recommendations of the Select Committee. New provisions in this Bill also provide for setting aquatic reserves and the establishment of a fisheries research and development fund to aid fisheries research for so long neglected in this State.

The present restrictive legislation whereby anglers may only use a single rod and line or one handline has been liberalized in this Bill so that they may at any time use two rods or two handlines at the one time. In considering the individual clauses of the Bill I will indicate as far as possible the changes they effect to the existing law. Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the Fisheries Act, 1917-1969, and makes appropriate transitional provisions. Clause 5 sets out the definitions for the Bill, and I would draw honourable members attention to the following: the definition of "boat" has been extended so as to include marine hovercraft and submersibles; the definition of "fish" has been extended to include aquatic animals; definitions of "rod and line", "hand line" and "dab-net" are included in view of new provisions entitling people to fish with these devices without a licence; and a definition of "honorary warden" is included. There are new provisions for the appointment of these persons as wardens.

Clause 6 sets out some general provisions relating to proclamations under the Bill. It provides that any proclamation may be varied or revoked by another proclamation. Clauses

7 to 15, which constitute Division I of Part II of the Act, make appropriate provision for its general administration. Clause 7 provides for a power of delegation that may be exercised by the Minister or Director in relation to their respective powers. Clause 8 provides for appointments as inspectors of fisheries and also provides that members of the Police Force will be *ex officio* such inspectors. Clause 9 provides for the appointment of honorary wardens and clause 10 provides for identity cards for inspectors and honorary wardens. Clause 11 prohibits persons having a financial interest in fishing being appointed as inspectors, and clause 12 sets out in some detail the powers of inspectors. Clause 13 enlarges on these powers, and clauses 14 and 15 set out certain offences relating to inspectors and honorary wardens.

Clauses 16 to 20 deal with the registration of boats intended to be used for commercial fishing and are generally self-explanatory. Clause 21 enables the Minister to construct artificial reefs and to remove certain obstructions which interfere with the free passage of fish. The exercise of the Minister's powers in this regard are expressed to be subject to the approval of the Minister of Marine. Clause 22 authorizes the Minister of Marine to construct certain facilities for use by fishermen, and subclause (2) of that provision provides for the prescription of charges for the use of those facilities.

Clause 23 is a new clause empowering the Minister and the Director to conduct research, exploration and experiments relating to fishing and marketing of fish, and also to establish biological stations and other establishments for such research. Clause 24 provides for the setting aside of aquatic reserves for research and development purposes and for regulating entry into and conduct of persons on such reserves, and clause 25 provides for the preservation of certain waters from undue disturbance for the same purpose. Clause 26 reproduces the provisions of the present Act relating to the marking of fish boxes. No alteration of substance is proposed.

Clause 27 is a new provision. Its effect is to require the person or company which first handles or processes fish after they are caught to take out a licence. The clause is not aimed at general control of the dealers, but is merely for the purpose of enabling the department to know who they are and where they carry on business, and what fish they are handling. With the aid of this information the tasks of preventing illegal fishing and enforcing the

licensing requirements of the Act will be considerably simplified. Similar provisions have been found necessary in the other States. Clauses 28 and 29 specify the types of fishing licence which will be required in future, and set out the penalties for fishing without a licence in cases where one is required. They also specify the circumstances in which fish may be taken without a licence. They are based generally on recommendations of the Parliamentary Select Committee and in substance embody the principles recommended by the committee, although some of the terminology is different.

The present Act provides for only one class of fishing licence for which the fee is \$4. Such a licence entitled the holder to take and sell fish of all kinds, except species such as crayfish, prawns and abalone for which a special permit is required in addition to a licence. There is no distinction at present between the licence granted to a professional full-time fisherman, and a licence granted to a person who fishes periodically and desires to sell his catch. No fishing licence, however, will be required if the fish are not taken for sale and are not sold and the holder of the licence fishes only with certain gear mentioned in the Bill, namely, (a) a rod and line or hand line; (b) a hoop-net for taking crabs; and (c) a dab-net for taking garfish.

Clause 30 is an important clause which sets out the qualifications for obtaining a commercial fishing licence. To be granted a class A fishing licence, an applicant must satisfy the Director (subject to a right of review) that he intends to carry on the business of fishing as his principal business. To be granted a class B licence, he must satisfy the Director that he will carry on business as a seasonal or part-time business, and in either case that he has equipment, experience and resources to enable him to fish efficiently and profitably. Clause 31 reproduces in part a provision in the existing Act relating to companies holding fishing licences. The previous restriction on aliens holding fishing licences has not been carried forward into this Bill.

Clause 32 requires the holder of a fishing licence who employs other persons in fishing, to take out a licence authorizing him to employ such persons. The existing law provides that a licensed fisherman must take out a separate employee's licence for each person employed. The Bill simplifies this scheme by allowing a licensed fisherman to take a licence to employ any number of

persons up to to a limit specified in the licence. If an employee of a licensed fisherman is the holder of a fishing licence, no licence to employ will be required in respect of him.

Clauses 33 and 34 set out the procedure and requirements for obtaining licences. The Director will decide the applications, and the fees will be fixed by regulation. Fishermen of long standing over 65 years of age and in necessitous circumstances may obtain licences without paying fees. If licences are held for less than six months, half the fee paid will be refunded, and reduced fees may be charged for licences granted for three months or less. Licences properly applied for cannot be refused except on grounds set out in the Bill. One ground for refusal is that the applicant does not comply with a requirement of the Act, for example, as to qualifications, experience or resources. The other is that a licence can be refused for the purpose of giving effect to an approved administrative policy for conservation of fish or proper management of any fishery. Research has shown that fish resources are not limitless and from time to time restrictions on the number of licences may be necessary. A person whose application for a licence is refused may obtain a review of the decision on request to the Minister. On receiving such a request, the Minister is required by the Bill to have the matters in issue investigated and decided by a competent authority. This decision must be given effect to by the Director. These provisions for ensuring that applications for licences are not arbitrarily refused are new.

Clause 35 retains the principle of annual licences but will enable the department to have different expiry days for licences, instead of one fixed day for all licences. This will enable the work of issuing licences to be spread over the year. Regarding clause 36, in recent years it has been found necessary to introduce special codes of regulations for certain important fisheries such as crayfish, prawns and abalone. Regulations about crayfish were specially authorized by an amending Act in 1967, and other regulations by some general provisions of the Act of 1917. In view of the need for further management and for improving the existing schemes, it is now desirable that the Governor should have an explicit authority to make codes of regulations for the management of any specified fisheries. For this reason, clause 36 has been drafted. Codes of regulations

under this clause may require special permits for taking specified fish in addition to the ordinary commercial licence, and may require authorization certificates for boats used in specified fisheries, and prescribe rules to be observed for carrying out schemes of management of such fisheries.

Subclause (1) of clause 37 enables the holder of a licence or permit to surrender it. There is no similar provision in the present law. Subclause (2) enables the Minister to revoke licences or permits. Subclause (3) enables the Minister to suspend a licence or permit when the holder is charged with an offence, pending the hearing of the charge. Clause 38 is similar in principle to a provision of the existing Act that makes it an offence to lend or hire a licence or obtain one unlawfully or falsely pretend to be the holder of a licence. It is wider than the present provision in that it applies to permits as well as licences.

Clause 39 makes it clear that licences and permits do not confer rights over private land or over water on private land, unless the owner of the land consents to the exercise of such rights. A similar provision is contained in section 46 of the present Act. Regarding clause 40, the present Act contains a provision penalising a person who refuses to produce a fishing licence on demand made by an inspector. The new clause alters the present law in a number of ways:

- (a) It extends the law to permits as well as licences.
- (b) It empowers honorary wardens as well as inspectors to demand production of licences.
- (c) It requires the inspector or warden making the demand to identify himself by producing his identity card or, if the inspector is a plain-clothes policeman, by producing his certificate of authority issued under the police regulations.
- (d) It gives the person who is required to produce a licence or permit the option of producing it at a police station or public office within 48 hours, and not necessarily immediately on demand.

Clause 41 makes it an offence for the holder of a licence or permit to take fish contrary to the terms of the licence or permit, or to contravene those terms in any other way. Clause 42 confers on the Minister a power to grant a special permit to any person to take fish in any circumstances. It is contemplated that such permits may be required

to facilitate research or for stocking waters. A similar but more limited power is in section 7 (1) (d) of the Act.

Clause 43, which is similar in principle to section 15a of the present Act, enables the Minister to grant an exclusive right to any person to take specified fish from any waters. An example of the purpose for which such a franchise may be granted is the taking of eels. An eel fishery would be difficult to develop in a particular area if eels could be taken without restriction. Clauses 44 and 45 enable the Governor to grant leases of or licences to occupy Crown land with or without adjacent waters for fish culture. Such rights are at present available only for the culture of oysters. The new clauses, however, are in general terms and enable leases and licences to be granted for the culture of oysters or fish of any kind. No grant of a lease or licence under these clauses can be made unless any Crown land affected has first been dedicated under the Crown Lands Act for the purpose of fish culture. The maximum term of any lease or licence is 10 years, but renewals may be granted subject to the same limitation. Provisions are included in clause 45 to restrict entry by unauthorized persons into any fish culture area.

Mr. Rodda: This will apply anywhere, will it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will apply where an area has been declared; it restricts entry by unauthorized persons. Clauses 46 to 55 contain all the general restrictions on taking fish which apply whether or not the person taking them is a licensed fisherman. They are based on principles such as the protection of undersize fish, the prevention of the use of devices that are harmful to fisheries, and the closing of waters where that is necessary to conserve or build up stocks of fish. To achieve these objects, the Bill gives the Governor power to make, revoke and vary proclamations that may be made to operate for short terms or long terms. Such controls have been found essential by every Government that has undertaken the task of conserving and building up its fisheries. In drafting the Bill, care has been taken to provide only for those forms of control for which there is a clear justification. Put shortly, clause 46 enables the Governor to restrict the taking of fish of all species or of any prescribed species. The restriction may be temporary or permanent, and either general or limited as to area. Proclamations of the kind authorized

by this clause have been in force for many years.

Clause 47 enables the Governor by proclamation to declare that fish not complying with a minimum dimension or weight are not to be taken. It is somewhat wider than the present power to prohibit the taking of undersize fish in that it enables the Governor to prescribe the minimum permissible size for any part of a fish, for example, the length of the carapace of a crayfish or lobster. No exemptions allowing the taking of undersize fish are specified in the Bill, but the Governor is given power to proclaim such exemptions, with or without bag limits, on the number of undersize fish that may be taken.

Clause 48 declares that if fish of species subject to size limits are caught from a boat they must be brought ashore without being cut up or otherwise mutilated, except by scaling and gutting. At present, people who have caught undersize fish from a boat often fillet or otherwise cut up the fish before coming ashore so that (as they hope) the fact that the fish are undersize cannot be proved. These offences sometimes occur on a big scale and their prevalence justifies the restriction in the clause. The clause will not apply to fish used on the boat as food for persons therein.

Clause 49 brings together all the powers that are contained in the present law to regulate and control the use of devices for taking fish. The regulation of such devices is an essential factor in conserving and improving fisheries, and a variety of restrictions are now in force as a result of many years of experience and are generally accepted as being necessary. This clause has been drafted so as to authorize the types of control now in force as well as others that may be found necessary as a result of the development of new fisheries.

Clause 50: As previously mentioned, no licence is required for fishing by hand lines, rods and lines, crab nets and dab nets for garfish. However, by the use of numerous lines at once an unlicensed person would in some waters be able to take substantial quantities of fish and in this respect be almost as well off as the holder of a licence. This would be an anomalous situation and would tend to cause illegal sales. For this reason it is proposed to limit the number of fishing devices which may be used at one time by an unlicensed person. The limit proposed is two. Clause 51 empowers the Governor to proclaim what are commonly called "bag

limits"; that is, maximum limits on the number of fish, or fish of a specified kind, which may be taken by a person in one day. It is not likely that bag limits will be imposed on professional fishermen except in special cases. But if, as may happen, unlicensed persons are to be allowed to take undersize fish it may be necessary to put a bag limit on the number of such fish which may be taken.

Clause 52 makes it an offence to place obstructions in positions where they may hinder the lawful use of fishing devices or damage devices being lawfully used. Its main purpose is the protection of nets. It also penalizes persons who unlawfully hinder lawful fishing or interfere with or take fish from devices set by other persons. Conduct of this kind has been reported from time to time and is not adequately dealt with in the present law. Clause 53 prohibits the taking of fish by the use of explosives or poisons. It is substantially similar to provisions contained in section 53 of the present Act. Clause 54 lays down that pipelines through which water is pumped from the sea or a river must be fitted with sieves of a pattern approved by the Director. This rule has been in the law since 1938.

Clause 55 prohibits the breeding, keeping and release into waters of noxious fish. The Director is empowered to grant exemptions from the prohibitions. Clause 56 sets out the matters on which regulations may be made. In general, the regulations which may be made are ancillary to the other provisions of the Bill. However, paragraph (b) of clause 56 is designed to enable provisions additional to those in the other parts of the Bill to be made for research and for the conservation, improvement and protection of fisheries and the regulation of trade in and processing of fish. In addition, wider powers to prevent pollution of waters are conferred by paragraph (c). It should also be noted that paragraph (f) provides for the registration of devices more commonly known as fishing gear.

Clause 57, which is of a kind usually found in Fisheries Acts, is designed to facilitate the proof (in legal proceedings) of various matters. Most matters dealt with are matters of departmental record, and the clause provides that *prima facie* evidence of these may be given by a departmental certificate. The clause also facilitates the proof of proclamations and of the fact that a place referred to in evidence was within waters specified in a proclamation. Other provisions lay down that the onus of proving that fish taken were not



for sale shall be on the defendant, and that distances, depths and heights may be proved by evidence of measurements taken by electronic, sonic or mechanical devices.

Clause 58 makes it an offence to make a false or misleading statement in any application or statistical return furnished under the Bill. It is a defence to a charge for any such offence that the defendant believed on reasonable grounds that the statement was true. Clause 59 provides that offences under the Bill must be dealt with in courts of summary jurisdiction. It also provides that complaints for an offence may be laid within 12 months after the commission of the offence. The usual period of six months is extended because various types of offence under the Bill, for example, failure to lodge returns or renew registrations, may not be discovered until more than six months have expired.

Regarding clause 60, throughout the Bill the normal maximum penalties for offences are stated in the clauses creating the offences. The most usual maximum penalty is \$100. Some less severe offences carry \$20 or \$50, and some more serious up to \$200. These are on the whole somewhat higher than those in the present Act in which the standard maximum is \$100. Apart from these standard penalties, however, the Bill continues the system of additional penalties for offences involving the illegal taking of fish. This system has been in force for many years and it is a most effective means of deterring offenders. The core of it is that the court is required to impose an additional penalty (above the basic penalty) for each fish taken illegally. At present the rate of the additional penalty is expressed as not less than \$1, with no maximum. The Bill provides that the additional penalty per fish will be not less than \$1 and not more than \$2.

Clause 61 enables the court, when convicting a person of a second or subsequent offence against the Act, to cancel or suspend any fishing licence or permit held by him or disqualify him, for a fixed period not exceeding three years, from obtaining a licence or permit. Section 57 of the present Act is to the same effect. Such a provision is justified by the difficulty inherent in policing fishing legislation. Clause 62 enables the court to order the forfeiture of a fishing device where a person has been convicted of using it to commit an offence against the Bill. The justification for a power of this kind lies in the fact that some devices, for example, nets of certain kinds,

are such that it is not legal to use them for fishing in any circumstances.

Clause 63 declares that fish illegally taken are the property of the Crown and that an inspector may seize them and dispose of them in accordance with Ministerial directions. It also reproduces a long-standing rule that if one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle are under-size all the fish may be seized and disposed of as directed by the Minister. This has been found to be a most useful deterrent and beneficial to public institutions which have received the fish. Clause 64 requires any person having in his possession fish belonging to the Crown or ordered to be forfeited to the Crown, to deliver the fish to an inspector on request. A provision to the like effect is in section 53 of the present Act.

Clause 65 makes the master of a vessel liable for offences committed on the vessel unless he can make out the defence provided for in that clause. Clause 66 enables the Director, under his official title, to institute legal proceedings to recover money due to the Crown under the Bill. By clause 67 a fisheries research and development fund is established in the Treasury. It will consist of one-third of all licence fees and registration fees paid under the Bill other than fees paid for the use of facilities provided by the Minister of Marine under clause 22 of the Bill and money appropriated for the fund by Parliament. It is contemplated that money will also be made available by the Commonwealth.

Subclause (3) sets out the purposes for which the fund may be used—that is, fishing research in South Australian waters, conservation and development of fisheries, and other purposes beneficial to the fishing industry. Clauses 68 and 69 are the usual financial provisions stating that money received under the Bill (except money for a fisheries research and development fund) must go into general revenue, and moneys required for the administration of the Bill (other than money from the fund) must be appropriated by Parliament.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation to workmen and their dependants in respect of injuries suffered by workmen arising out of or in the course of their

employment, and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.* Every year more than 50,000 workers in industry and commerce in South Australia suffer an accident at work which results in a claim being made under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Many of these accidents do not result in absence from work, although first aid or medical attention is needed, but it is an unfortunate fact that every year in South Australia at least 10 persons are killed at work whilst about 10,000 workers suffer accidents which result in them being absent from employment for a week or more.

In the last 10 years educational activities of various types have been developed, both by the Department of Labour and Industry and voluntary bodies such as the National Safety Council of Australia (S.A. Division) in an effort to reduce the number of industrial accidents. It is clear that this educational campaign is having some effect because in the last five years the number of claims made under the Workmen's Compensation Act increased by less than 5 per cent although there was an increase of 16.5 per cent in the workforce in the same period. Even more significantly, the number of accidents at work which resulted in loss of time from work of a week or more fell from 11,800 in the year ended June 30, 1965, to 9,800 in the year ended June 30 last, which represents a fall of 17.5 per cent in the five years during which the number of people at work increased by 16.5 per cent.

Because accidents at work will never be completely eliminated it is necessary that adequate measures be taken to ensure that an injured workman and his family do not suffer severe financial embarrassment as a result of such injuries. In his policy speech given before last year's election, the Premier indicated that the Australian Labor Party would modernize the Workmen's Compensation Act. Among the matters which the Premier specifically mentioned were increases in the present amount of weekly payments, action to ensure that payments to a workman when absent on compensation cannot be terminated until the claim had been settled and a simplification and shortening of procedures to enforce compensation rights. The present Workmen's Compensation Act was passed in 1932 and in nearly 40 years of operation it has been amended by no fewer than 19 amending Acts. It can best be described as

a patchwork quilt. It is not legislation of which we can be proud, as during the vast majority of the time it has been in operation, the Governments of the day were not noted for their generosity to the working men and women of this State, whose labours have resulted in such significant industrial development. It can readily be seen from the date of the original Act that it was passed in the midst of the depression of the 1930s. Conditions have changed so much since those days that the Government considers that, rather than trying to substantially amend the present law, it is preferable for the present Workmen's Compensation Act to be repealed and for a completely new Act to be enacted. The Bill which I now introduce is such a measure.

It will be appreciated that the drafting of a Bill of this magnitude has taken some months. About the middle of last month, when the draft of this Bill was completed, the New South Wales Government released a report of an inquiry which had been conducted by the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Commission of New South Wales into the feasibility of establishing a scheme for the rehabilitation of injured workers in New South Wales. It has obviously been impossible since then to give a great deal of attention to the 129 page report which includes a number of matters that I consider should be carefully considered in this State, even though the inquiry was conducted in New South Wales.

For many years any attention given to the plight of injured workmen was centred around compensating him for injuries which he received at work. This is clearly the wrong approach, as the main emphasis should be on taking steps to prevent accidents, which the Government and some employers are doing but to which many employers have not directed much attention. If accidents do occur the second step should be to do all that is possible to rehabilitate injured workers to enable them to return to work at the earliest possible date, even if for a time they are unable to perform all of the work which they previously undertook. The purpose of workmen's compensation legislation should be to ensure that workmen do not suffer financially because they have been injured in the course of employment, and so are unable to earn a living, or if injured seriously, suffer permanent disablement.

This Bill makes a number of significant changes to the present legislation. The amounts of weekly compensation payable to

workmen during disablement are increased, as are the lump sum payments for death and injuries which cause permanent disablement. I will refer to these matters in detail when explaining the clauses concerned. A new requirement is that the payments of weekly amounts of compensation must be commenced as soon as practicable after the injury occurs, but in every case such payment must be commenced not later than two weeks after the injury. This will overcome the delays that have occurred in the past in commencing payments, so that in many cases injured workmen have not had any income at a time when their need was greater than normal. That the Bill provides for the Industrial Court to determine questions or disputes regarding the payment of, or liability to pay, compensation should come as no surprise as this view was forcibly expressed in 1969 during the debate in this House on a Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

The Government intends to appoint an extra judge to the Industrial Court to handle workmen's compensation matters, the procedure in respect of which I will explain in detail when dealing with the sections of the Bill concerned. It will be seen from an examination of those sections that the intention of the Bill is to have a comparatively simple system whereby workmen can claim compensation and can have their claims dealt with expeditiously and with the least amount of technicality. In view of the nature of the Bill, it is appropriate that detailed explanations should be given in connection with certain provisions instead of dealing with matters generally. Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clauses 4 to 6 set out the necessary transitional provisions. Clause 7 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act; the most significant of these are the definitions of "disease" and "injury". Clause 8 sets out the basic right to compensation under this Bill and in broad terms is similar to that contained in section 4 of the present Act. Clause 9 is a new provision taken from the corresponding law of New South Wales and has the effect of clarifying a particular aspect of the "scope of employment". It seems unreasonable that a workman should run the risk of being deprived of his compensation in the circumstances set out in that clause.

Clause 10 is a new provision and arises from a fairly recent decision on a claim for compensation *in re Pretty*. This provision, which is along the lines of comparable provisions in other States, provides for compensation for a workman injured outside the State in cases

where it can be shown that the employment has a substantial connection with this State. Clause 11 in terms follows the substance of section 9 of the present Act. However, the provision for the giving of an indemnity by the hirer of a workman to the true employer of the workman has been omitted. The effect of this provision was to expose the hirer of the workman to a somewhat unforeseen and unexpected liability. Clause 12 is in terms the same as section 10 of the present Act except that subsection (3) of section 10 has been omitted, since the effect of this subsection was to impose an unnecessary limitation on the scope of the provision. Clauses 13 to 16 respectively re-enact sections 11 to 13 of the present Act.

Clause 17 re-enacts the substance of section 14 of the present Act, taking into account provisions of section 292 of the Companies Act, 1962, which differs somewhat from the provisions of the repealed 1934 Companies Act. Clause 18 follows the principles set out in section 15 of the repealed Act. Clause 19 follows the principles expressed in section 8 of the present Act but has been subject to some drafting modifications. Clauses 20 to 24 constitute Division I of Part III of the Bill and vest jurisdiction over claims under this Act in the Industrial Court of South Australia. Formerly, this jurisdiction was vested in the Local Court. Provision is made, at clause 23, for assistance to be provided, if necessary, by judges of the Local Court. Division II of Part III of the Bill deals with matters of procedure generally. Clause 25 provides for the giving of notice. Clause 26 excuses in certain circumstances a failure by the workman to give notice as required in clause 25. Clauses 27, 28 and 29 in substance reproduce the provisions of sections 32, 33 and 34 of the present Act.

Clause 30 re-enacts section 34a of the present Act and clause 31 does the same for section 35 of that Act. Clause 32 re-enacts in a somewhat expanded form section 33a of the present Act as subclause (1). It provides that a report shall be made of every medical examination made of a workman under the Bill and that a copy of the report shall be given to the workman. Clause 33 is a new provision and, in effect, provides that copies of all statements made by a workman that have been reduced to writing shall be supplied to the workman. Clause 34 is again a new provision and provides for a right of inspection by representatives of the workman of plant or premises where an injury has occurred. Clauses 35 to 38 which comprise Division III of Part II of the Bill

relate to agreements for the payment of lump sums by way of compensation. It is intended that these provisions will assist in the speedy resolution of claims for compensation where the substance of the matter is not in dispute. Clause 38 corresponds to section 58a of the present Act.

Clauses 39 to 43 which comprise Division IV of Part II provide for the resolution of disputed claims. Provision is made for a relatively informal hearing by the use of the "summary list" procedure or at the request of either party for a formal hearing. Clause 41 which limits costs in the proceeding re-enacts section 58 of the present Act. The provisions of this Division of the Bill are based on corresponding provisions in Victoria and are intended to provide the means for the speedy settlement of disputed claims. Clauses 42 and 43 re-enact sections 59 and 60 of the present Act. Division V of Part II, being clauses 44 to 48, sets out the system of appeals from decisions of the Industrial Court. Clause 49 is in terms similar to section 16 of the present Act and sets out the lump sum payments to be made when a workman dies, leaving dependants. However, compensation for death has been increased from the total of the previous four years' earnings to a total of the previous six years' earnings with an upper limit of \$15,000 and a minimum payment of \$5,000. The payment for a dependent child has been increased from \$210 to \$300.

Clause 50 which relates to compensation for the death of a workman without dependants re-enacts section 17 of the present Act. The funeral expenses have been increased to \$300. Clause 51 relates to compensation for incapacity for work and corresponds to section 18 of the present Act. However, in relation to the levels of compensation payable there have been some significant changes. Weekly payments have been increased from three-quarters of average weekly earnings to 85 per cent of those earnings. The class of persons having the status of a member of the family of the workman has been extended, it is defined in section 7 of the Bill and the allowances payable in respect of dependent members of the family have been increased. The maximum weekly payment has been increased from \$40 a week to a more realistic amount of \$65 a week. The maximum liability of the employer has been fixed at \$12,000, except in the case of total permanent incapacity for work in which case the maximum liability is \$15,000. Clauses 52 and 53 are new provisions and provide for weekly

payments to continue throughout incapacity and to ensure that weekly payments are commenced as quickly as possible after incapacity has been established.

Clause 54 is intended to protect an employer who makes a weekly payment in accordance with clause 53 by providing that the making of a weekly payment shall not of itself constitute an admission of liability. Clause 55 re-enacts section 31 of the present Act. Clauses 56 and 57 respectively re-enact sections 36 and 37 of the present Act. Clause 58 re-enacts the substance of clause 18a of the present Act. However, payments under this section are now provided for loss or damage of tools of trade associated with an injury. Previously this provision did not provide for compensation where spectacles or artificial limbs are damaged in an accident. The clause provides that rehabilitation services are to be paid for as well as medical and hospital expenses. Clause 59 is again a new provision and provides for an additional allowance where a constant attendant is needed. Clause 60 follows closely section 20 of the present Act. Clauses 61, 62, 63, and 64 respectively re-enact sections 22, 21, 23 and 24 of the present Act. The amount of \$45.90 in clause 64 is the present State minimum wage under Commonwealth and State awards.

Clause 65 is a new provision and is intended to provide that absences on compensation will count as service for the purposes of the accumulation of annual and sick leave. Clause 66 makes the similar provision, as far as is within the constitutional competence of this Parliament, in relation to employees under Commonwealth awards. Clause 67 is based on section 24a of the present Act but throws the onus on the employer to provide suitable alternative employment that is within the workman's capacity. Clause 68 re-enacts section 25 of the present Act. Clause 69 substantially follows section 26 of the present Act in that it provides fixed rates of compensation for what are commonly known as "table injuries" since they appear in the table to that section. The present maximum amount of compensation of \$9,000 has been increased here to \$12,000 and some new injuries have been included in the table. Sub-clause (6) makes it clear that in determining the degree of loss of the full efficient use of a member or faculty mentioned in the table no regard shall be had to the extent to which that loss may be reduced by the use of artificial aids.

Clause 70 is a new provision and provides for the application of the "table injuries"

principle to injuries that may not necessarily involve incapacity for work. In the application of this section, the court will have the capacity to fix an appropriate lump sum as compensation for a wide variety of injuries. Clause 71 re-enacts section 27 of the present Act. Clause 72 in general reproduces section 28 of the present Act except that an application for redemption of weekly payments may, under the proposed provision, be made before weekly payments have continued for six months. In subclause (2) the increase of total liability to \$15,000 has been recognized in cases of assumed total incapacity.

Clause 73 is a new provision derived from the corresponding legislation of New South Wales and in essence is intended to ensure that if more than one claim for compensation is made in relation to the same injury the percentage of "loss of function" on which the claim is based shall be the percentage arising since the last claim. Clause 74 is again a new provision and will enable the court to allow for the natural deterioration in hearing because of old age in claims relating to noise induced hearing loss. Clause 75 is also a new provision and is intended to ensure that full compensation is available under this Bill for noise induced hearing loss in respect of which no claim has previously been made even though some of the loss may have occurred before the commencement of the Act proposed by this Bill. Part V (clauses 76 to 82) which deals with payment and investment of compensation substantially reproduces Part VI of the present Act.

Clause 83 re-enacts section 69 of the present Act, and deals with claims for damages made independently of this Act. Clause 84 substantially re-enacts section 70 of the present Act with an additional provision contained in subclause (2). This clause applies to the principles expressed in subclause (1) to the case where although damages would have been obtained they would have been less than the appropriate compensation payment under this Act. Clause 85 re-enacts section 71 of the present Act. However, it is made clear in paragraph (d) that the indemnity that the employer has at present against a third party is enforceable by action. Clause 86 substantially reproduces section 72 of the present Act.

Clause 87 follows section 73 of the present Act in that it forbids the practice of "contracting out". In the present act this provision was subject to an exception in favour of

compensation schemes supervised by the Public Actuary. In fact, for many years no such schemes have existed, nor in the present or future circumstances are any likely to be established. Accordingly such schemes are not provided for in the Bill. Part VII (clauses 88 to 90), which deals with the application of the measure to special classes of persons, closely follows the provisions of Part VIII of the present Act. Part VIII (clauses 91 to 97), which deals with certain industrial diseases, is based on Part IX of the present Act with some modifications.

Clause 91 fixes the last employer in the "disease causing employment" with the primary liability for compensation, but at subclause (2) permits that employer to seek a contribution from any employer who employed the workman within the preceding 10 years in employment of the same nature. Clause 92 requires the workman to provide details of his previous employers and is similar to section 83 of the present Act. Clauses 93 and 94 respectively re-enact sections 86 and 87 of the present Act. Clause 95 refers to the traditional scheduled diseases and processes which are to be found in the second schedule to the Bill. Two new "diseases" have been added to the schedule, namely, "asbestosis" and "noise induced hearing loss"; a common manifestation of the latter is "boilermakers' deafness".

Clauses 96 and 97 respectively re-enact sections 91 and 94 of the present Act. Part IX and Part X deal with "Silicosis" and "Industrial Diseases Contracted at Port Pirie" respectively and re-enact the corresponding provisions of the present Act. Clauses 121, 122, 123 and 124 respectively re-enact sections 105, 106, 107, and 108 of the present Act. However, a new provision has been included as subclause (2) of clause 124 to protect the workman against a default by the insurer on the ground that some breach of the policy of insurance has been committed by the employer of the workman. Clause 126 provides in effect that orders for the payment of money by the Industrial Court shall be enforced by and as orders of the Local Court. Clause 127 is a general regulation-making powers provision with a particular power to require periodical returns for statistical purposes from insurers and employers together with a power to prescribe rates of premium for policies of insurance and for the appointment of an advisory committee to advise on these.

Clause 128 provides for the duties under this Act of inspectors appointed under the

Industrial Code. Clause 129 provides for information as to insurance cover, etc., to be provided by an employer to his workmen. Clause 130 corresponds to section 111 of the present Act. Clause 131 provides appropriate rule-making power for the Industrial Court. Clause 132 which exempts agreements, etc., from stamp duty follows section 113 of the present Act. Clause 133 provides for summary procedures in relation to offences under the Act. The first schedule sets out the titles of the Acts and portions of Acts repealed. The second schedule sets out the diseases and processes mentioned in connection with clause 95 of the Bill.

For the convenience of members, I have had a table prepared showing the relationship, if any, between the clauses of this Bill and the corresponding sections of the present Act. I would point out to members that the fact that a section number is set out opposite the number of a clause in the Bill should not be taken to indicate that the clause exactly reproduces the section. However in dealing with the clauses of the Bill, I have tried to indicate where the important modifications have been made.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LIFTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lifts Act, 1960. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

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

Requests were made by the Road Transport Association (on behalf of crane owners) to the previous Government, and have been made by trade unions, for legislation to be enacted to require that all power cranes used in the State should be designed to approved standards. A similar suggestion was made in 1967 to the Royal Commission on State Transport Services by the manager of one of the major crane-hiring companies in the State, who also expressed the view that all cranes that come into the State should be examined and tested by Government inspectors to ensure that they are safe.

At present, legislation in this State regarding the safe construction, maintenance and operation of cranes applies, by virtue of the Lifts Act, only to those power cranes attached to a building and, by virtue of the Industrial Code and the Construction Safety Act, to power cranes (including mobile cranes) when

used in factories and on building sites. Numerous mobile cranes, which are used elsewhere than in factories and on building sites, and fixed cranes such as loading cranes on wharves are not covered by any legislation in this State. Cranes in mines also need to be subjected to greater control than at present. In all other States of Australia legislation ensures the safety of all types of power cranes, whether fixed or mobile, and wherever they are used.

This Bill seeks to amend the Lifts Act (renamed the Lifts and Cranes Act) so that all power cranes and hoists (with certain exceptions) must be designed and constructed to conform to approved standards and must be registered with the Secretary for Labour and Industry. The Bill further requires the owner of every crane to be responsible for ensuring that the crane is properly maintained and kept in safe working condition, and authorizes inspectors to inspect any crane and to order repairs or alterations if a crane is found to be unsafe. The Bill also provides that, in the interests of safety, any crane or hoist that is built or altered after the Act comes into operation must be inspected before it is used. The Director of the Marine and Harbors Department has indicated his agreement to the proposal that cranes on wharves come under the control of the Secretary for Labour and Industry.

The principal Act already applies to lifts in all parts of the State and, apart from a clarification of the meaning of "lift", these provisions are virtually left untouched. The requirement that certain crane drivers must hold a certificate of competency issued by the Engine Drivers Board, appointed under the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, should more appropriately be included in the Lifts and Cranes Act; provision is therefore made in the Bill for the issuing of such certificates under the principal Act. A consequential Bill to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act repeals the provisions of that Act concerning certificates of competency for crane drivers. The opportunity has been taken to include in this Bill some Statute law revision amendments and sundry machinery and other amendments to overcome problems that have arisen in administering the Act since it was passed in 1960. I will refer to them in commenting on the various clauses of the Bill, which I shall now proceed to do.

Clause 1 is formal and amends the citation of the Act to read "Lifts and Cranes Act". Clause 2 provides for the commencement of

the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts a new definition of "crane" as meaning any power-driven apparatus for raising, lowering or moving goods or materials. A new definition of "lift" is inserted as meaning any apparatus attached to a building and controlled by guides for raising, lowering or moving persons, goods or materials, including chairlifts, escalators and moving walks but excluding a conveyor belt used only for goods or materials. A new definition of "owner" is inserted as meaning, in relation to a lift, the owner, occupier or lessee of the building that houses the lift and also, where relevant, the contractor erecting the building and the contractor installing or repairing the lift. In relation to a crane or hoist, "owner" is to mean the person who has the crane on hire or lease and, where relevant, the owner, occupier or lessee of the building in which or in connection with which the crane is used, and also means the contractor constructing, installing or repairing the crane.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act, which deals with the application of the Act. The result of these amendments is that the principal Act will not apply to lifts worked by hand power, cranes exempted by the Chief Inspector, hoisting appliances to which the Construction Safety Act applies and which are exempted by the Chief Inspector, machinery to which the Mines and Works Inspection Act applies, cranes (other than mobile cranes) to which the Industrial Code applies, and cranes owned and used by an agriculturist on his farm. The clause further provides that the Chief Inspector may exempt from the provisions of the Act any crane, or any hoisting appliance to which the Construction Safety Act applies. The Chief Inspector at present has this power only in relation to lifts worked by hand power. Clause 5 amends section 5 of the principal Act by up-dating a reference to the Industrial Code.

Clause 6 amends section 6 of the principal Act, which deals with the construction and alteration of lifts and cranes. A passage is inserted which provides that the Chief Inspector may require plans and specifications to be altered so as to conform to any standard of the Standards Association of Australia, before he grants a permit to construct or alter a lift or crane. The life of a provisional certificate of registration is altered from 30 days to 90 days, as the first-mentioned period has been found to be far too short, having regard to the increasing number of lifts and cranes

which are and, after this Bill passes into law, will be registered with the Secretary for Labour and Industry. New subsection (7a) is inserted, which provides that the present provision that a lift or crane that is constructed or altered in any way must not be worked until it has been inspected, approved and registered, shall apply, in respect to cranes, only to those cranes which, after the commencement of this amending Act, are to be used for the first time after being constructed or altered. Therefore, those cranes which are now operating and which at present do not come within the ambit of the principal Act need not, when this Bill passes into law, be inspected and approved before they may be registered. It would be impossible for such inspections to be completed by the Chief Inspector under at least a year.

Clause 7 repeals the existing provision relating to registration and inserts a new section 7, which provides that all cranes and lifts must be registered with the Secretary for Labour and Industry before they can be worked. Existing registrations are continued and are given full force and effect under this new section. Therefore, the owners of cranes that do not at present come within the ambit of the principal Act will have to apply for registration and will not be able to work those cranes until registration is effected. The interval between this Bill passing into law and the day proclaimed for commencement will be ample time for all such owners to apply for registration. New section 7 further provides for the issuing of registration certificates (conditional or otherwise), the payment of a prescribed fee, the notification of change in ownership, and the periods during which such certificates will remain in force. The registration of a lift must be renewed annually or on change in ownership, whichever is the sooner, and the registration of a crane need only be renewed on change in ownership. Definitions of "registered" and "unregistered" are provided.

Clauses 8 and 9 contain amendments to sections 8 and 9 of the principal Act respectively that are consequential upon the new definition of "owner" referred to earlier. Clause 10 amends section 11 of the Act, which deals with annual inspection of lifts and cranes. New subsection (2) is inserted, which provides that the owners of lifts worked by hand power and all cranes (other than exempted lifts and cranes) shall cause them to be inspected at prescribed intervals. This clause also makes a consequential amendment to the section. Clauses 11 and 12 make amendments to

sections 12 and 13 of the principal Act respectively which are consequential upon the new definition of "owner". Clause 13 makes a consequential amendment to section 14 of the Act, which deals with the working of lifts by persons under the age of 18 years. New subsection (3) is inserted, which provides that the prohibition against a person under 18 working a lift shall not apply to a passenger controlled lift (which is defined in the regulations).

Clause 14 inserts new section 14a in the principal Act, and provides for certificates of competency for crane drivers. All cranes in this State (including the cranes excluded from the other provisions of the principal Act) that are fitted with vertically moving jibs come within the ambit of this new section. Classes of cranes or single cranes can be exempted. No person can operate, be in charge of or permit another person to operate or be in charge of a crane without a certificate of competency. The Chief Inspector is given the control of these certificates and he may cancel or suspend such a certificate when he thinks there is good cause so to do. Persons who hold a crane driver's certificate under the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act will be deemed to hold one under this new section.

Clause 15 amends section 15 of the principal Act which deals with regulations. The Governor is given further power to make regulations for all matters concerning certificates of competency. New subsection (2) is added, which provides that any regulation may refer to or incorporate any standard of the Standards Association of Australia. Clause 16 makes a statute law revision amendment to section 17 of the principal Act.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

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

It is consequential upon the proposed amendments to the Lifts Act, and serves only to repeal those provisions in the principal Act that relate to certificates of competency for crane drivers, as such provisions are now incorporated in the Bill to amend the Lifts Act. I shall now deal with the clauses.

Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation (the same day as that fixed for the commencement of the Lifts Act Amendment Act). Clauses 3, 4, and 5 amend sections 4, 34, and 35 of the principal Act by deleting all reference to crane drivers' certificates of competency.

Mr. CUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 16. Page 4075.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The general story in State Administration has been one that has given a picture of constant striving for additional funds with which the Government of the day can provide new works on behalf of its citizens. It becomes a matter of political argument as to how well the funds are disbursed in their various directions according to the whim and desire of the Government. Generally, this is a matter of search and striving to get additional funds, whether from local taxation measures or a yield from a buoyant economy (as it was in the two years of office of the L.C.L. Government compared to the deprived years in which the Labor Government was in power between 1965 and 1968), or striving to get a better proportion of funds from the Commonwealth Government by means of various Acts by which State Governments are assisted.

In this instance we are seeing a new principle injected into road funds in South Australia, the first real diversion of funds collected from motor users to general revenue. This is a most serious aspect of a new policy. For many years the public has been jealous of the funds it has contributed to the Highways Department, and we know the consideration that has always been given to taxes applied by the Commonwealth Government. There has always been the argument put by individual citizens, by State Governments, and by local organizations that funds so collected should be used for road purposes. The imposition of a road maintenance tax was another example of funds collected for a specific purpose. It was not a pleasant tax, and still is not, and it is a tax that I should like to see replaced by a more equitable tax. However, I use it as an example of taxation for a specific purpose being paid by citizens in their day-to-day business to support their businesses.



In the present instance, we have adopted for the first time a serious diversion from this State's capacity to build roads. This is happening at a time when this Government continues to criticize the Commonwealth Government for not giving South Australia enough money to build the Eyre Highway, although over the years there will be a diversion of funds greater than the sum needed to build that highway because of the provisions of this Bill. The accounts of the Highways Department show the traditional disbursement of that fund. Money paid to the fund is set out in section 31 of the Highways Act and represents the receipts from registration fees, drivers' licences, and other fees, after deducting therefrom the cost to the Motor Vehicles Department of collecting this money.

It also sets out the administration expenses of the department, and the debt charges and interest on the sinking funds that are provided by the Financial Agreement. The disbursement of that collection is made up of the cost of collecting the money, administration expenses, superannuation contributions, accommodation paid to the Public Buildings Department, the services of officers of the Police Department, and those indirect services rendered to the Motor Vehicles Department. These are the only forms in which money can be paid from the Highways Fund—or were, until now. These expenses were all legitimately directed to either collecting the money or to building roads, and were not used for other purposes. Perhaps on one small issue one could make out a case for diversion, but how has the Minister phrased this? He makes no apology for his bare-faced policy in his second reading explanation when he states:

This Bill is intended to give effect to one of the series of revenue-raising measures announced at the resumption of this session.

At least he is honest in his description, but this is not an additional tax to build more highways or freeways: it is to divert funds from those purposes. The Minister said there would be an increased yield of about 20 per cent, and he gave details of the increased percentages in the various categories of motor vehicle. He did not give a comprehensive explanation of how these charges will apply, and I should have thought that he would give more detail, because he knows that he was given enough details when he was in Opposition. We gave him the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, and he has not recovered from that shock yet. He cannot digest it, because he

never understood it. Today he is unable to say whether he disagrees with the State Planning Authority. That shows the attitude of this Minister regarding the detail he had the opportunity to supply to the House. We are not told how much the increases imposed by this Bill will cost the important transport industry of South Australia. How much will it cost in relation to a semi-trailer with a payload of 16 tons?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Can you answer that?

Mr. HALL: The Minister asks whether I can answer it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: I know that the Minister is out of order. He was out of order in introducing this Bill yesterday and expecting this House to pass it today, without having worked out the cost to the transport industry and how much money will be siphoned off to general revenue. What sort of encouragement to industry is this, from a Government that is going to build up industry? The Minister was taking great interest in industry in the photograph in this morning's newspaper when he was discussing assembly line procedures. If he goes into that kind of detail, why can he not say how much this Bill will cost the transport industry? What sort of attitude is this to throw up to the House? He has given a few figures that help his case, such as references to 15 per cent or 16 per cent, and he throws in one case involving an increase of 29 per cent. What about the increased charges for 15-ton trucks or 20-ton trucks?

Mr. Langley: I thought you'd work them out for yourself.

Mr. HALL: It is all right for the member for Unley to say that. We gave the present Minister 26 pages of explanation regarding the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, but now we have had this dictatorial attitude by him towards the present Opposition. Before I was diverted, I was getting to the point that the Minister had said carefully, in a somewhat ostentatiously careless way, that this additional money would be available for appropriation by Parliament for the purpose of road traffic and road safety purposes. What does he mean by road safety purposes? Has he told us? Will he build this marvellous drive-around thing for the hot rod school, or whatever he calls it, or will he use the money to pay for traffic signals? What will he do with this money? You cannot tell me, Sir, and no-one else in this

House can tell me, because we have no basis on which to make calculations. The Minister seems to be busily pencilling on a piece of paper now. He may tell us later why we are expected to pass this Bill while industry is waiting at the doors of the Chamber for an explanation. The Minister is working busily with his pen: perhaps he will give us the information, as an afterthought. That is typical of the Minister, as typified by his previous remarks about raising finance for road purposes.

I remind the House of the Minister's attitude to revenue raising for road purposes. In a debate in this House on the M.A.T.S. proposals on October 9, 1968, the Minister spoke of this matter and, when dealing with what money our Government might use to give effect to the M.A.T.S. plan, he stated:

If it uses the ordinary Revenue and Loan Accounts, this will mean a reduction in expenditure on education, hospitals, and other State services: there is no alternative.

He went on to show anger because our Government might increase fees. I remember the then back-bencher's anger at proposals put forward in the M.A.T.S. plan. These proposals suggested that contributions from the Municipal Tramways Trust, increased fares, increased motor vehicle registration fees, and increased driver's licence fees could be used. What fun the present Minister made of it then! How shocking it was to contemplate, for a road programme, increasing fares and driver's licence and motor vehicle registration fees! According to the present Minister then, it was a crime against humanity to increase those charges, and that was two years ago or even less.

What has the Government done since then? This is the Government that represents the workers: it is the working man's Party! The Government has done just what the present Minister derided then. The Government is now about to increase fees by 20 per cent and, for some people, 30 per cent. The Government will also hit industry. This Government says that it will increase registration fees by a huge amount, yet the present Minister, when he was a member of the Opposition, thought that our Government might even raise the fees by 10 per cent! That was his figure. He even said that a levy of \$1 could be imposed on every gas and electricity account! That is what he frightened the community with. However, have we an increase of \$1 here? No: instead, we have an increase of 3 per cent on every electricity account in this State. The present Minister has had these matters in his mind all the time and has supported the present

increases in Cabinet. Every time the matter has come up in Cabinet, the Minister has been the pioneer of new taxes in South Australia.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Bill under discussion deals with motor vehicle registration fees, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. I do that by telling you that this subject matter is taken from a debate on transport, dealing with the very matters that have since come to pass in relation to transport. I will not mention electricity charges again, although that came up in the debate to which I referred and was mentioned by the present Minister, when he was a back-bencher. Since that time these things that the Minister said were to be foisted on the public by the evil Liberal and Country League Government have been pioneered by this new Minister! Today he sits pencilling away, with his afterthoughts.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am not.

Mr. HALL: Well, he ought to be doing that. He is sitting there, ignoring the debate. He has been a pioneer of this sort of legislation, and he is increasing the tax on industry by as much as 30 per cent. By doing that, he will put a heavy impost on South Australian growth. I do not doubt that there is a good reason why the Minister is leaving the Chamber: he ought to be ashamed of himself for promoting this kind of Bill, in view of the type of representation and protest that he has made previously in this House. We have not only these inequities and inequitable taxation measures, but also a diversion of funds, and that is the damning part of the Bill. As much as the Government may speak of the Eyre Highway and all the other programmes that it may think of, in this Bill it deliberately diverts from those programmes.

As least the Minister is to be given credit for not hiding the fact that this is a revenue measure to help the general Budget: up to 6 per cent may be diverted for general revenue purposes for some unnamed aspect: all the Minister said was that it was for traffic and road safety purposes about which we have not been given details. This could relate to any part of police operation on the roads, and it will provide a tidy sum. At least it will take care of the 6 per cent diversion. We will see road funds milked. Will it stay at 6 per cent in the future? This sets the precedent: it is the first milking of the fund. Road users in this State who are in gaol for not paying

their road maintenance tax will be delighted, I am sure, to hear about this diversion.

There has been so much money in the fund that we can apparently afford to increase the tax by 20 per cent, and siphon it off! That is how healthy the fund has been. This is something of which the Government should be ashamed. There has been a complete reversal of attitude by the Government in relation to general fares. I think you would allow me, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, to develop this theme a little. If this type of taxation is to be levied in respect of transport and then diverted, what is the Government's attitude to transport in general terms? How is the Government treating the economy? Is its attitude to transport sensible? I remember the criticism of the Labor Party in Opposition when we reduced country rail services to achieve a saving of \$1,000,000 a year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But you would be out of order in this debate in remembering it, wouldn't you?

Mr. HALL: I do not think I would be out of order, having first referred the matter to you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. If we are to consider the imposition of a huge new taxation impost in South Australia based on transport, I think I am in order in dealing with one aspect of Government policy on transport and relating it to the saving of money. These two factors must be considered together as they could have a multi-million dollar impact on succeeding Budgets. We cancelled rail services, much against the will and the wishes of certain country communities. An average of 13 passengers a day used one of these services, although 2,000 petitioners wanted the service retained. However, when the buses were substituted, the public became used to them; in fact, people liked the buses, because they were cheaper, quicker and more mobile, and the train service could not be sold back to people in those areas now served by buses.

What is the Government's attitude to economy in transport? The Moonta bus service, which was cancelled by our Government, has been the subject of strange representations over the last few months. I asked the Minister a question about this bus service, on which a single ticket to Adelaide costs \$1.80 as against \$3.25 for the rail service, and which is three-quarters of an hour quicker than the rail service. I asked the Minister whether it was true that he was considering cancelling the much better and cheaper bus service and replacing it by a railcar service at a loss to the Budget of over \$200,000 a year, and his

amazing answer was "Yes," he was considering it. On that occasion, the Minister, in part, said:

The Government considers that the service previously given the districts of Moonta, Angaston and Eudunda should never have been taken away, and it is currently considering the situation it has inherited with a view to seeing whether it would be practicable to restore to local residents the service they so obviously desire.

That is the Government's attitude to money! It regards money as something to play with.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader must link his remarks to the Bill; otherwise he will be out of order.

Mr. HALL: I appreciate that, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker; but what I have said demonstrates the Government's complete disregard for a sum in excess of \$1,000,000 that has been saved in one instance. Apparently, the Minister is willing to spend that \$1,000,000 on a service that is not wanted. I assure him that that service is not wanted, except maybe by those employed in the Railways Department. The Minister would waste that money and put on road transport an impost of the type stipulated in the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. HALL: I know this makes the Minister uncomfortable. What details has the Minister of Roads and Transport given? Where has he said how much money will be devoted to road safety services? Will it be all of the 6 per cent? This fatuous Bill simply tells us that money will be diverted from road funds to general revenue. I am sorry to say that, in regard to legislation, this is typical of the administration and credibility that we have come to expect from members of the Government front bench. That is not good enough for this House or for South Australia, even though it may be good enough for the Labor Party. This search for funds is going on at a time when this Government, bearing in mind the accounts presented in connection with the Budget, has \$24,000,000 more to spend from two sources than we had in our last year of Government. This Government expects to receive an additional \$5,200,000 in State taxation irrespective of the increases brought about by this Bill and \$18,900,000 more from the Commonwealth. It is all very well to talk about an additional \$8,000,000 in wages: the Government has a further \$24,000,000 to use.

Mr. Venning: It will never have enough.

Mr. HALL: Never was a truer word spoken. The Government regards money as something

to play with. In this instance, the Government is so desperate that it will take money from industry and put it into general revenue and then treat it as paper money. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I fully support the Leader, who has made an eloquent speech in which he has pointed out the severity of this levy on the people of South Australia. South Australia has traditionally maintained a low cost structure in regard to its industrial activity, while its people have enjoyed a standard of living equal to that in the Eastern States. However, the present Labor Government is doing its best to remove this privilege that has been enjoyed in the past. A standard of living is more important than a rate of pay. Higher standards of living are achieved by producing more goods. The Treasurer often claims that South Australia exports 90 per cent of its goods to the other States: although I do not accept that, that is what he says. If anything affects the export of goods over the roads, the State's ability to compete will suffer. No-one likes paying taxes, but some taxes do more harm than others, and the tax proposed in this Bill will do much harm. The Leader pointed out that this State had received an extra \$24,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government and from other sources. Therefore, the Treasurer has had an easy Budget to operate, easier than the Budgets of the Treasurer of any other State in Australia because, through its generosity, the Commonwealth has given this great increase to South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to depart from the Bill. This Bill does not deal with general revenue, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: Surely collecting \$3,000,000 has to do with the general revenue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Bill makes no reference to general revenue; it imposes a tax.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not know in what way the Bill does not deal with general revenue, as \$1,000,000 of the sum raised will be diverted into general revenue. Therefore, general revenue must be affected.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about general revenue, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that, in his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the Bill was

one of a series of revenue-raising measures. Surely that refers to general revenue.

The SPEAKER: No. The honourable member for Heysen is not speaking to the Bill before the House. This is not a general revenue Bill: it is a Bill that imposes certain fees with regard to registration.

Dr. TONKIN: With respect, I submit that the measure is designed to raise funds with regard to general revenue. Surely the disposal of these funds must be the subject of debate.

The SPEAKER: The Bill does not affect the general revenue aspect. The honourable member is anticipating a debate on another Bill. The member for Heysen must refer to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: By raising money in this way, the cost of production in South Australia will be increased. This is an inflationary measure at a time when Australia is fighting against inflation. In the June quarter, the cost of living index will probably show that South Australia has possibly had a greater increase than has any other State.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, and they must cease. These interjections make it hard for me to hear what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. McANANEY: I would be sorry indeed, Sir, if you did not hear my words of wisdom. The tax imposed by the Bill distinguishes between owners of private cars, owners of motor bikes and owners of trucks. Road transport is especially affected. Because of the great distances in Australia, transport costs are most important. The greatest impost in the Bill affects people concerned with road transport, who already have to pay road maintenance tax, which is a heavy charge. This addition to transport costs must be to the detriment of everyone in the State. Although I am not allowed to refer to general revenue, I point out that only a part of this tax will go into revenue. A sum of \$2,000,000 will be concerned with roads. This measure will increase costs in South Australia, and that is something we should try to avoid.

The State Government has got itself into this problem. It has increased public expenditure to a far greater extent than has been the case in recent years. There has been a 20 per cent greater increase in expenditure with regard to the public sector than in respect of the private sector. Every increase affects the ability of the private sector to produce goods on a competitive basis. By increasing many aspects of its expenditure by more than

20 per cent, the Government has created the need for a tax such as this. How much longer can we continue to increase expenditure in the public sector, with the result that taxes such as this tax must be imposed? I cannot understand why registration charges for motor cycles are to be increased by 33½ per cent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is the total monetary sum involved?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: Many people who have limited incomes, such as students, use motor cycles, as it is cheaper for them to do so than to pay bus fares. I cannot see the reason for this increase. Many people who ride motor cycles cannot afford to buy a motor car. We appreciate that, as no increase has been made in motor registration fees for many years, possibly the matter should be looked at, but this is not the time to impose an increase.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister has said that is a revenue-raising Bill. However, it has been the normal practice for many years for the money received by way of motor registration fees to be placed in the Highways Fund so that it can be spent on roads. The Bill provides that part of the money so raised is to be diverted to purposes other than for road construction, and so on. This is a new procedure, about which South Australian motorists may well feel alarmed. Until now motorists have, apart from a small amount raised by local government for the purpose, paid for the roads of this State. I have already expressed my views on this and have said that money so raised by local government is an old-fashioned way of obtaining such finance and that it should be done in a different way. However, I do not intend to press that point now. From my reckoning, the Bill will raise over \$3,000,000 extra a year, and \$15,350,000 is expected to be received this year.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're wrong again.

Mr. McANANEY: I might concede that I am wrong, as it might be even more. Although the Minister said that this was a revenue-raising measure, he did not pay the House the courtesy of saying how much revenue was expected to be raised by the Bill. I am sure he did not say in the second reading explanation how much would be raised. The Minister is also indefinite about the amount to be transferred into general revenue; nor has he said how this money is to be spent. Despite this, members are asked to vote on a measure that could raise (making an intelligent guess)

over \$3,000,000 in a full year. Unless we run into a depression like the one we experienced during the term of office of the previous Labor Government (when there were no increases in registration fees) one would expect, in the normal course of events, to have to pay an increase in motor registration fees. The Minister said in his second reading explanation of another measure that an amount not exceeding in any one year 6 per cent of registration fees shall be diverted for the purposes of traffic and road safety services operated by the Police Department. It appears, therefore, from the vague figures that we have been given that an extra \$3,000,000 will be raised in a year and that 6 per cent of a total of \$15,000,000 received in a year (which amounts to just over \$1,000,000) will be so diverted to safety services. This Parliament has already diverted certain moneys for road safety campaigns, which members have generally supported. Although it is now said that some amount up to 6 per cent, or about \$1,000,000, will be diverted for some purpose, the Minister has not explained reasonably how the money will be spent. I consider that the Minister has an obligation to the House to explain this.

The Minister has claimed that, if something is not done about the Eyre Highway, someone will be responsible for a death on that road. If he does not provide a freeway from Stirling to Adelaide, it can be claimed, on the same basis, that people will be killed on the winding road to the city. Therefore, anyone who delays for any period a plan that provides for a straight and safe road to Adelaide can be claimed to be killing people. Many of the deaths on our roads have occurred on the bends on the road near Murray Bridge. Anyone who diverts money from expenditure on roads can be claimed to be creating a hazard and killing people.

Perhaps the reason behind the thinking on railway revenue, which was already in a serious situation, is that the position regarding transport has deteriorated considerably and that general revenue from the railways has increased by only \$200,000, whereas railway expenditure has increased by \$2,800,000.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about the railways. The honourable member is starting to digress from the Bill. He must confine—

Mr. McANANEY: The loss is \$2,600,000 this year, so we are raising money by this tax to make up for the losses on the railways.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have told the honourable member for Heysen that there is in this Bill nothing pertaining to the railways or to the loss of revenue by the Railways Department, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The loss on the railways of \$2,800,000—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: —makes it necessary—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually direct the honourable member to speak to the Bill before the House. This is the third occasion on which I have asked him to speak to the Bill, not to the question of the railways, which has nothing to do with the Bill. I request the honourable member for Heysen to speak to the Bill. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: With all due respect, this is money that will go into general revenue, as claimed by the Minister, so I connect my remarks by saying that the money being raised by this Bill will be used to finance the deficit on the railways.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously pointed out that the honourable member is out of order in speaking about general revenue on this Bill, and he is not to anticipate debate on future Bills. I will not call the honourable member to order any further on this matter. If he does not speak to the Bill, he can resume his seat. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: As I said recently, I have never seen the gag applied in this House previously, and I have been here for eight years.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about the gag being applied. I am asking the honourable member to observe Standing Orders and to speak to the Bill before the House. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I think that, in making such a decision, you should indicate which Standing Order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not going to continue in that vein. I have ruled that he must speak to the Bill. If he wants to disagree with my ruling, that is his prerogative, but I have ruled that way, and I insist that the member for Heysen speak to the Bill. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: These matters have already been discussed in this debate and, bearing in mind the precedents established in

this House, I do not agree with the Speaker's ruling on this subject. We are dealing—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to call the honourable member again on this measure. There is nothing in the Bill about the Speaker's ruling, and I have been more than tolerant. This is about the fifth time I have requested the honourable member to speak to the Bill. If he does not obey the Chair, I will have to name the honourable member. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I have a point or two to make yet.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: In connection with the Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I warn members of the Government front bench to cease interjecting. They are just as much out of order as is the member for Heysen, and they must observe Standing Orders.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister claims that this is a revenue-raising Bill and that an extra \$3,000,000 will be obtained. This is an inflationary tax that will only inflate costs in South Australia, and that is not a good thing at a time when the problem in Australia is one of combating inflation. However, while we are increasing inflation, we will not be able to compete with overseas countries and, in this matter, by increasing costs in South Australia we will not be able to compete with other States. The Treasurer has said that 90 per cent of our production is sent to other States: although I disagree entirely with that figure (in fact, statistics show that it is incorrect), a sufficient proportion of our production goes to other States to indicate that we cannot risk increasing production costs, as they will be increased as a result of this Bill. The fact that rail charges have been increased in this State makes it necessary—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has been warned that there is nothing in this Bill about rail charges. I again warn him that if he refers to this aspect again I will have to take action. The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I am connecting the increase in rail charges with—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled the honourable member out of order, and he is not going to continue in this vein. If he does, I will name him. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I am linking my remarks with the reason for raising this tax. Because of increased charges, the proceeds of this tax

must necessarily go into general revenue. I think I am definitely linking up my remarks.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is being most repetitive on this subject.

Mr. McANANEY: This is the third time I have made the point that, with these increased charges, the railways will not make—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Pursuant to Standing Order 155, in view of your persistent warnings to the honourable member, Sir, I am obliged, as Leader of the House, to move the following motion:

That the honourable member for Heysen be no longer heard.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you taking a point of order?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 155 to uphold the authority of the Speaker of the House. Standing Order 155 provides:

If the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall have twice warned any member then speaking that his speech is irrelevant to the question being discussed, or that he is guilty of undue repetition or prolixity, a motion that such member be not further heard may be moved at any time so as to interrupt such member speaking, whether in the House or in Committee, if supported by the rising in their places of not less than seven members. Such motion shall then be put without debate, and if it be carried by a majority of the members present, being not less than 14 members, the member so interrupted shall not be again heard on that question in the House or during that sitting of the Committee:

Sir, you have pointed out to the member for Heysen on far more than the required number of occasions that he is speaking in a fashion that is irrelevant to the question before the House. You have given him a great deal of latitude and you warned him of the consequences if he did not stick to Standing Orders. In order to uphold the authority of the House, I therefore move the motion and ask for the support of the requisite number of members.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion supported?

*Several members having risen:*

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know that when the Speaker is on his feet it is contrary to Standing Orders to interrupt. The honourable Premier has moved "That the honourable member for Heysen be no longer heard." The motion has been supported by the required number of members. As it is in order, in accordance with the

Standing Orders such a motion shall then be put without debate. Therefore, the question before the Chair is—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order in this matter.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order is that the Premier did not read the following proviso in Standing Order 155:

Provided that the Committee may at any time, on motion without debate, permit a member so interrupted to speak on any subsequent question during that sitting, but no such motion shall be put unless supported by the rising in their places of at least 14 members: provided also that in the warning the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall call the member's attention to this Standing Order.

With great respect, Sir, you did not do that.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Order does provide that, in warning the honourable member, the Speaker or Chairman of Committees shall call his attention to the Standing Order. Although I warned the honourable member on several occasions, I must confess that I did not draw his attention to the Standing Order. Therefore, I will not accept the motion. However, Standing Order 168 provides:

If any member persistently or wilfully—

(a) obstructs the business of the House,

or

(b) refuses to conform to any Standing Order of the House, or to regard the authority of the Chair;

or if any member, having used objectionable words, refuse either to explain the same to the satisfaction of the Speaker, or to withdraw them and apologize for their use, the Speaker shall name such member and report his offence to the House.

In view of the circumstances, I have no alternative but to name the honourable member for Heysen.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to be heard either in explanation or in apology.

Mr. McANANEY: Since I have been a member of this House it has been the practice to cover a wide field in second reading speeches. It has been a precedent for future rulings in this House that a member has a certain amount of latitude in a second reading speech. We are now dealing with a revenue-raising Bill that was introduced and explained by the Minister of Roads and Transport. He gave a very brief explanation that did not satisfy Opposition members. Surely we are entitled, when dealing with a Bill that

authorizes the raising of about \$3,000,000 for general revenue, to connect the Bill with items on which the Government will spend the revenue that is being raised.

Although seven new taxation measures have been announced, the Opposition has been refused the right to demonstrate to this House how such a sum could be saved so as to make it unnecessary for these forms of taxation to be levied. If we, as representatives of our districts, cannot fully debate a revenue-raising measure, I cannot see how we can effectively carry out our duty as an Opposition. It is the Opposition's job to criticize constructively a Government and to show the people of South Australia the advantages or disadvantages of revenue-raising measures. Members opposite laughed when I referred to the common law, which is based entirely on precedent, but if the Attorney-General were here he would agree with me in this respect.

I am asking (I was going to say "demanding", but that would be a reflection on you, Mr. Speaker) that we be given the right to continue to refer to anything connected with the matter before the House and to say how it affects the general revenue and expenditure of this State. It is Government expenditure that has brought about this additional impost on the people we represent. If we are to be denied the right to point that out, what is our purpose in being here? We are outvoted by members on the other side.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: To hell with Standing Orders!

Mr. McANANEY: I should not reply to the interjection, on your instructions, Mr. Speaker, but no-one has told me what Standing Order I have broken up to now. My defence is that we have had the precedent that we are allowed, on second reading, to discuss the full implications of a Bill and its effects on the affairs of the State. I consider that I have been deprived of the right to discuss fully the full implications of a revenue-raising Bill. I am repeating myself now, Sir, and I know that this is against Standing Orders, so I will not go any further on that line. I base my argument on the fact that we have a precedent, and that it is practically common law in this House for members to have this right. To be deprived of that right means that we are going backwards. I think a revenue-raising measure, which makes road transport less competitive as against the railways, is a matter on which I have a perfect right to connect the railway argument with the increased charges for road transport,

and that is a direct connection. I stand on those two principles: that the matter is connected, and that I have a right in debate in this House on a revenue-raising measure to discuss more fully the general effect of this Bill on the State's finances.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the honourable member's explanation be accepted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE seconded the motion.

The SPEAKER: I will put the motion "That the explanation of the honourable member for Heysen be accepted." Those in favour of the motion say "Aye", those against "No". The "Noes" have it.

Mr. HALL: Divide.

*While the division bells were ringing:*

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Of course he was out of order: you heard what the galah said.

Mr. COUMBE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the Minister's referring to my colleague as a galah. I submit that this is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I submit that I have the right to raise that point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is "That the explanation of the honourable member for Heysen be accepted."

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Steele. No—Mr. Lawn.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to Standing Order 170, the honourable member for Heysen must now withdraw from the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Sir. As I understand it, you have been invoking Standing Order 168 so far.

The SPEAKER: No, Standing Order 170.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, with great respect; you quoted Standing Order 168 before.



The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of the member for Mitcham, Standing Order 170 provides:

Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology, and shall, unless such explanation or apology be accepted by the House, then withdraw from the Chamber . . .

We are at present in that situation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is so, it is necessary that there be a motion for the honourable member's naming.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been heard in explanation, and his explanation is not acceptable to the House. The honourable member for Heysen must withdraw from the Chamber now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, Sir, there is no motion for the suspension of the honourable member, as required by Standing Order 170. If you look at Standing Order 170 you will see that there has to be a motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order, and the honourable member for Heysen must withdraw immediately.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If he doesn't go he'll be arrested.

The SPEAKER: I direct the Acting Sergeant-at-Arms to remove the honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: What a terrible thing, on Saint Patrick's Day, and I have fought for democracy!

*The Acting Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. J. W. Hull) having escorted the member for Heysen from the Chamber:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the honourable member for Heysen be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the day's sitting.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded? The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. King and Lawn. Noes—Mr. Evans and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: The motion has been carried in the affirmative. The honourable member for Heysen is therefore suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): When explaining this Bill, the Minister made no secret of its intent, for he said:

This Bill, together with a Bill to amend the Highways Act, is intended to give effect to one of a series of revenue-raising measures announced at the resumption of this session.

Since the Minister referred to revenue-raising measures announced at the beginning of this session, I remind honourable members of item 2 in the Treasurer's statement, which is as follows:

An increase of 20 per cent in the registration fees for motor vehicles, combined with a parallel requirement that the Highways Fund shall undertake financial responsibility for certain police road traffic services and the eventual financial responsibility for the proposed Kangaroo Island ferry service.

That was, as I say, item 2 in the Ministerial statement regarding the series of revenue-raising actions to be taken by this Government. I repeat that the item refers to the use of moneys obtained from car registration fees for general revenue purposes, and I believe that I have quite clearly linked these proposals. As registration fees will be increased, it is reassuring (if this debate is to continue in the narrow confines you have seen fit to direct, Mr. Speaker) to consider another statement that the Treasurer made when Treasurer on a previous occasion, namely:

Moneys from the Highways Fund—this is the fund that we are now discussing—are required to be spent essentially for roadworks.

I think it is entirely in order to ask ourselves just what these increased moneys that will result from increased registration fees will be used for. Presumably, since we are not able to touch on another matter, they will be used for roadworks. Presumably we might see the Eyre Highway more than half completed. We have nothing to talk about other than these road measures. Here we have a proposal to raise more money for the Highways Fund. The fact that I can say nothing more is a complete farce, because members on both sides know what the Government has in mind. In one sentence, the Treasurer has already said exactly what is to be done with the money raised by increasing registration fees. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The new fees payable will generally conform to the relationship between private and commercial registration fees existing in other States of the Commonwealth.

He is trying to justify this increase in fees by saying that we should bring our fees to the same level as applies in other States of the Commonwealth. That is a most debatable reason for increasing fees. He went on to say:

In addition, since in this State net revenue from registration fees flows into the Highways Fund and commercial vehicles account for relatively high road usage as well as, in the case of heavier vehicles, relatively higher road wear, it seems proper that these factors should be reflected in the comparative scale of charges.

They are fine sounding words and, read in isolation in terms of this Bill, they give the impression that the Minister intends to put all of these moneys into improving the road system. However, because of the statement made by the Treasurer in this House at the beginning of the session and because of the Minister's own words in the first sentence of his second reading explanation, all members know that this is a farce: it is laughable. The Government does not intend to do this at all, and that is as far as I can go in discussing the matter. Perhaps I can be forgiven for questioning motives. I know it is a matter of technicality that the two Bills must be brought in separately. Nevertheless, I think it is a great disservice to the people, especially the motorists of the State, who work and earn their living, that in speaking to this Bill we cannot deal with the motives of the Government which have already been freely expressed in the House. When he was Treasurer in the previous Labor Government, when dealing with the Highways Fund the Treasurer said:

Moneys from the Highways Fund are required to be spent essentially for roadworks. It is good to have this reassurance, since apparently that is what will happen with this increased revenue: there will be better roads. Apparently none of this money will go into general revenue. The Minister agrees.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I don't agree at all.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister acquiesced by gesture.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't acquiesce: they are your words, not mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The Minister may reply later.

Dr. TONKIN: Undoubtedly we will have the best roads in Australia if this money is used for roads. I suppose it is to be used for roads, and that is all I am allowed to say. I cannot believe that the Treasurer, having said that moneys from the Highways Fund are

required to be spent essentially for roadworks, could possibly envisage using them for anything else. For instance, I cannot believe the Treasurer would suggest that a certain percentage of the moneys should be used to finance certain activities of the Fire Brigades Board or the Police Department. Certainly I am not allowed to see that any of these funds could possibly be used for any purpose other than building roads. The whole situation is absurd. Regarding the statement that the fees are being increased to bring them into line with those in the Eastern States, I ask: will the Government never learn?

The Treasurer has openly stated that these increased fees will be a means of raising additional general revenue and will be directed towards supporting some of the activities of the Police Department that are at present paid for from general revenue. The fees are supposedly being increased because of the dire financial straits that this State finds itself in. No doubt Ministers will jump up and down and say, "The Commonwealth, the Commonwealth"—that nasty, big, bad boggy! However, Ministers cannot go on blaming the Commonwealth much longer, especially when they take the very steps that will again increase prices. We are told that we need to raise money for general revenue, but what happens? The Government goes out of its way to slug the motorist, the man who will pay because he depends on transport. Industry, too, depends on transport.

As a result of the Government's move, prices will increase. What is more, we will lose that cost advantage that Government members always scoff at but are very quick to refer to when it is a question of attracting industry to this State. This Bill will have the reverse effect; it will create a vicious circle and serve no useful purpose. If this money was to be used to improve our roads, I would say, "Yes; probably fair enough". I would say that if the increase was small, but this increase is large. Admittedly there has been no increase since 1954, but at that time total collections from registration fees were \$6,300,000, of which 82.5 per cent was used for roadworks. In 1968-69, the increase in population raised the collections to \$13,700,000, of which only 57.8 per cent was used for roadworks. Although revenue increased by 117.5 per cent in 15 years, the amount spent on roads from State sources increased by only 52.5 per cent. I believe that certain services of Police Department officers have been

covered under the Highways Fund in the past. As from January 1, a charge of \$1 has been introduced for driving tests, and there is some talk that the fee will be increased. Up to one-sixth of licence fee revenue is to be used for road safety purposes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where is the talk of the fee going up—in L.C.L. circles?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister clutches at straws. If the Highways Fund has in the past covered both road safety and the services of police officers, surely we are entitled to know whether that fund will continue to cover these things, or whether there will be a special levy for these things. You know, Sir, I know, and every member knows (but we are not allowed to say so) that this is the case. Why should the motorist get it in the neck again? I shall have more to say on the next Bill, which is associated with this measure. I must say that the recent happenings were entirely unnecessary, and I am sure that every honourable member regrets the storm in a teacup, which I believe the last episode was.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a reflection on the vote of the House.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not intended as a reflection, but I believe things have been made extremely difficult by the Minister when, in his second reading explanation, he referred to both Bills; by the the Treasurer's statement referring to both Bills in one sentence; and by the complete interdependence of one Bill on the other. I reserve what other remarks I have to say about other aspects of this measure until the second reading debate on the next Bill. I oppose this Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I think it is a shame that this Government, for the first time for many years with a great majority, has had to resort to the fragmented legislation that has been introduced. We acknowledge that Governments can get into difficulties, but there is no need for the Government to introduce legislation piecemeal. We recognize that you, Sir, have narrow guidelines when we are discussing these matters. However, on February 23, the Treasurer made his Ministerial announcement and listed this measure amongst others in his financial statement. As the member for Bragg has pointed out, we are discussing a revenue measure, but we are required (indeed, obliged), in view of what has gone on in the most recent discussion in this House, to restrict our discussion to the narrow gauge, as it were.

Mr. Coumbe: Hasn't it been said that we would have an opportunity to debate the matter?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, the Treasurer said we would have a full opportunity to debate this measure.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are having it now; you are on your feet.

Mr. RODDA: The Opposition has been thorough but it has not put the Government on ice. However, after what has happened this evening, the Government leaves us no alternative. We will remember that it was the Government Party that threw out our respected colleague. It was not because of what he was saying about this Bill, as he was linking up his remarks to it. He is not now in the precincts of this Chamber. Apparently, the Minister of Education does not like it: he has stood up for exercise.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are out of order.

Mr. RODDA: We are sliding downhill into bankruptcy and sucking the motorists of this State in a snide way.

Mr. Coumbe: You mean milking?

Mr. RODDA: No, I mean sucking. The cow is dry and the only way one can get anything out of a dry cow is to suck. I have qualifications in that matter.

Mr. Langley: What qualifications?

Mr. RODDA: Those of a dairyman. As I say, we are sliding downhill into bankruptcy, and there is not much farther to go. In the all-sweeping statement made by the Treasurer on that memorable occasion, he said that the increase in fees would be about 20 per cent. When we examine these figures, we see that the motor-cyclists (the young people who are trying to establish themselves in this community) are being slugged a 33½ per cent increase, and the truck operator is also required to pay a 30 per cent increase. What will people in Mount Gambier think of this when they receive a freight bill with an extra 30 per cent added to their charges? What will the people of Port Lincoln say when Western Hauliers Proprietary Limited passes on these added costs to them? The member for Eyre will have to justify these increases to the people he represents and he will have some unpleasant things to say about the Government. I do not blame the Minister for this legislation, as he is a member of Cabinet and must do what he is told.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the people in Port Augusta?

Mr. RODDA: The member for that area will be in trouble, too. Throughout the whole of this session members have been asked to debate in isolation fragmented legislation. When a Government comes into office with a majority such as that bestowed upon this Government by the people of this State, this is what happens, and it deserves the highest censure. The member for Heysen has paid his price for trying to link his remarks with the Bill, but I do not think it would be good for all members to emulate him.

Mr. Langley: When are you going to say something?

Mr. RODDA: I can just imagine what the people of Unley will think when they hear about this Bill.

Mr. Langley: Why don't you go out there and stand against me?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley must cease interjecting.

Mr. RODDA: The people who have so loyally supported the honourable member will have to pay \$39.40 instead of \$34 to register a Holden Kingswood car, and they cannot pass this added cost on.

Mr. Langley: And they can't afford it out there.

Mr. RODDA: Then what is the honourable member doing about it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually warn members about interjecting. The member for Victoria is speaking to the Bill, and I warn honourable members that, if they continue to interject, they will, irrespective of what side of the House they are on, be dealt with in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr. RODDA: This is indeed a snide way of raising revenue, especially when one considers that the high charges imposed on owners of commercial motor vehicles will be passed on. This legislation will do the very thing about which we have heard the Premier and his Ministers complaining for so long. They have in the past blamed the Commonwealth Government for its inflationary measures, yet they are doing exactly the same thing. The Minister and his colleagues, the architects of this legislation, deserve to be censured. It is a revenue-raising measure of the highest order, and Ned Kelly will never be dead when issues such as this are brought before us. No words of mine can be strong enough to castigate the Government for what it is doing. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, oppose the Bill. The Minister has said that this is a revenue-raising measure and that it has a

direct relationship to the Bill that we will be discussing later in the evening. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

As I said earlier, this Bill must be considered with the Bill to amend the Highways Act, since the additional revenue generated by this measure will, by virtue of that Act, flow to the Highways Fund.

The Minister has said that it is a Bill to raise revenue for the Government, and he has also said that it should be considered at the same time as another measure to come before us. I was one who accepted, when the Minister said that, that he would give us the opportunity to discuss, in this debate, parts of the other proposal, so I am disgusted with what happened this evening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's the point you are making?

Mr. EVANS: I think the Minister realizes my point.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I don't.

Mr. EVANS: The opportunity to discuss both matters together can be given only at this stage.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you reflecting on the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. EVANS: No, I am not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide that.

Mr. EVANS: I am only saying that the opportunity to discuss both matters together cannot be given when we are debating the other Bill, because a member may not refer to another speech made in the same session. In what area will this money be raised, and in what area will it be spent? Perhaps we can consider those matters later. In particular, what will be the effect of the increases upon the State? We have heard the member for Mawson say, in another debate, that he considers that the private motorist causes most of the traffic congestion in the city, yet in this Bill we let the private motorist off with an increase that is 13 per cent less than the increase in the commercial section of the transport industry, the people who operate trucks, whom we hit with a 30 per cent increase. We are attacking industry, when we should be trying to bring it to the State. Some members opposite have said that we should hit the motorist with taxation and deter him from coming into the metropolitan area, yet we let him off with an increase of only 17 per cent.

The Minister has said that the average increase is 20 per cent, but the road users in the commercial section have been hit with an

increase of 30 per cent, or 10 per cent more than the average increase. The Minister thinks that he can justify this. We have been told many times that the motor truck has been termed the unwelcome child of the Australian transport industry. Here is another example of a Government setting out to knock the truckies, and to force people to put their goods on to other forms of transport, particularly the railways. I should like to quote a statement made on Friday, May 2, 1969, by Mr. W. J. Holcroft regarding this type of proposal. On page 9 of his report he states:

How long can we stand by and see our manufacturing industries penalized with intra-state distribution costs which cripple their opportunity to expand home markets and compete in world markets? How long do we listen without action to the pleas for help from our rural industries who are burdened with rising costs of materials (farms are no longer labour intensive, but rely on plant and manufactured commodities) in a world of uncertain and declining price levels for farm produce? Where are we really tackling the problem of inflation when it is an indisputable fact that a very high proportion of the cost of moving a ton of most things by road within most States is really for the privilege of competing against State-owned rail services?

I consider those statements to be true. I commend the Minister for considering pensioners and physically handicapped persons, but what about the incapacitated rural industry? Did he say that perhaps it is wise to leave registrations as they are for persons in the rural industry? Did he give them that opportunity, at a time when they are facing a crisis? He did not. The contribution of members of rural industry has been increased at the same rate as that of others. At no time did the present Government consider rural industry. At no time has the Government considered that, in regard to this type of legislation, it would be desirable to leave primary producers' registration fees as they are. Although it had the opportunity to do this, not once did we hear a word or see a sign of any action in that regard.

I take it that passenger buses are involved, and I think of my own area, involving one part of my duties and, indeed, one of my direct responsibilities. People in my area find it too expensive to commute by private motor vehicle to the city. Indeed, the Government wants people to keep out of the metropolitan area, so that it will not have to build freeways. These people must travel, in the main, by private bus services and, having to commute to the city, their fares will be increased because

of the 30 per cent increase in registration fees. Has the Government considered these people? They are workers, the people whom the Government claims it represents. It does not represent them; it merely pleads with them to give it a vote; it hoodwinks these people and takes them down at every opportunity.

The Government knows that any direct charge such as this hits the worker the hardest. When it comes to getting money to promote its own facilities, the Government does not consider the worker. The Minister has said that this is a revenue-raising Bill, and the moneys obtained will help the Government implement certain of its policies. He said:

... since in this State net revenue from registration fees flows into the Highways Fund, and commercial vehicles account for relatively high road usage as well as, in the case of heavier vehicles, relatively higher road wear, it seems proper that these factors should be reflected in the comparative scale of charges.

I wonder whether the Minister has heard of petrol tax and road tax. Who pays the most in this field? Is not the commercial industry already hit hard enough? Does the Government consider that farmers have reached the stage where they will have to combine and buy one semi-trailer between perhaps four or five farmers in order to transport their goods, because they cannot afford to cart them by rail or by any other conventional method of transport? Does the Government not consider that the stage has been reached where this sort of tax will knock many people more than they have ever been knocked in the past? Does it not consider that this tax will break some primary producers? Does the Government consider that it should bleed many people to the last drop? Not once have we heard this Government say that it will cut down its expenditure to try to improve the economy. We have heard the Minister say that we are possibly short of funds and, every time he and his colleagues get the opportunity, they say that it is the Commonwealth Government's fault. They pass the buck in this regard. They say that more cannot be provided to local government because the Commonwealth Government will not provide the money. However, this Government has taken no action to cut down costs in any area. If it had, we would have been told about it in this Chamber.

Mr. Keneally: You wouldn't admit it if you were told.

Mr. EVANS: We might doubt it if we were told, but if it were proved we would

accept it. We have heard Government members, particularly Ministers, say that we should decentralize and encourage industry to establish among the rural communities. Transport is one of the biggest bugbears one has to face when trying to implement decentralization, as I do not think any member could deny. However, this Bill hits hardest the commercial vehicles. The State needs decentralization. We need to have industries 200 miles or 300 miles from the city to provide employment for people who cannot make a living on their farms or who may wish to work eight hours in a factory and then do another day's work on their farm as they try to survive on the land until there are better days. How can Government members align that situation with the fact that they are taxing the section of the community that serves country areas? Members opposite are silent.

Mr. Langley: We aren't allowed to interject.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. EVANS: I meant that there was silence except for the member for Unley, who is always interjecting. The Minister has said that the increased revenue will go directly into roadmaking, so I presume that some money will be spent on proposals under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. I could deal with that matter for some time. The Minister was a great supporter of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee. I wonder who put the thought in the minds of members of that committee in 1969 that there would be an increase in motor registration fees. The present Minister, who I suppose was the shadow Minister of Roads and Transport then, knew that this was a way in which he could gain revenue. He has not waited long before implementing this method, yet on many occasions in this House he has said that his Party is concerned with people and with the working man. Now he is slugging working people, particularly those in the country who need motor transport to commute to the city. Often such people must have a truck to deliver their goods, because the train does not deliver to their back door. In many cases, country people must purchase trucks to do their own deliveries. Such people are being hit hard by this Government.

I am most disappointed that the fee for commercial vehicles is to be increased by 10 per cent more than the average increase, and by 13 per cent more than the increase in the fee for a private motor car. I believe that,

if there has to be an increase (and I do not accept that there has to be), it should affect all sections of the community equally. At present the owner of a commercial vehicle is hit harder than are any other motorists, and no-one can deny that. I am disappointed that the Government has not been prepared to save money in its own area of administration and cut down a little on its expenses so that this type of legislation need not have been introduced in the foreseeable future. I am disgusted with the Government's attitude in introducing the Bill, which I could not possibly support.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the Bill. Opposition members who have concentrated on the Bill have said that they are disappointed that it should have been introduced. Government members, too, are concerned that this Bill had to be introduced. The Government would not normally introduce such a Bill, and it certainly does not give Government members any great pleasure. However, we must consider why it is necessary to increase registration fees. This increase is necessary to assist in overcoming the Budget deficit that faced the Government; before these taxation measures were announced, that deficit was running at the rate of about \$11,000,000 annually.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are not allowed to talk about that.

Mr. KENEALLY: This Bill has been introduced as a result of two factors: first, the increase in the wage structure in South Australia and, secondly, the miserly attitude of the Gorton Liberal Government towards the States.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. I want to hear the honourable member link his remarks with the precise details of the Bill. The honourable member has been indulging in irrelevancies, and he has been prolix and unnecessarily verbose.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Stuart must link his remarks with the Bill. The honourable member must abide by my ruling.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Opposition denied that the Commonwealth Government had been miserly in its attitude towards the States, and the member for Heysen went as far as to say that the Commonwealth Government had been very generous. If we investigated this—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. There is

nothing about the Commonwealth's generosity in this Bill. The member for Heysen has been suspended from the Chamber for referring to some of these matters yet the member for Stuart persists in continuing along these irrelevant lines. I seek your ruling on this matter.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Once again, I point out that the remarks of the honourable member for Stuart must be confined to the Bill. The honourable member will be out of order if he does not confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: The point I referred to has been mentioned by every other member who has spoken during the debate so far.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you mentioned why the member for Heysen was kicked out?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! No reference can be made to that matter.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, can I reply to some of the accusations and suggestions made by members opposite during this debate?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot refer to remarks made by other speakers if it was ruled that those remarks were not relevant to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Heysen suggested that the Government, rather than impose taxes on the motorist, should consider reducing expenditure in the public sector. Members opposite use this term "public sector" as a cover-up for what they actually mean. Whilst "reducing expenditure in the public sector" may not sound too bad (it may mislead some people), it means that we are required to reduce spending on schools and hospitals.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I seek your ruling. The honourable member is not confining himself to the details of this Bill. He is speaking in general budgetary terms in the same way as another member was doing who was asked to leave the Chamber.

The SPEAKER: I have just entered the Chamber, and I heard the member for Stuart referring to education. He is out of order and must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: I will try to do that, Sir, but in doing this I will be unique in this debate. Registration fees for motor vehicles have been increased to a figure comparable with those in other States. We do not suggest this as a justification for the increases having been made, but it proves that the charges are not inordinately high. The part of the Bill that has given me the greatest pleasure is the provision giving concessions to pensioners and

to physically incapacitated people who are already eligible for public transport concessions: 85 per cent of the new registration fee will be payable by these people. Honourable members will realize that this represents a reduction in the current registration fee that these people have to pay. This is a worthwhile provision, and I compliment the Minister for including it.

Mr. Nankivell: What Bill are you speaking to? There is nothing about that in this Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Fisher said that the Government was trying to cripple those engaged in the trucking business. He said that an increase in registration fees would clearly place a charge on people using this service. If this argument were valid, trucking businesses in other States would now be non-existent, because the registration fees in other States are already much higher than they are in South Australia. However, there are thriving trucking businesses in other States. Obviously, the point raised by the member for Fisher is entirely irrelevant. Do Opposition members suggest that motorists who crowd our roads, causing accidents and killing themselves and other road users, have no responsibility to provide moneys for safety devices that will certainly react in their favour and so save people from accidents? The present Opposition has not had a good record in road safety expenditure. It did not provide sufficient funds for the Road Safety Council, and now it is bickering about the possibility that the funds raised from increased registration fees on motor vehicles may be siphoned off (they were the words used by the Leader) to provide safety devices. This is an entirely dishonourable attitude for Opposition members to take. I know they do not mean this, but that is what they are saying.

I know that Opposition members share with Government members a deep concern about road safety in this State and would support any move to improve it. Provisions of this Bill are one way of doing this, and I am sure that Opposition members will support them. I have been instructed by you, Sir, and by the Acting Deputy Speaker, to confine my remarks to the Bill, and I have found myself in the same position as that of other members. Another Bill will be before the House on which I may be able to expand my remarks. I should like to have been able to put to the House that the Government has found it necessary to increase registration fees because the State now faces a Budget deficit.

Members opposite have criticized this Government for suggesting that the Commonwealth Government has a part to play in this matter. However, they must realize that, if they want facilities to be provided in the future at the rate at which they are being provided now by this Government, money must be obtained from somewhere. They should consider, too, the policy of the recent Commonwealth Government under Prime Minister Gorton of not giving the States sufficient finance to cover their expenditures. This aspect has been raised by the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and Queensland as well as by the recently deposed Premier of Western Australia.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Sir, and in view of what has happened tonight, these remarks are not connected to the Bill. The honourable member is talking purely for the sake of dropping baits about which he hopes Opposition members will complain. He knows very well that this debate is being conducted within narrow limits, so narrow, indeed, that you, Sir, have ruled against a member on this side of the House. Despite this, the honourable member continues to speak of the revenue that will be derived under the Bill.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That the member for Stuart is not speaking to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: Although Government members share the Opposition's concern about this Bill, we are at the same time practical and realize that it is necessary. This Government does not want to raise revenue in this way, and it realizes that any taxation measure such as the one before us is ultimately paid for by the workers. We are concerned about this and do not introduce legislation such as this lightly, and it does the Opposition no good to suggest that we do. Members opposite are within their rights to criticize and, if they were to address themselves to the Bill as did the member for Fisher, their criticism might then be valid. However, in opposing the Bill, members opposite have given a variety of stories and reasons for their stand, few or which have been relevant. Knowing that this measure has been forced on the Government, I reluctantly support the Bill. I hope to be able to further my remarks when the House is debating another Bill later.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat said how practical are members of the Opposition. I wonder whether the people he represents, as well as other people in South Australia, will believe that this is a practical solution to the problems facing this State, especially when its effects become apparent to the breadwinners because of the effect it will have on the cost of living index. The resultant increased transportation costs must affect the prices of various commodities. More particularly, being a youthful member, I point out that the youth of the community are asked to bear the increased costs not only in respect of motor vehicles that they use to commute to work and for other purposes but in respect of the rather larger increase in the registration fees on motor cycles. The honourable member's attempt (and it was an unsuccessful attempt) to justify his and his Government's claims about the Bill will, I suggest, not be acceptable to the public. I should like now to point out that here again we have a Bill introduced with an obvious disparity between the song that the Treasurer sings to the tune and the song that the Minister of Roads and Transport sings to the tune. The Treasurer has stated:

An increase of 20 per cent in the registration fees of motor vehicles . . .

There are other words associated with that phrase, but nowhere do we find the situation that was outlined yesterday by the Minister, when he stated:

The general level of increase of fees now proposed has been set so as to increase the revenue yield by 20 per cent overall.

Suddenly we get a new version, a new aspect of it. The increase will be 20 per cent overall, but it will not be 20 per cent as stated by the Treasurer. Is this another attempt by the Minister to show who is the boss in the Party opposite, another attempt by the Minister who was not permitted to commission Dr. Breuning? This is the Minister who showed his power on the occasion of the appointment to the tenth position in the Ministry—

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that at least three remarks in the last three sentences spoken by the honourable member have nothing to do with the Highways Act Amendment Bill. The elevation of the tenth Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the tenth Minister or any other Minister



in this Bill, and I ask the honourable member for Light to speak to the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I also point out, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that the measure I am speaking to has nothing to do with the Highways Act Amendment Bill. I happen to be speaking to the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, which has nothing to do with the Bill to which the member for Playford has referred. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

Thus, the increase for what might be called private or light motor vehicles, with the exception of motor cycles and trucks, has been held to about 17 per cent, while the increase for what might generally be described as commercial motor vehicles has been fixed at up to 30 per cent.

Already, since this matter was placed before members, we have received information that there is to be, in one area, an increase of 50 per cent and, in another area, an increase of 100 per cent. That is certainly not within the limitations of up to 30 per cent stated by the Minister in his second reading explanation. I believe that every member has a high regard for the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated, which has expressed grave fears about these proposals. I agree with the association that there will be "an erosion of the well structured road-making provisions that have existed for almost 50 years". I see in this measure a step towards the possible diversion of vital funds that should continue to be devoted totally to highways. I wonder whether these additional funds, which we know are necessary—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's an admission.

Dr. EASTICK: I know that they are necessary but, if the Minister cares to wait until I have completed my remarks, I will accept his same comment then. These funds will help the Government extricate itself from the mismanagement in which it has become so involved in so short a time. The Minister is silent now.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I'll wait until the correct time, when I reply.

Dr. EASTICK: It is strange to have to wait; I thought a comment would be made immediately.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is not replying at this stage.

Dr. EASTICK: In its letter distributed to all members, the R.A.A. council sees "a need for road expenditures to increase, and therefore does not oppose modest increases to meet inflationary trends, provided that the revenues are properly and faithfully applied

to legitimate road requirements". I wholeheartedly support that proposal, but I will not support a Bill that is aimed at fostering the Government's mismanagement of State funds.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, oppose the Bill, for I am greatly concerned about the effect it will have on people engaged in rural industry in this State who depend on motor vehicles for their livelihood. An increase of 30 per cent in commercial vehicle registration fees will have a detrimental effect on rural industry, which cannot afford any more increases. Members opposite, especially the member for Unley, have shown this evening a total disregard for the plight of the man on the land.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has not spoken this evening.

Mr. GUNN: With great respect, he has had much to say by way of interjection, although I realize he has been out of order. This measure, which will increase motor vehicle taxation, can be described only as a slur on country people, especially the farming community. The average farmer has three vehicles, including a five-ton truck, a motor utility of some description (whether it be a four-wheel drive vehicle or an ordinary light vehicle), and a motor car. That would often be the minimum number of vehicles. In many cases, a farmer has two trucks but the fact that he may have two or three vehicles does not mean that he is in a sound financial position. Motor transport is a necessity in farming operations. Members opposite would have no appreciation of the problems facing country people. The Government takes funds from the Highways Department and diverts them—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has the call. There are too many interjections from too many self-appointed would-be Speakers. I ask the honourable member for Eyre to ignore completely the assistance some members are apparently trying to give him.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned about the effect this measure will have on people who depend on road transport, as many country people do. People receiving lower incomes will have to meet these increased costs. At present, most farmers are in the low-income bracket, so this measure will affect them detrimentally. In many cases, farmers pay large sums in interest, and they will have to pay extra interest so that they can meet this increase in motor vehicle charges. People

living in outback areas, such as Coober Pedy, depend entirely on motor transport for the carriage of their goods. They pay an enormous sum in freight charges to receive normal commodities that are required for everyday living, and they will be penalized by the Government's action. The only reason we have this Bill before the House is that the Government has failed to administer the State capably and is guilty of sheer mismanagement. This Socialist Government is totally incompetent. This proves once again that trade unionists cannot administer the State properly.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): As the Minister stated in his second reading explanation, the Bill relates to the raising of certain additional revenue. He has said that it will increase the revenue yield by 20 per cent overall. The Auditor-General's Report, referring to the Highways Department, states that, in 1969-70, \$13,400,000 was received from motor vehicle registration fees and incidental expenses. Therefore, if the Bill is to raise 20 per cent additional revenue, about \$2,700,000 will be raised. The principle in the Bill is new in this Parliament. Since I have been a member, we have seldom, if ever, had an opportunity to debate anything in respect of the Highways Fund. The money to be collected in increased fees will be paid into that fund. By Statute, we do not have any say in how that money, once it is appropriated, will be spent, for it is paid directly into that fund and comes under the control of the Commissioner of Highways.

This is the first time that principle has been changed. The Minister nods his head. Undoubtedly he will talk about the use of the money for bridges and about the fact that Loan moneys were previously required for certain purposes. However, a new principle is involved here, and the Minister can explain where the old principle has been departed from in the past. As the Royal Automobile Association has pointed out, we are starting a principle that could lead to the gradual erosion of funds that in the past have been specifically collected for road purposes, and they are being transferred into general highways funds.

Mr. Ryan: What clause are you dealing with?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The increase in fees will increase the revenue yield by 20 per cent overall.

Mr. Ryan: What clause is that in?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is in the Minister's second reading explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I presume that I am entitled to refer to the Minister's second reading explanation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is entitled to speak to the Bill. The Speaker will tell the honourable member when he is departing from the Bill. Interjections are out of order and I ask the honourable member to ignore them.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It appears that it is intended to collect \$2,700,000, which will be appropriated to a fund. The Minister says it will be appropriated for the provision and operation of a ferry service to Kangaroo Island, amongst other things. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

This Bill must be considered with the Bill to amend the Highways Act, since the additional revenue generated by this measure will, by virtue of that Act, flow to the Highways Fund.

I suggest that the sum that is to flow to the Highways Fund is considerable. It is to be spent for certain purposes, but I will not refer to them now; I will have to wait until the next Bill is dealt with. This sum is not being appropriated for the purposes that this sort of tax has been used for in the past. To use an expression used by the member for Stuart, the working man will pay it; he will pay it both directly and indirectly. There is no question that the people who can pass on costs will incorporate this tax in their charges, as the member for Unley would know. We have been challenged to say something on this matter. This is precisely what will happen in connection with road transport.

Like other country members, I am concerned about what is happening to road transport in the country. There are developments in the country (I cannot refer to them, because one of my colleagues who did so was ruled out of order) that are depriving people of alternative services to road transport. Figures quoted in evidence are based on the assumption of the present cost to the carrier. When the carrier has to bear these additional costs he will automatically pass them on. Not only is this a direct cost to people registering motor vehicles but also it will be an indirect cost to people who use carriers for hire. Consequently, I am concerned that this measure will create an added impost on people who have to cart their goods to sell at a market.

My colleague, the member for Eyre, pointed out the position in his district, which is a

large district and which depends on road transport. The member for Goyder knows what this may mean to the people of his district who depend entirely on road transport, and I have no doubt what it will mean to certain people in my district who will be carting their produce farther than they do at present. Because I disapprove of the principle of this Bill (the amount being appropriated is a matter for debate on another Bill on which I will speak, too) in that it will add to the costs of people who will not be able to pass on the added costs, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Whenever a tax measure is introduced the people object, and I believe that when there is an increase in the registration fee of motor vehicles, as provided by this Bill, people are not pleased with the increase. I am one of those who will not be pleased, because I have to pay increased registration fees. I take this as an impost on the motorists of the State because, at present, we cannot balance the State Budget. For this reason we have to introduce measures by which we can raise income within the State. The Highways Fund and other funds that will benefit by the provisions of this Bill are unable to receive additional moneys from the State, because of the financial position of the State. It is a great pity that the Government, after 17 years, has decided to levy motorists.

South Australia depends on the motor car industry, but for many years it has had a poor public transport system. Therefore, as most people must have a motor vehicle, the Government knew that it was on a winner when it decided to increase registration fees for motor vehicles, because most families in the community would have to pay something. This tax cannot be avoided, and this is the crux of the whole issue. The Government has hit on something that previous Liberal Governments and a previous Labor Government did not touch—registration fees of motor vehicles. Because of the incompetent handling of the State Budget by the Treasurer, we are paying this impost. It is a shame and a pity, and a sad day for the motorists of this State and a sadder day for those who manufacture motor cars.

These things come, and most of those who will have to pay voted for this Government, but they will have another choice within a few years. It is a pity that the increase in registration fees for motor vehicles was not foreshadowed before the last election: this

is the first time we have not heard the cry, "We have a mandate to do this." However, these things happen, and we are now faced with this situation. I do not like certain clauses of the Bill, one of which provides for a steep increase in the registration fees of trucks weighing five tons or more. As the member for Eyre said, this will place an additional impost on farmers, the poor old members of the rural community, as there is no chance of their being able to pass on these costs to anyone else. It is high time, therefore, that we considered further concessions for those in the rural sector.

Another important point is that this State depends on the importation of much of its daily food from other States. Semi-trailer operators are to be hit with higher registration fees once more, and no-one can expect them to absorb these increases. This means that food costs will rise even more, and the cost of living index will increase. It is a pity that the Government did not try to attract some of these manufactures to establish their plants in South Australia, thereby lowering the cost of living here.

The Bill also deals with the registration of motor cycles. All members know that the youth of this country, being the daredevils that they are and loving to travel at speed, like their motor cycles. However, why should this section of the community be levied with a higher registration fee? I presume that the provision relating to motor cycles also covers motor scooters. As members well know, many people who attend university, high schools and other types of educational institution and who travel by motor scooters and motor cycles earn only enough during their vacations to enable them to attend these institutions. Why, then, should we levy them with additional registration fees for their motor scooters and motor cycles? The Government has adopted a poor attitude in this respect.

Clause 5 deals with registration fees for certain pensioners. Much has been said and written regarding the plight of pensioners in our community. I do not doubt that people who have worked a lifetime, particularly those who are receiving the pension today, have contributed much to the community. Despite this, the Bill gives these people only a 15 per cent reduction in registration fees. This reduction applies only to those persons who qualify under the Commonwealth Act for a pension, but what about people who are on fixed incomes under State superannuation funds? Nothing has been said of these people,

who are really worse off than anyone else in the community. How would honourable members opposite like to contribute to a super-annuation fund for 45 years—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about superannuation in the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: Thank you, Sir. I am merely trying to link up my remarks with the Bill, which provides for a 15 per cent reduction in registration fees for pensioners. I believe a similar provision should be included in relation to persons under State super-annuation funds. All in all, this is not a good Bill. It is not a Bill that we can really enlarge on or delve into too deeply regarding its implications. The Opposition members are hamstrung, because we are unable to refer to certain provisions in the Bill. As a motorist and a member of the Opposition, I consider it important to register a protest against the Bill. As the member for Light has said, he has received a circular letter from the Royal Automobile Association, as have other members, and I consider it important that what the association has said should be incorporated in *Hansard*. I commend the association, because the letter is dated March 17 and was received by members yesterday, so the association has not wasted any time in giving us its views. The association states:

My council has directed that I inform you of the attitude of this association to the Highways Act Amendment Bill currently before Parliament. As set out in detail in the accompanying statement, the Highways Fund was set up in 1926 to direct State . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is reading a letter pertaining to a Bill that is not under discussion. He must speak to the Bill before the House. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. BECKER: I will not pursue that, in view of the comments that have been made by the member for Light. I simply repeat that, as a private motorist and a member of the Opposition, I consider that someone should strongly oppose the Bill and the increase in registration fees, and I have pleasure in doing that.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill. Being a country member, of course, I consider it from the point of view of a country member and of how it affects our rural community. As has been said, these increases will have a considerable effect on decentralization and such matters. It is not necessary for me to go into detail to remind the House of the plight of the primary producer at present. As members know, the

average increase in registration fees is 20 per cent, and the registration fees on trucks that transport our grain to silos will be increased considerably.

At present the cost to the primary producer of getting his commodity to the point of shipment is so vital that, as the Minister has stated today, unfortunately, the primary producer is using road transport instead of the much more expensive railway system. We know that rail freight charges will increase further, so it will be necessary for the primary producer to continue to use his present means of conveyance. We have also been reminded this evening that farmers have two or three vehicles.

We must realize that the standard of living in country areas, as in other parts of the State, has improved over a period of years, and a farmer would only have the minimum if he had a truck, a car and a utility. If he has some sons, they also would have vehicles. This is the mode of living today and, if we take these facilities away from these people, the standard of living in the country will be considerably lower than it is in other parts of the State. Why should this be so? Some people are willing to stick to primary industry, and members know that a young man working a property today has only a reasonable income, yet we are increasing his costs by way of registration fees.

Usually, people do not mind a normal increase in taxes, for they consider that it is an investment and that it is money invariably well spent. However, in this case we are dealing with an increase that will have severe effects. Generally, people consider that money spent on roads is not money spent, but money made and that they benefit by having an improved road system. However, this form of tax is new to a large degree. I think the Labor Party, when it was previously in office, departed slightly in regard to the use of moneys derived from road maintenance charges, as well as in regard to its guarantee to the City Council in respect of the Morphett Street bridge. We find that this legislation is similar, inasmuch as it departs from the normal situation. Reference has been made to registration fees in other States: I think the member for Stuart would have done well to undertake more homework in regard to the road maintenance charges and registration fees, as well as fees in connection with vehicle weights, etc., levied in other States.

I know that this impost will not be well received in country areas. This Government

has little sympathy for the man on the land, for it receives no votes from him. At the last election, my opponent distributed a card that stated, "If you need help, call me." Rural areas need help, but I am afraid that this impost will make the task of country people more difficult than ever. Certain members on this side have said that the impost will hit some of our younger people severely, and this could be so although, on the other hand, it may not have such a detrimental effect on them, for young people's wages today are fairly high, and it is only reasonable that they should make some contribution to the general running of the State. However, the Labor Party knows only too well that people in rural industry rely on markets in the Eastern States.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about markets.

Mr. VENNING: I want to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must resume his seat when the Speaker rises. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill, and there is nothing in the measure about markets. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Linking up my remarks to the proposal to increase registration fees in connection with motor transport, including trucks, etc., I point out that the Treasurer has often said that South Australia depends for its markets on the Eastern States, but increased costs of transporting our goods to markets in the Eastern States will affect those markets. An increase of 30 per cent or 40 per cent in the registration fees on large vehicles will have a drastic effect on the costs of competing with the Eastern States. I oppose this legislation, because it represents a departure from the normal situation in that money will be spent for purposes other than those originally intended. The money obtained here will go into general revenue and will be pushed around by this Government which, although the finances were sound when it came into office, has already got into trouble. Indeed, the Government has deemed it necessary to introduce this legislation to help it out of its trouble. This measure will serve only temporarily, and then the Government will have to find something else. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I, too, oppose the Bill, having good reasons for doing so. As the member for Mallee has said, I represent a community made up of people who depend entirely on motor transport. If people want to move around my area or out of it, they have to use a motor car. Goods must be

transported in commercial motor vehicles. The increased fee in respect of these vehicles will be an imposition to be borne by the people in this area. Road hauliers in my district have willingly paid motor registration fees because they have known that the total sum paid in fees is used in constructing roads. As they had no alternative but to use the roads, they reasonably expected to pay fees for this service.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They got good roads, too.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, they have good roads and good representation; as they have good representation, they naturally get good roads. When these people realize that the total sum of money collected by way of registration fees will not be used in constructing roads, they will resent having to pay the increased fee. The member for Mallee said that the increased fees to be paid by road hauliers would be passed on to the community. However, I doubt whether they can pass on this charge without there being an investigation, as I believe that their charges are under the jurisdiction of the Prices Commissioner. Therefore, before they can increase their charges as a result of the higher registration fee, there will have to be an investigation. In view of their small margin of profit, it would be absolutely necessary for road hauliers to apply to increase their charges.

I realize that the debate is restricted and that I cannot refer to certain matters. However, I am sure that you, Sir, will allow me to say that, if the increase in registration fees had been introduced so that the road maintenance tax could be removed, I could consider supporting the Bill. I believe everyone in the State would agree that it would be far fairer to raise money to maintain the roads by way of registration fees than to raise it by imposing a road maintenance tax. I know that many councils throughout the State are fearful that Government road grants will be considerably reduced in the next financial year.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That has already happened.

Mr. FERGUSON: It is ironic that increased registration fees should be charged and that the total amount raised will not be used for road construction. The increase in registration fees should enable the Highways Department to maintain the road grants that have applied in the past. I oppose the increase in registration fees because it will be a severe impost on the general public as well as on the people I represent.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I hope we can get back to the Bill now that we have gone all round the paddock. Members have talked about many things that do not relate to the Bill. I wish to reply to some of the spurious charges that have been levelled at the Government in connection with this Bill. First, I wish to refer to the remarks of the member for Hanson.

Mr. Venning: He made a good speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already contributed to the debate. I ask the Minister to reply to the debate and to ignore interjections.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson said that the increase in registration fees was not mentioned by the Labor Party prior to the last election and that the Government therefore did not have a mandate for the Bill. I agree that we did not mention this matter prior to the last election, but we did say that we would govern responsibly. I appreciate the mirth of members opposite, because they do not understand what the term "responsibility" means. In view of the situation that faced this State, the Treasurer had no alternative but to cut services or increase charges. We chose to increase charges, and the increases in registration fees fall into that category. The member for Hanson made some other rather startling statements. For instance, he said that the increase in registration fees on semi-trailers would be such that it would result in an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. Venning: That would be true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Does the honourable member know that owners of semi-trailers registered in South Australia pay the grand sum of \$2 a year and that owners of interstate semi-trailers pay nothing? What will that add to South Australia's cost of living? Members opposite should get their facts straight before they start criticizing the Government. It is just like the argument about hitting the farmer. Not one Opposition member told the House that the farmer continues to get a 50 per cent rebate. If members perused my second reading explanation they would find that the increase was about \$5 or \$7 a year. While we are putting this impost on the city man, we are also putting an impost of about \$3.50 on the country man. Is this hitting him? Opposition members whinged, but most of them were off-key. If I have to correct them and they do not like it, that is their bad luck. I do not mind members opposite

whingeing if they get their facts correct, but I do not like them telling untruths, as did the member for Hanson, who spoke of the cost of living being increased by this extra levy on semi-trailers. Many crocodile tears were shed by Opposition members who sympathized with young people and students at the universities who would have to pay an extra 33½ per cent to register motor cycles. How many Opposition members took the trouble to find out what the impost was? How many of them know what the existing registration fee is for a motor cycle? It seems that only one out of 20 knows that it is \$4.50. The fee will be increased to \$5.90 on average. This is the amount about which Opposition members are shedding buckets and buckets of crocodile tears. I do not think the member for Alexandra would complain about the increase: after 17 years it is \$1.40 a year.

The member for Rocky River showed that he had not done his homework (although he accused the member for Stuart of not doing his) when he said how much harder the people of South Australia were to be hit with motor taxation and road maintenance contributions than were the people in other States. The honourable member and others may be interested (as may be the member for Bragg, who had some fairly caustic comments to make) in the average total cost a vehicle in other States. In New South Wales the cost is \$43.89 a year; in Victoria, it is \$48.04; in Queensland, \$45.23; in Western Australia, \$45.66; in Tasmania, \$37.72. In South Australia, the cost is \$38.70. I leave the House to decide who did their homework, and I suggest that the member for Stuart did far more than did the member for Rocky River. It has been suggested that the Bill will not be acceptable to the public. However, only time will tell whether that is so. I know that members opposite will do their best to ensure that it is not acceptable to the public; that is their right.

Mr. Rodda: We represent a district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is right. However, this Government represents 52 per cent of the people of South Australia, not just one little section in one area or another. The Government is legislating not just in the interests of a small group of people in one district but in the interests of all the people of South Australia.

Mr. Rodda: You are hitting the people of Booleroo Centre.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government is not hitting anyone.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has been stated that the Bill reduces by 15 per cent the registration fees payable by pensioners. The member for Hanson criticized the Government for not providing a rebate for persons on fixed incomes, such as persons receiving payments under State superannuation schemes. I ask the member for Hanson and any other member what reduction was ever offered even to pensioners by the former Liberal Governments of this State. What provision was ever made for superannuitants who had to pay \$2 stamp duty, from which pensioners are exempt?

Mr. Coumbe: It was before his time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then he is criticising the Leader of the Opposition for something he did when Premier; I do not blame him for that. One could deal with many other matters. However, so much drivel was spoken in the debate that it is not worth my wasting the time of this House answering the points raised. There were many occasions on which you, Sir, and the Acting Deputy Speaker had difficulty confining members to the Bill. In view of your persistent efforts to keep members within the confines of the Bill, I certainly do not intend to transgress Standing Orders by answering any of the unjust criticisms which were made but which were not relevant to the Bill. The Bill provides something that is necessary for South Australia; it is a just distribution of the added taxation that the Government determined was desirable and necessary to maintain services in this State and, if members complain, as the Leader did, that I have not produced some comprehensive list—

Mr. Venning: That is true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member or any other member indicates to me the existing registration fee for any vehicle on which he desires to know this, I will volunteer (to save them the trouble and the brain fag) to work out what the added percentage will be. I commend the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curran, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Kenneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Fer-

guson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. King and Lawn. Noes—Mrs. Steele and Mr. Wardle.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Registration fees."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I move:

In new section 29 (2) to strike out "or (9)" and insert ", (9), (10) or (11)".

This clause repeals section 29 of the principal Act and inserts a new section in lieu thereof. Regrettably, subsections (10) and (11) were omitted, and this amendment merely alters the drafting to allow those subsections to be inserted.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new subsections:

(10) If a motor vehicle has all or any of its wheels fitted with rubber tyres other than pneumatic tyres the fee shall be one and a half times the amount which would otherwise be payable under this section.

If a motor vehicle has all or any of its wheels fitted with metal tyres the fee shall be twice the amount which would otherwise be payable under this section.

(11) The fees previously set out in this section are those payable for registration for twelve months. The fee for registration for six months shall be fifty-two and a half per cent of that payable for registration for twelve months.

If members opposite wish to oppose this amendment, there will be no provision for the payment of six-monthly registration fees.

Amendment carried.

Mr. EVANS: I believe that the increases provided should have been more uniform: say, 20 per cent throughout. Although interstate operators do not register their vehicles here for the purpose of their interstate operations, many of these people operate within the State, for they must deliver their goods from the main delivery unit within the State, and the vehicles used for this purpose are subject to these increases. I oppose an increased tax on the motorist, and particularly the commercial operator, in whose case the increase is greater. I cannot see the justification for a 30 per cent increase in respect of certain vehicles and less than a 20 per cent increase in respect of others to make a 20 per cent average increase.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member completely misunderstands what the Treasurer said when he made

the announcement on February 23. First, he indicated what would happen in various fields, and then he said that the increase in motor registration fees would be an average of about 20 per cent, indicating that the Government's purpose would be to obtain an increase of about 20 per cent overall. At no stage has it been suggested that there would be a 20 per cent increase across the board, as the honourable member now suggests there should be and that is completely inconsistent with what he said previously in accusing the Government of hitting the worker. Members should appreciate why the Government, in altering these registration fees, decided to rectify a mistake of many years standing. For a 7½-ton semi-trailer, the registration fees are as follows: New South Wales, \$288; Victoria, \$297; Queensland, \$208.60; Western Australia, \$286; Tasmania, \$264.52; and South Australia, \$202. Surely these figures justify equalizing the imposition of motor registration fees equitably over the whole field. We believe that we have acted in the interests of all people.

Mr. RODDA: I hope the Minister realizes that these increases will make South Australia, which is now a low-cost State, a high-cost State, because these costs will be passed on. The Government is now doing what it has castigated the Commonwealth Government for doing. Not only the worker but everyone will be affected by the flow-on from this increase in the registration fees for commercial motor vehicles.

Mr. EVANS: As usual, the Minister of Roads and Transport put his own interpretation on other people's words. I did not say at any time that the Treasurer said the increase would be 20 per cent; I did not even refer to any statement by the Treasurer. I said that my opinion was that, if there was to be an increase, it should be a 20 per cent increase on all; that would be better than separating vehicles into categories and saying that one category should pay a 30 per cent increase and another category should pay an increase of less than 20 per cent. We have all learnt not to place much reliance on any statement the Treasurer makes on any matter.

The Minister also referred to workers. I said that I completely opposed the Bill; that established, I had no possibility of having it defeated. I then chose to look at the actions of the Labor Government, which says it helps the worker. I challenged the Government on its double standards, because it was imposing a tax that would affect the worker overall. That is why I took that line.

I do not support the increase made under this clause. I particularly object to the rather large increase on the commercial section and the very moderate increase on the private section. The average working man will be affected by the cost of distributing goods. Regarding what the interstate haulier has to pay, let us consider what advantages we had in this State through having a low-cost structure. The Minister will eventually slow down this State by the type of charge imposed under this clause. The Government argues that the increases in registration fees will bring them into line with those in the Eastern States. What we are doing is increasing our costs to the level of those in the Eastern States. Eventually industry will be forced out of South Australia if this goes on. What incentive is there for industry to stay here if we continue to increase costs?

The Minister of Roads and Transport quoted figures for intrastate vehicles; he said that they did not have to pay a high fee. The cost of distributing goods from the factory to the warehouse is an intrastate cost, not an interstate cost, but, if the vehicle is used for both purposes, the owner must pay the full registration rate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What sort of annual turnover would you expect to apply to one of these vehicles?

Mr. EVANS: It would be a lot less if the present Government had its way and forced these people to use railway services, and that is why this legislation is being introduced. I invite the Minister of Roads and Transport to give the cost of private motor vehicle registrations in other States and say whether they are the same or slightly more than the figures for this State. The Minister has not done this: there may not be a wide variation but there is a difference, and the other States' figures are slightly higher. The Minister chose to use the figures that suited his argument.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is untrue.

Mr. EVANS: Although the Minister said I did so, I did not contradict my arguments, because I opposed the Bill. I realized that this measure could not be defeated so I had to consider its other aspects.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister attacked me and said that I had stated that the cost of living would increase because of these extra fees. Semi-trailer operators, especially those operating within this State, will have to pay increased fees no matter what area of the State



they operate in, and these fees will add to the freight costs, particularly in respect of perishable goods. The Minister said that the increased fee for motor cycles (and I presume this includes motor scooters) was only 80c. To students that is important, because they have to work during the Christmas holidays to pay for fees and books. Any increase is an imposition on them. I register a further protest at the increased fees, which will affect all sections of the community and, most importantly, the rural sector, which can ill afford any increased fees.

Mr. VENNING: Our rural areas cannot stand any further increases in costs at present. If the money were spent on roads in our country areas there would be some benefit but, with our rural industries battling to survive, the country people will be hostile when they realize what impact this legislation will have on them. I oppose the clause.

Mr. GUNN: I, too, oppose the clause, which will place an additional burden on the rural industry. It would not be so bad if the money so raised were to be used to the advantage of the rural industry, but this is not the case, as transport operators will pass on their added costs to the farmers. I therefore oppose the clause, as it will adversely affect my constituents more than it will those of any other member.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Enactment of sections 38a and 38b of principal Act."

Mr. HALL: I draw the Committee's attention to the concession provided for pensioners by the previous Government, when the stamp duty was imposed on third party insurance policies.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are out of order in doing so.

Mr. HALL: Not really, because it is a similar concession.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): I cannot accept references to other legislation, The Leader must confine his remarks to the clause.

Mr. HALL: The clause deals with registration fees for certain pensioners, and I make the point that this follows a precedent set by previous Governments. I remind the Committee that the Minister was once again wrong in another statement when he said earlier this evening that no previous concessions had been made by the Liberal Government.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow references to the second reading

debate. The Leader must confine his remarks to the clause.

Mr. HALL: I have made my point, and it is unnecessary for me to lead the Minister by the hand any more.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments; Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I move:

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

This Bill is necessary and I regret the narrow attitude that some members have taken on it. It is necessary for the State and for the people as a whole. We have introduced something that has never applied to motor vehicle registration fees previously, because we are providing a rebate for pensioners. That is something that no Government, including the previous one, has done.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 16. Page 4075.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This debate gives me the opportunity to complain briefly of the destination of the funds we have been speaking of collecting. I know that the member for Alexandra has a special interest in this Bill, but I wish to say that I oppose this diversion of funds from the Highways Fund, which is being made for the first time. It is a sign of a decadent Administration that is running into serious administrative troubles in financial aspects. The Government is looking for means of raising revenue other than the traditional taxation means whereby the community is expected to sustain the services for which it asks and which are provided for it. The Government is going outside into another service to milk it so as to provide funds for what the Government wants to do in other directions.

This is being done, as I think I have said elsewhere, in the face of largely increased funds available to this Government this year to the extent of nearly \$19,000,000 in increased funds from the Commonwealth Government, plus an amount of \$5,000,000 from the Grants Commission and about \$5,000,000 from additional taxation. Despite this, the Government considers it necessary to milk the Highways Fund in this way.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): This Bill has two objectives, as the Minister

has set out. Referring to the second one in his explanation of the Bill, the Minister states:

New paragraph (n) will make available from the Highways Fund such moneys as are appropriated by Parliament for the provision and operation of a ferry service to Kangaroo Island. Clause 2, on the other hand, provides an additional source of payments into the Highways Fund, and this is, in effect, the revenue that may be expected to be derived from the operation of the proposed ferry service.

The fact that the Highways Fund is now to be used for the provision of a road link to Kangaroo Island is, in my opinion, logical, and I support the Minister's view in this respect. I consider it just as logical as it would be to pay for a bridge with money from the Highways Fund, if that were practicable. That is as logical as paying for the cost of a ferry across a wide river. Therefore, to my mind the linking of the people of Kangaroo Island to the mainland, in a way that will be unique in South Australia, is to be commended. I support the Minister in this respect and, in spite of some criticism (I recognize the project has been criticized), I believe that the people of South Australia have generally recognized that Kangaroo Island is an important part of the State, having a population of about 3,500. They recognize, too, the island's growing potential as a tourist resort, and its other features are well known to the community.

I have no doubt that the community itself wants to see the island linked to the mainland in this way. It is perhaps relevant at this stage to point out that the disabilities suffered by primary producers in general throughout the State and the Commonwealth, well known as they are, are greatly increased on Kangaroo Island because of the lack of cheap and easy transport between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. After the island was settled (it was settled before the site of Adelaide was chosen), it was under a severe disability and, until about 1947, the island had a relatively static population. People on the island, who had to put up with the disability, made their living from growing grain, the movement of which suffered less disability than did the movement of livestock. There was also fishing and the tourist industry, and so on.

After the war service land settlement scheme was commenced, I think the population doubled within about 10 years, but it has not increased so fast since then, and it is now about 3,500. The transport service at the time that this huge increase in activity was commenced was provided mainly by the *Karatta* and, in general, by the Adelaide

Steamship Company. I think the *Karatta* commenced operations in 1907 and continued until about 1960 or 1961. This ship provided over a half a century of service and, incidentally, after the 50th anniversary of its service it broke its own speed record to the island. However, this service involved wharfside loading and wellknown disabilities of inconvenience and high costs.

Then came the roll-on-roll-off ship, the *Troubridge*, which the Adelaide Steamship Company provided to service both Port Lincoln and Kingscote. However, this service has been a commercial failure. I think it is fair to point out that the company took some big risks involving heavy investments and that, having found that it would not work, the company, instead of casually abandoning the service, gave the Government a chance to intervene before the service was closed. The present service has been spoilt by the uneconomic operation, particularly to Port Lincoln. I think it is well to remind members that we have some responsibility in this regard. The Public Works Committee investigated the project and recommended three expensive ferry terminals at Port Lincoln, Kingscote and Port Adelaide. We are careful to examine projects such as this through our Parliamentary committees. In the light of subsequent events, we must say that in the case of this project not only private enterprise but also the Legislature made a mistake. The Government of that time, of which I was a member, was informed by the steamship company that the service was losing money heavily and that something would have to be done about it.

Having made that point to the Government, the company was asked to maintain the service for a certain time. This Parliament then provided a subsidy in return for which the company agreed to keep the service running until June, 1972. In the meantime, the Government would have the chance to see what next could be done. That Government then set up a committee, comprising Mr. E. M. Schroder (Chairman), and Messrs. Tom Shanahan and Des Byrne, which investigated the Port Lincoln and Kangaroo Island services. Within a few days of that Government's leaving office, that committee reported. I read the report, but I did not have time to examine it in detail. As the election was only a matter of hours away, it would not have been appropriate for my Government to make any decision on it. As I knew the contents of the report, I raised the matter with the new Minister, I think probably on the day he was sworn in. Through

this Minister, the new Government examined the report carefully and decided to accept it. On June 19 last year, the Minister wrote the following letter to the Chairman of the District Council of Dudley:

I can now advise you that the Government has received, and is currently considering, a report of the special committee appointed to inquire into certain transport problems relating to Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula. The committee recommends that a ferry service be established between Cape Jervis and Penne-shaw to replace the m.v. *Troubridge* when the present subsidized period of *Troubridge* operation expires on June 30, 1972.

The Minister went on to outline the time table for the ferry, suggesting that Kangaroo Island residents could visit Adelaide and return without needing to stay overnight in Adelaide. Several other matters were referred to. The Minister duly announced that the Government had accepted the report, and I commend the Minister for this. I have not criticized him since, except that I have raised with him several times the question of the time that has elapsed since the report was accepted with no apparent action being taken. However, I realize that the Minister has plenty of justification for not acting too quickly. As I pointed out both in the House and outside it, I am not criticizing the Minister on the matter, although I have raised the question as one of anxiety.

It is only 16 months before the *Troubridge* subsidy expires, and that is not a long time in which to provide a ship of the kind foreseen for the road link to the island. Apart from the planning, engines have to be ordered, and these are undoubtedly not available immediately anywhere in the world. Further, there will have to be shore installations suitable for the ferry. The ferry service is to ply over the shortest distance between the island and the mainland. The committee considered that the long sea haul and relatively short road haul had been a failure and it therefore went to the other extreme and provided for a long road haul and a short sea haul. Before making its decision, it took much evidence.

No doubt the Minister will in due course answer the many questions I have raised; I do not expect him to answer all of them during this debate. However, those questions are exercising the minds of people on the island. One such question is the question of how the ferry service will be controlled. A co-ordinating committee has been appointed; it will comprise the members of the old inquiry committee and Mr. Shannon, the Assistant Director of the Engineering and Water Supply

Department (who will be chairman), Mr. Roeger, the Assistant Commissioner of Highways, and Mr. O'Malley, the Chief Engineer of the Marine and Harbors Department. This co-ordinating body will proceed with the design and building of the ferry.

We do not know how the ferry will be controlled after it commences to operate, and I should like to have that information in due course. The fares to be charged will be of major interest to all people concerned with Kangaroo Island. Those fares will affect the Highways Fund, because any moneys received will go back into that fund. Whether those fares will have to carry the full weight of all capital charges is very important to the whole project. I hope and believe that the fares will be realistic.

The ferry facilities must be kept relatively simple. We must not expect a luxurious vessel that will provide lavish accommodation. We must remember that it is a road link, a ferry, and it must be treated as such to keep the costs within reason. Of course, the Public Works Committee will investigate this project; no doubt it will do that swiftly when the need arises. I do not know what will happen when the *Troubridge* subsidy expires in 16 months, and I do not know what the future activity of the company will be.

Some other people are involved in transport to the island but I think in a much smaller capacity than this ferry will be. I am satisfied that the Government is correct in treating the question of the road link as a justifiable expense from the Highways Fund, and I support its move to make possible the operation of the ferry from that fund. I am not criticizing the Minister in any way for what he has done concerning the ferry, although I have expressed anxiety about the time of commencing this project. However, the next part of the Bill is a different story. In his second reading explanation, the Minister stated:

Clause 3 deals with payments that may be made from the Highways Fund. New paragraph (m) proposes that an amount, not exceeding in any one year 6 per cent of the registration fees payable under the Motor Vehicles Act, shall be available for appropriation by Parliament for the purposes of traffic and road safety services operated by the Police Department.

I am not so happy about that provision. I realize that wherever money is available within a State it is liable to be used where considered appropriate. As far as possible within the various Acts under which we operate, the Government is liable to be flexible about

its expenditure. Historically, the Highways Fund has been confined to expenditure on roads. No doubt there are plenty of ancillary considerations. Safety on the roads and the police control of the roads are ancillary to a transport system, but that is not to say that they have anything to do with actual road construction. I am not pleased about this new departure. It could be different if the Highways Fund had built up to a monstrous amount, which was perhaps surplus to requirements for road purposes, while the rest of the State's finances were badly in need of help. However, that is not the position. The fund is not adequate for the purpose for which it was designed. We know that the fund is augmented from many sources, such as the Commonwealth Government, and registration and licence fees in this State are paid into the fund. However, in recent years a different attitude was taken to it. In 1964, under a Statutes amendment, a stamp duty of 1 per cent was provided on motor vehicle transactions to pay for police services and to help with ambulance services. It received heavy criticism from the Labor Party, which registered extreme objection. The present Treasurer then complained that every working man in the community would be affected because a car was no longer a luxury in a community such as ours. He said that having a car already took a considerable sum out of a person's weekly wages, but that now there was to be this additional tax. That is what he thought of the stamp duty on motor vehicle transactions.

This Bill and another that we have been considering tonight would make it difficult for him not to repeat those words, but, of course, he will not do that. In 1970, the present Government increased the driver's licence fee from \$2 to \$3, 50c of the \$1 increase to be diverted for road safety purposes. Also, we are to establish a new principle (which is to be permanent, because it will be on the Statute Book) that 6 per cent of the revenue received from motor vehicle registrations is to be diverted for road safety purposes. One would not argue about the importance of road safety or the need for expenditure thereon: one would only criticize the method by which it was financed. I remind honourable members that this 6 per cent will amount to about \$1,000,000 this year, and in future years it will undoubtedly increase rather than decrease.

What is happening to our roads in the meantime? A most unsatisfactory situation obtains. In South Australia we have a remarkably

extensive road system for a relatively small population. In some respects we are lucky, as in many parts of the world one could not get into a motor car and drive all day for as great a distance as between, say, Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. We can count ourselves lucky in being able to travel along these main roads, as we can. However, the situation is deteriorating rather than improving, and the Highways Commissioner constantly reminds us about this in his reports. If one has to go through the metropolitan area, the time one takes to do so is increased immensely by the congested traffic. Members have heard much lately about the need for something to be done about the Eyre Highway and about how the Government will struggle along and do the best it can. Opposition members know that it has not got all the money it wants.

We have not heard so much about the other roads, however. What about the road from Port Augusta to Woomera, which is probably much busier than the Eyre Highway? I should think it carries much more traffic. The member for Stuart might support me in this respect. What about the busy road from Quorn, which the bitumen now reaches, to Leigh Creek and to points beyond? There is a fairly large population at Leigh Creek, so that road is used heavily. If one reads the paper, one can see that most roads in the Far North-East are impassable to all vehicles indefinitely. This applies to the Birdsville track. When Cooper Creek floods, the road could be kept closed for many weeks or months. Although much of the road dries out, provision should be made for one to cross the creek.

The Strzelecki Creek track is impassable indefinitely, as are many others in that part of the country. We need money for those roads. The estimated cost of repairing the Birdsville track alone to make it a first-class road, appropriate to the conditions for which it would be needed, would be between \$6,000,000 and \$10,000,000. I think that to repair the whole road would probably cost more than \$10,000,000. Of course, that is out of the question at present. The Commonwealth Government help that was offered was small compared to that amount. In those circumstances, I do not think the Highways Fund can stand new charges being imposed upon it.

We have argued many times here about future transport proposals for the metropolitan area, but I do not think anyone disagrees that traffic congestion in the metropolitan area is worsening each month. We have heard

discussions in this House in the last day or so about several intersections in the metropolitan area, and we know that serious choking of traffic occurs at certain times of the day. Our opinions differ about the Breuning report, but I think that report was ineffective in that it lacked an appreciation of the problem, and to me the idea of deferring the major decision for 10 years is appalling.

Apart from the main roads I have mentioned, our well-known country roads, and our metropolitan area problems, we have hundreds of miles of country roads, some close to the metropolitan area and some far from it. These roads need bituminizing eventually but, at the present rate of progress, it seems that this will never be done. We are standing still, if not going back, in many respects in our road building and, in those circumstances, I cannot see the justification for taking from the Highways Fund 6 per cent of the revenue from registrations and licences, which amounts to more than \$1,000,000 a year. I intend to discuss this matter further in Committee, and I shall move amendments. With the reservations that I have stated about part of the Bill, I support the second reading.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I wish to make one or two points in this debate, arising from the Leader's remarks in which he alleged that the Government was milking the Highways Fund and from the latter remarks of the member for Alexandra. I am pleased that the member for Alexandra has taken such a responsible attitude in his contribution to the debate in relation to the Kangaroo Island ferry and I do not intend, therefore, to discuss that matter.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member's wife, like many other wives, has certain tins in the kitchen? One is for food and other general necessities and another tin is for contributions to the cost of purchasing a motor car. This may or may not be fictitious, but something like this could happen. One tin is marked "Motor car fund" and, under the rules of the household, certain payments received into the household each week must go into that fund and other payments go into the tin marked "Food and other necessities." Of course, the occasion can arise where the tin marked "Food and other necessities" has nothing in it, and the family has to decide whether it should be a little more flexible in its budgeting and allow certain funds in the little biscuit tin marked "Motor car fund" to be used in order to prevent its members from starving. Any household adopting sensible

procedures will adopt flexible budgeting and will not say, "That 5c is for a contribution towards the purchase of a motor car and that 5c is for food." If the price of food rises so that 5c is not enough, no-one will say that the other fund must not be milked in any circumstances.

Members opposite suggest that the Highways Fund is not just a cow: it is a sacred cow, which must not be milked, even in the most logical circumstances, for any purpose other than that of road construction. No-one can say that the needs in regard to our roads are fully met at present. There are many areas for improvement in road construction, some of them having been pointed out by the member for Alexandra. However, I believe the same general point applies to a much greater extent in relation to other services for which the State is responsible, notably schools and hospitals. The gap between what is desirable and what exists is much greater proportionately in relation to schools and hospitals than it is in relation to hospitals.

Furthermore, many of our expenses associated with road construction are not directly productive: they do not increase the productivity of the community, although they prevent the productivity of the community from becoming less. This is particularly true concerning the metropolitan area. Most of the expenses in the metropolitan area associated with arterial road construction do not increase the productivity of our community. They are necessary expenses because, if we do not carry them out, traffic congestion will become worse, and the productivity of the community will fall. Therefore, much of the road construction in the metropolitan area is directly concerned with preventing a fall in productivity, not with improving productivity. It is certainly true that, if one built a bitumen road between Woomera and Port Augusta, where no bitumen road existed previously, that kind of facility would provide a direct increase in the overall productivity of the community. However, much of our road construction is of this negative variety: it is necessary because, unless it is carried out, the problems of road congestion will get worse and productivity will fall.

I suggest that that is not the case in relation to many other activities in which the Government is involved, for example, education. I do not think one can argue that increased expenditure on education is necessary to prevent productivity from falling. Increased expenditure, in so far as it has a productivity impact (and it does in the long

run) is concerned with gaining an improved standard of living in the community. Therefore, to set aside road construction as in some sense sacrosanct as against all other Government activities (and that is what has been done in this State) is indeed a peculiar method to adopt.

I will now deal with the point made by the Leader and the member for Alexandra. The Bill does not provide that certain sums in the Highways Fund can be used for general safety purposes, as the activities of the Road Safety Council cannot be financed as a result of the provision in clause 3. All that can be financed are purposes connected with traffic and road safety services operated by the Police Department. How do these traffic and road safety services operated by the Police Department arise? Are they a consequence of the activities of people who travel on public transport? Should we increase charges on public transport to get more money into the general revenue so that these police services can be provided? Should we use land tax to pay for these services?

Surely it is clear to honourable members that the provision of these services on an ever-increasing scale is a direct consequence of the ever-increasing use of our roads by the motor car. That cannot be denied in any way. The police activities in connection with road safety and the control of traffic are designed to prevent people from killing each other to an excessive extent by using motor cars as weapons. The greater the congestion on our roads, the more powerful our motor cars and the higher the registration fees that are collected, the greater will be the expenditure of the Police Department on matters connected with controlling road traffic and police activities in respect of road safety.

There is a direct connection between an increase in the numbers of registrations of motor cars as well as the increases in fees, and the expenses of police in respect of the traffic on the roads. I believe it is fully justifiable, even if the view is accepted that the motorist should be charged only for what it costs to operate the roads and that nothing extra should go into road construction. Even if it is desired that budgeting be completely inflexible and that the Highways Fund be turned into a sacred cow, it is still the case that the expenses of the police in this direction are directly related to motor registrations.

Finally, the total sum that can be diverted for this purpose is set at 6 per cent of registration fee collections. The member for

Alexandra pointed out that that was about \$1,000,000 a year. The increased registration fees that have been imposed involve an increase in revenue of almost \$3,000,000 a year. Therefore, it is not true that the Government has taken no action in respect of the increased costs of road construction which are just as much a concomitant of inflation as are the increased costs of providing education or hospital services. There will be a net positive improvement in the money available for road construction purposes as a consequence of these measures. Once the Kangaroo Island ferry is built, the effect of the combined measures taken by the Government will be that two-thirds of the extra registration fees collected will go directly into road construction. With regard to road construction getting into difficulty as a consequence of increased costs, the Government has taken action to provide an extra \$2,000,000 a year. Members opposite should examine the matter carefully and move away from the emotional language of which the Leader is so fond. I suppose that he has not milked a cow for some time. He is getting a little nostalgic. It was emotional and not directed at the logic of the case. If he directs his attention to the logic of the position he will see that what the Government proposes is not only justified, as the member for Alexandra says, in relation to the Kangaroo Island ferry, treating that as a direct road link, but is also fully justified in relation to the requirement under clause 3 that the Treasurer may pay up to 6 per cent of the total amount received in registration fees for traffic and road safety services operated by the Police Department, because those services are a direct consequence of motor cars on the road and the need for them will rise in proportion to the total number of registrations of motor cars in this State.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support some aspects of this Bill, but I oppose others. I am very grateful indeed (as, I suppose, are all members) for the exposition we have heard from my learned colleague the member for Alexandra about the history of Kangaroo Island and transport matters generally. I cannot agree with him in one respect because I have very unhappy memories of the *Karatta*. While I was on that ship the time passed too slowly. I listened with great interest to the Minister of Education. I wondered whether Enid Blyton would applaud from the gallery. I could almost expect to see Noddy in his little car come with a "toot toot" past the House. But even Noddy would have to pay the increased registration fees and even his money

would have to be accounted for. The Minister says that the Highways Fund is no longer a sacred cow, as it has been for many years. He says that road development is not productive and is not necessary and that we should not be spending any more on it. I may have misunderstood the Minister; perhaps he did not intend that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I did not say that.

Dr. TONKIN: That is the message he got across.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No; that is your misinterpretation.

Dr. TONKIN: As long as he says he will not spend more money on highways, what will he do about the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Bill provides an extra \$2,000,000 for road construction.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister likes to make two speeches.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No; I object to being misinterpreted by members opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister talked about police activity and road safety. I am the first to applaud the efforts of our Police Force for all it is doing to make our roads safer. When I heard the way the Minister referred to this matter, it sounded as though, unless we passed this Bill and agreed to a 6 per cent levy, there would not be enough police activity in the interests of road safety. It sounded like blackmail to me, but perhaps I misunderstood the Minister. If upgrading the highways and making them safer is not contributing to road safety, what is? I cannot accept either of those arguments of the Minister.

This is a new departure, as was said by the Leader. This has been a sacred cow, if that is what the Minister wants to call it, but it is a good thing it has been, because South Australia would not have developed to its present extent unless the fund had been kept sacrosanct. That is not a derogatory term, as the Minister is using it. Roads are important to our rural development, our industries, and our commerce. Any decline in road quality will penalize our industries directly, and there is no way of getting out of that. In September, 1967, rumour was rife throughout South Australia that this action was being contemplated by the then Labor Government. I quote:

There had been forecasts of inevitable motor tax increases to compensate for the "raids" on the Highways Fund, together with prophecies of further inroads by an impecunious Treasury.

That action was not taken then, because the Government had called on Loan funds.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are you quoting from—a Liberal Party rag?

Dr. TONKIN: I am quoting from the *South Australian Motor*.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The same thing.

Dr. TONKIN: The same journal praised the then Premier, who is the Premier now, for his statement that the Government did not intend to touch the Highways Fund. The report states:

"I assure members of the R.A.A. and the general public that the Government has no intention of amending the present law, which requires all State motor registration fees and drivers' licence fees, less only the cost of administration, to be transferred in total to the Highways Fund. Moneys from the Highways Fund are required to be spent essentially for road works," Mr. Dunstan said.

That was a specially prepared statement for the journal.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What year was that?

Dr. TONKIN: It was a significant year: it was 1967, when this State's finances had once again been run down by the machinations of a Socialist Government. The Royal Automobile Association (and no-one will deny this) speaks for most motorists in this State, and it has always fought bitterly to maintain the principle that the Minister of Education calls a sacred cow. A report in the journal states:

We would deplore any suggestion that might endanger this principle—but similarly, the R.A.A. would deplore the development of an attitude that any State motorist funds that the Highways Fund might receive over and above the mere minimum required to secure Federal grants is in any way an unnecessary "excess".

I agree with that statement, which continues:

Throughout the State there is a need for better roads, and the National Association of State Road Authorities has in fact demonstrated convincingly that there is a tremendous gap between actual road needs in Australia and even the maximum funds that can be provided by the current Commonwealth-State roads funds agreement. Thus, the current high yield in S.A. from motorist taxation is itself an indication of a directly related need for extra expenditure on roads.

The situation has not changed: there is still a need for greatly increased expenditure on our roads. Times are similar. The Socialist Government has its beady eyes and its grasping hands open for whatever funds are available, and it has seen the Highways Fund as a first-class opportunity to try to reduce its first year's deficit Budget.

Mr. Keneally: Just to keep people alive.

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member has not been listening to the points I have been making. Road safety is very much related to road conditions. I am not going into the details of the original Highways Act or of how the Highways Fund was set up. I hope that all members are conversant with these matters. This Bill sets a precedent in providing that 6 per cent of the registration fees received shall be diverted for road safety purposes. However, I am afraid that that 6 per cent will increase to 10 per cent, and so on, until the time will come, if the Minister of Education has his way, when there will be no expenditure on roads at all. The Minister says that such expenditure is non-productive and not economic. We are told that 6 per cent of these funds is to be diverted to pay for things that are normally paid for out of general revenue. Why do we not pay school-teachers' salaries out of these funds?

I remember an interesting episode during the term of office of the previous Labor Government, when schoolteachers were paid by Highways Department cheques. At least, that is what I am told. Why do we not pay the Railways Department salaries in this way? Why allocate this money to the Police Department and to road safety? I will tell members why: because it sounds better. The principle is the same: milk the funds and use them instead of general revenue, but make sure that the expenditure is put under a good solid heading, so that people will think it is a good proposition and support it.

Everyone is concerned with road safety. These measures are similar to the tactics used by the Labor Government when the State lottery was introduced. We were told then that the revenue derived therefrom would benefit hospitals and health services. Although this has happened, does it fit into the picture that the average man in the street had that, when he bought a lottery ticket, all the money he paid for it went straight to the hospitals?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not what he thought. That's what you thought.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what he thought when the lotteries were introduced; the average man in the street bought tickets believing that the money he paid for them would go straight to the Hospitals Fund. However, this is not so. It goes to general revenue.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The honourable member will have to link his remarks to the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: I have already done so, Sir. It seems that this Government is using the same tactics to clothe this Act in respectability by using the name of road safety. Members know perfectly well that, if this Bill is passed, as it undoubtedly will be, 6 per cent of the revenue in the Highways Fund will be diverted to general revenue. One can put it under what ever heading one likes: the activities of the police safety division will be just as extensive and as keen as ever they were. The only result will be that the money originally paid into general revenue for this service will be bolstered by the Highways Fund. My objection to the Bill is simply this: I do not think we can afford to put aside any of the money in our Highways Fund. We still have a long way to go in upgrading our roads. The mere mention of the Eyre Highway is enough for members.

This legislation sets a dangerous precedent because, if the Highways Fund is not protected from the ravages of a Government that is obviously beginning to grasp at whatever source of revenue it can find, South Australia's finances must be in a sorry state and we have a very unhappy future ahead of us. I support the part of the Bill relating to the Kangaroo Island ferry, but I am strongly opposed to using funds that should be used on our roads for general revenue, just to get this Government out of the hole that it is steadily getting farther into.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This is another nail in the coffin of what was, until this evening, a low-cost State. I join with the member for Alexandra and the member for Bragg in their statements about the Kangaroo Island ferry service. During the short time I was in Cabinet we discussed this much-needed service, and I am pleased that it will become an accomplished fact. I consider that this would have been so, notwithstanding the financial difficulties that this Parliament has had to discuss, and I am sorry that this evening we had to consider the documents before us.

We are considering nothing more than a mini-Budget, or horror Budget. One cannot describe it otherwise. From what has been said during the last three years that I have been a member of this House, I would never have thought that we have had a horror mini-Budget submitted by my friends opposite. Notwithstanding the need to give the people of Kangaroo Island a ferry, which we endorse, we look with horror at the fact that the motor vehicle has become a medium of bolstering up the revenue of this State and it is



unfortunate that we have not been able to discuss the subject widely and develop the debate, as should be the right of the Opposition. Therefore, we are seizing every opportunity on behalf of the people of this State. We are playing the numbers game.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're not sincere, you admit?

Mr. RODDA: In politics it is a matter of numbers and the sincerity comes to the surface on polling day, every three years, as it will do next time. There are extreme consequences arising from the matter of State finance that we are considering. This is a revenue-raising measure. We heard the Treasurer, in his Ministerial statement on February 23, discuss fully and widely the reasons for these fragmented measures to raise, I think he said, \$6,000,000 in a full year. We have also heard his colleague say that this measure will raise \$3,000,000. If one does some arithmetic, I suppose one will find that we will have more than \$6,000,000.

Some of the people who supported my friends opposite in May last year complained bitterly to me last week about the financial measures operating in this State. One of these people complained bitterly about motor car registration and told me that he was receiving only \$75 a week but that out of this 6 per cent increase (one of the reasons given by the Treasurer for this type of legislation) he will receive only 85c, simply because he will receive from this Government \$4 in service pay. Therefore, his increase has been discounted to the extent of \$4, yet the Treasurer says this sort of legislation is necessary.

The only reason that many people voted for the Government is that they thought they would get a better deal from the Government than from the Party to which I belong. The person to whom I spoke is certainly getting a better deal: he is getting 85c out of a 6 per cent wage rise! These matters will be examined fully at the next election, and it will take smarter words than those used by the Minister of Education to justify the statement that the Highways Fund is not sacrosanct to persuade the people to vote again for the Government. Why do these people come to us on this side of the House and complain bitterly that they receive 85c out of a 6 per cent national wage case?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria must link his remarks to the Bill. It is not a Budget debate; we are dealing with a specific matter.

The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: The complaint made to me is relevant to the matter with which we are dealing. There is not much difference in money whether it be associated with the Budget, the Highways Fund, or any other source. If the Minister of Roads and Transport desires an appropriation to do certain things, he can obtain it while the Treasurer has money in the coffers but, if there is no money in the coffers, the Minister seeks ways and means of getting it. The people of this State are those facing up to these issues and footing the bill. The Minister made great play of the fact that commercial vehicles will be brought into line with the position in other States. The canary is doing none other than flying away with the cage, and South Australia has one foot on the banana skin and nowhere to put the other. As I said earlier, we are sliding downhill into a state of bankruptcy. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill only in respect of the provision relating to the Kangaroo Island ferry. I suppose that my district would contain more unsealed and more bad roads than would most other districts in the State, except Eyre. People in these districts have been waiting patiently for many years to get sealed roads or some improvements in their roads generally. Towns in my district, and possibly in one or two other districts, which are only about 100 miles from Adelaide still have unsealed roads coming to within 15 miles of the township. People in Booboorowie, who have been patiently waiting for improvements, have this year heard the good news that work is to commence, and in a few years' time they will have a sealed road. Booboorowie and the surrounding area comprises one of the most prosperous districts in South Australia. Although I have not checked (I have used the information quoted by other members), I understand that it is 17 years since the Highways Fund was established. Councils have looked to this fund for many years to supplement their income. As the number of motor cars on the roads has increased, so has the Highways Fund increased, and councils generally have had increased finance to help them out. I can just imagine what country people, particularly those who are still waiting patiently for sealed roads, will say when they hear that, although people will pay an extra \$2,700,000 in registration fees, there will be a decrease in money spent on roads in the next financial year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How can that be?

Mr. ALLEN: Last week I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question in which I pointed out that there was a strong report in the district that there would be a reduction in the money available next year to councils for debit order work. The Minister said that money had not been allocated at this stage for the next financial year, but that costs had increased by about \$1,000,000. This is almost certain to affect the grants made to councils all over the State. The report circulating amongst country councils is that there will be a reduction of about \$750,000 on roadworks in country districts next financial year. There is another report that the northern district will have its allocation reduced considerably next financial year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who makes this up?

Mr. ALLEN: We will wait and see whether these reports are correct; if they are, I will remind the Minister when the time comes. Several new works have started in my area in the last 12 months. The Spalding, Burra Hallett and Jamestown councils have commenced debit order work and have been allocated \$18,000 this year for that purpose. They proceeded to buy additional plant and employed extra staff. Now they will hear that there is to be a reduction in the funds provided this year. If that happens, they will have to retrench staff and will be left with the plant that they bought this year in the expectation of a continuation of the debit order grants. I hope that, if there is a reduction in the grants, it will be a percentage reduction spread amongst all councils rather than a reduction that will stop the work of some councils altogether.

There is also a report that the sealing of the road from Hawker to Wilpena, which is a road used extensively by tourists, will either slow down this year or cease altogether owing to a shortage of funds. Work on this road commenced last May and wonderful progress has been made, with seven miles of road being sealed and another seven miles to be sealed shortly. It will be a great pity if the work on this road is affected. Motorists will now have to pay more, and less money will be spent on debit order work in country districts.

I support the clause in the Bill that relates to the ferry to Kangaroo Island, and I think most people in the State would support this. Most people realize the transport difficulties encountered over many years by people who live at Kangaroo Island. I am sure people will be prepared to forgo a little of the

money generally provided to their area if it is spent on the Kangaroo Island ferry. I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support that part of the Bill that relates to the Kangaroo Island ferry. I wonder how the Minister of Education expects us to accept the example he gave of his wife having different tins at home for different facets of the budget. This is especially the case when the Minister talks in terms of sixpences. Possibly he has hoarded up money for a long time. Most of us, particularly the farmers, have not been so fortunate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I was giving an example of something that was archaic.

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps the Minister is archaic in his attitude. When he brought in his ideas of theoretical Socialism he said that road construction did not contribute to productivity.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I referred to certain metropolitan arterial roads—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has already made his speech on this Bill.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister has repudiated the whole transport industry of this country, which represents a contribution of 20 per cent towards our gross national product. Any road that a commercial vehicle travels on contributes to our gross national product.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read what I said.

Mr. EVANS: When the Minister asks whether it is necessary to build hospitals, he should realize that, if we had better roads and more roads, there would be less need for hospitals, because there would be fewer accidents. So, it is a matter of which comes first—the chicken or the egg. I am not entirely against the principle of using some of the registration fees in the areas where there is a community need, such as policing our traffic laws and maintaining road safety. I am not normally averse to that type of move or to using money for an anti-pollution campaign or for developing caravan parks and tourist attractions that are patronized mainly by motorists. However, at a time when many northern roads are washed out, when we are discussing a futuristic transportation plan, when we are talking about transportation corridors, and when the Highways Department is facing the same increases in cost as are other departments, it is unwise to take the 6 per cent levy for other purposes. I believe it is the wrong time for the Government to make this move.

I support the part of the Bill dealing with the Kangaroo Island ferry. It could be argued that the cost of establishing the ferry service is a once-and-for-all cost. I do not think there will be any profit from the service, although I hope there will be. There is a limited number of people on the island, and those in the primary industry there are going through a terrible economic crisis. Also, to some extent the burden of supplying a service of transportation of their goods and persons will have to be carried by the community. These people are part of the State and are entitled to a transport service that costs the same as the cost to any other person within the State who is an equal distance from our major city and who has services supplied by Government departments and private enterprise; in other words, Adelaide proper. I said that I did not support the Part of the Bill relating to the 6 per cent reduction, because I believe this is the wrong time for the move. Where a cost is placed on any particular section of Government services by any particular section of the community, I believe that that section of the community should contribute as much as possible (if not all) to the cost. For these reasons, I reserve judgment in order to see what happens to the Bill in Committee.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting the Bill, I endorse the remarks made by the member for Alexandra, who did an extremely good job in presenting his views. However, it is a pity in one respect that the Minister of Education spoke to the Bill, because he tended to cloud some of the issues. One of the points referred to in the Bill, and which has already been stressed, is the 6 per cent that will be allocated to the Police Department for traffic and road safety services operated by that department. In explaining this provision, the Minister said that if one wishes to take from one tin but there is nothing in that tin, then one takes from another tin. In other words, if there is no money in one public account it must be taken from another to help the Budget. This is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It would be better if the 6 per cent had been transferred directly to the Treasury, because at present the Treasury is paying these fees for the Police Department to undertake these services. Therefore, why pay the money from the Highways Fund to the police fund as a reimbursement? Why not pay it straight into the Treasury?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There is no police fund.

Mr. BECKER: The Police Department.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It does not go to the Police Department.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why not keep quiet!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am only trying to help him.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections across the floor are out of order.

Mr. BECKER: To me this clause is only an emotional piece of politicking, appealing to the sympathy of the people by including this 6 per cent as an allocation to the Police Department for traffic and road safety services. I agree that the Kangaroo Island ferry is necessary, and I am pleased that it will operate eventually. I do not oppose this section of the Bill, because the initial capital expenditure will not be a recurring expense.

[Midnight]

As the ferry will benefit not only farmers and others on the island but also the tourist industry, it will benefit the whole State. I cannot agree with the view of the Royal Automobile Association that money from the Highways Fund should be used to construct this ferry, as the latter is only a portable road. That is one way in which this problem can be overcome. If one studies the Bill, one can see that the amounts mentioned therein do not balance with the amounts implied. The Minister of Education said that two-thirds of the increased registration fees would find its way into the Highways Fund to be spent on roads, and that \$1,000,000 will come out of the fund to reimburse the Police Department. That is a total of \$3,000,000. We must also provide for the construction of the ferry, which is estimated to cost \$1,750,000. We are, therefore, \$1,750,000 short, and it will be interesting to see where that money is to come from. I support the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I support only that part of the Bill relating to the provision of a ferry service for Kangaroo Island. When travelling in the most southern part of my district on Yorke Peninsula, I have often looked over to Kangaroo Island and thought of the disabilities under which the people there must be labouring in relation to transport. Providing a service for Kangaroo Island residents is nothing less than providing a highway for them. The ferry will merely connect the highway on the island with that on the mainland. The member for Frome made some comments to which I should like to refer. He said that many district councils, not just in his area but throughout the whole State, had

purchased new equipment on the understanding that they would from year to year receive grants for roads in their areas. The purchase of this plant has placed them in great financial difficulties, which were to be overcome by the payment to them of road grants from the Highways Fund. However, what will happen in the future if these road grants do not continue? The councils will have committed themselves to certain repayments, from which they cannot escape, and if grants do not continue to be made these payments will be an encumbrance on the ratepayers (not the electors).

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the part of the Bill that deals with the ferry service to Kangaroo Island but I agree with what the member for Frome and the member for Goyder have said about the remainder of the measure. My district comprises many roads that need attention, such as the Eyre Highway and the Flinders Highway, and I am perturbed because money will be taken from the Highways Fund to be used for other purposes. I agree with what the member for Goyder has said about councils purchasing equipment to carry out debit order work. Some time ago the Elliston council was given an understanding that if it purchased certain equipment it would be able to continue work it was doing. However, when I raised this matter with the Minister by way of question after debit order expenditure had been reduced, he said that this was a matter not for the department but for the council

Mr. Rodda: He wasn't very helpful?

Mr. GUNN: No, his attitude was disgraceful, because this put the burden back on the ratepayers, who are not able to make up any amounts of money that the Highways Department cuts back. At present councils in my district are having great difficulty in finding the money to match Highways Department grants for specific work and, if any money is taken from them, the councils will be placed in an extremely difficult position. We know what the last Labor Government did in respect of grants for the Western Division.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, you know what it was said that we did, not what we did.

Mr. GUNN: I was a member of a council at the time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You made up all the stories in the world.

Mr. GUNN: Once again the Minister is putting his bib into something that he has not

done much work on, and he does not know what he is talking about.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We know what sort of fiction you write.

Mr. GUNN: I will ignore interjections. I lodge a protest on behalf of the people in my district, in which there are many roads that need urgent attention, and my constituents are concerned about the actions of this irresponsible Government.

The SPEAKER: If the Minister speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: (Minister of Roads and Transport): The Opposition has not said much—

Dr. Eastick: Is this the gag?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, it is not the gag. If the member for Victoria wanted to say something, he had the opportunity when he spoke in the debate.

Mr. Rodda: I didn't say anything.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Minister speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would be pardoned for thinking there was something parochial in the Opposition's attitude in this matter. However, let me assure the House that, when the matter of doing one or two things with Highways Department money was first discussed, I considered that there was a completely unanswerable case in relation to providing the services that the motorist needs and demands in respect of our roads. I also thought, however, that some people might consider that we were not acting strictly in accordance with the time-honoured tradition if we provided a service across the sea and called it a highway. Opposition members have had exactly the reverse thinking, and I wonder what their attitude would be if Kangaroo Island were represented by a Government member. I hope it would still be the same.

I am delighted that all members opposite, with the exception of the Leader, have said that they support the Bill, except in regard to one clause. The Leader opposes even the clause relating to the ferry. However, we are used to these divisions. Let us get one or two facts straight in relation to this matter of taxation. Members who have contributed to the debate have adopted a holier-than-thou attitude and have said that under no conditions should this sectional tax on motorists that goes into the Highways Fund be used for anything other than the purposes associated with the fund. How must these members feel when, campaigning for a Commonwealth election, they are asked why their

Party has been retaining for general use about 30 per cent of the petrol tax? Why are not members opposite asking their Commonwealth colleagues to return all the petrol tax money to the people? I have never heard a bleat from any of them on this matter.

Mr. Rodda: Billy Mac might do something there.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Billy Mac still has to prove what he is going to give us. While he was Treasurer he was retaining for general purposes this large percentage of the petrol tax, not only the tax received from the motorist but also that received from those people who use petrol to run stationary farm engines. I do not hear too many of our friends from the opposite corner of the Chamber complaining about the harsh terms they are getting from the Commonwealth Government. I do not hear the member for Eyre speaking up on behalf of the fishermen in his district who, when they take their boats to sea, are paying the petrol tax supposedly levied in connection with roads. I never heard the Leader say that the money this State receives from the liquor tax ought to be spent on those who drink liquor. Let us be dinkum about this. We know that the Opposition has tried to put on a show because a week ago in the *Sunday Mail* it was accused of doing nothing, but it has continued to do nothing ever since.

Mr. Hall: You agree that the Commonwealth should retain 30 per cent of the petrol tax.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As usual, the Leader likes to twist things around and put his own interpretation on what I say. Frankly, I—

Mr. Hall: Do you agree with the Commonwealth's retaining 30 per cent of the petrol tax?

Mr. Millhouse: He won't answer that one.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Mitcham had heard 10 words of this debate, I think he would be entitled to interject, but he has not been near the House for the last three hours.

Mr. Millhouse: I can listen in the solitude of my room to what is going on.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has not been in the precincts of the House and he knows it.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not true.

The SPEAKER: I will not continually warn members about interjections: they must cease. The honourable Minister is replying to the debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In this debate and the previous debate, Opposition members have claimed that we are breaking new ground and that we are for the first time, in the words of one member, milking the holy cow of the Highways Fund. I sometimes wonder where members spend their time, because if any member cares to check to find out whether he was in the House last November he will find that at that time a vote was taken to allocate for the purpose of road safety up to 50c of the increase in the fee for a driver's licence. That provision was carried without one dissenting voice.

Mr. Hall: You were pleased about that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course I was, but why are members now saying that this is the first time that money has ever been diverted from that fund?

Mr. Rodda: We didn't know it was the first instalment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not concerned whether it was the first, second or last instalment. The point I am attempting to get home to members opposite is that only last November they voted to have diverted from the Highways Fund a sum equal to 50c for each \$3 licence fee.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That's the second time you've said that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I need to say it twice, if not more often, or I will have members opposite again telling lies, as they have this evening in claiming that never before have we allowed money to be diverted from the Highways Fund. How many members have read section 23 of the Highways Act? I suggest they should do this because they would find that all members opposite voted last year to permit money from the Highways Fund to be expended for the purpose of the investigation of transport by road in relation to other means of transport, research into road safety, the design of vehicles, and the behaviour of road users. None of these things is building roads, and members have suggested that the Highways Fund should be used only for building roads. Money has already been diverted from the fund, and this further diversion is in the best interests of the State. When he had the opportunity, the member for Bragg would not say that he would not take money from the fund for hospitals. I also remind members of the terms of the Bill. I have seen many crocodile tears shed, but no member has been able to suggest seriously that road protection is not a proper function of the motorist.

At this time of the night we have empty roads because most people have gone home to

bed. Are there police officers outside in their hundreds now? Of course not! However, the moment that motorists go on those roads in large numbers tomorrow morning, we will need police officers in their cars, on their motor bicycles, and in the Q cars that some people advocate. Surely one does not need to be a Rhodes scholar to realize that it is the motorist who requires the services of the Police Force. It is therefore only common sense that the motorist should pay for the services rendered. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Application of Highways Fund."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In paragraph (b) to strike out "paragraphs" and insert "paragraph"; to strike out paragraph (m); and to strike out "(n) and insert "(m)".

The Government has overlooked one important aspect of this whole matter; there have been previous occasions when other sources have been used to contribute towards the cost of police services generally. The statement that motorists need safer roads does not meet the problem fairly and squarely. In the long run industry and commerce will pay for the removal of any money from the Highways Fund. If our roads are not in a good condition our primary and secondary industries will be less prosperous. Much evidence is available to show that our road system is not good enough. For the past few years the Highways Commissioner has referred to the inadequacy of funds with which he has to provide highways and roads and to assist district councils. To a large extent we depend on selling our products economically in the Eastern States, and our greatest handicap is transport and transport costs. For that reason we should not reduce money available in the Highways Fund, but we are now removing 6 per cent to pay for services that otherwise would have been paid for from other sources.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not 6 per cent of the total fund.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, it is 6 per cent of the income from increased registration fees, and that is about \$1,000,000. If we followed the argument of the Minister of Education we would pay for hospitals, schools and many other things out of this fund. What would have happened had previous Governments been able to use the Highways Fund in the way outlined by the Minister of Education? Obviously, we would have had inadequate roads. Generally, our road system

has much to commend it, and many people throughout the world envy us our main roads, but not our other roads, not many of our district council roads, and not the roads that are now labelled "impassable indefinitely" in the Far North-East of the State. Surely it is not a good time to divert 6 per cent of the money received for registration fees to purposes that should be paid for from other sources. My amendments will delete this provision and allow the fund to provide a road link to Kangaroo Island.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The amendments are hitting at the Government's intention to spend money from the fund for general Budget purposes. I support the provision in the clause which will enable an essential service to Kangaroo Island to be maintained. Since the Minister has claimed the credit for this service it gives the Opposition much pleasure to know that the report on the investigations that it set in motion is to be put into effect. For the first time an effective instantaneous service will be available not only to the residents of Kangaroo Island but also to visitors thereto. I have been afraid during the last few weeks that the Government was stalling on this matter and that some difficulty would be experienced in the construction of the vessel to meet the date of the cessation of the subsidy and of the existing *Troubridge* service. However, the Minister assured me that this aspect would be taken care of. I compliment him on his answer to me and I will add to those compliments when the vessel is built in time to take up the slack in transportation to the island. If this happens, he will be completing the chain that the Liberal Government went so far in forging. I support the amendments.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I am surprised that the Leader, who voted strongly against the second reading of the Bill—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! No reference can be made to the second reading.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —is now supporting the amendments moved by the member for Alexandra. I am afraid that he, like the member for Alexandra, is not looking at the clause as it should be looked at. The member for Alexandra suggested that by deleting paragraph (m) the Bill would be passed in the way in which it was presented. I do not think the honourable member's memory is so short that he cannot recall the purpose for introducing the Bill: to provide additional finance

to run the services of this State because of the shabby treatment that the Gorton Commonwealth Liberal Government has given us. The Bill was never designed to do anything else. The honourable member's suggestion that, if the Highways Fund had not been the holy cow over the years, we would not have such good roads is an indictment of previous Governments, most of which have been of his political colour and in many of which he was a Cabinet Minister. He must feel that there was a greater need in the fields of hospitals, health, education—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister must connect his remarks to the clause under discussion. Otherwise, they will be out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am linking my remarks to the comments made by the member for Alexandra. As the Bill stands, the Highways Fund will benefit, after the initial expense of the ferry, by about \$2,000,000 a year, and then we will be able to build roads throughout the State, particularly if we get a decent share of Commonwealth Government money, not a disgraceful share, as the Leader described the grant he received when he was in office.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Mrs. Steele and Mr. Wardle. Noes—Messrs. King and Langley.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VOTING AGE)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 4 but that it had made an alternative amendment.

#### FISHERIES ACT: REGULATIONS

Order of the Day: Other Business, No. 2:

The Hon. D. H. McKee to move:

That the regulations under the Fisheries Act, 1917-1967, in respect of preservation of prawn resources, made on September 10, 1970, and laid on the table of this House on September 15, 1970, be disallowed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House do adjourn until Thursday, March 18, at 2 p.m.

In moving my motion, I inform members in whose names Orders of the Day (Other Business) and Notices of Motion (Other Business) stand that next Wednesday afternoon will be set aside for private members' business.

Motion carried.

At 12.48 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 18, at 2 p.m.