HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 31, 1973

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) look the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 172 persons who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Mr. PAYNE presented a similar petition signed by 83 persons.

Mr. EVANS presented a similar petition signed by 34 persons.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 32 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MINISTRY

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 235 persons, who prayed that the House of Assembly would support the appointment of a Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to Standing Orders the following written answers to questions have been received and, being in conformity with Standing Orders and the practice of the House, I direct that they be distributed to members who asked them and that, together with the questions, they be printed in *Hansard.*

CONSOLIDATION OF REGULATIONS

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Crown Solicitor has reported that consolidated regulations are prepared when the department administering the regulations requests it, or, on occasions, on request by the Government Printer when stocks of regulations which have been amended to an appreciable extent become low. There is no general programme for consolidation of regulations. Metric conversion in regulations is effected when requested by the department administering such regulations, or when amending regulations are referred to the Crown Law Department and it appeals that conversion to the metric system is required. The Crown Solicitor has not made any detailed study of the matter but, on a broad estimate of the work involved, he considers the task of consolidating within a reasonable time all regulations which have been amended would require the services of an additional legal officer and assisting staff working full time for at least nine months.

INTEREST RATES

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (October 3).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Board of the Savings Bank of South Australia stales that the increase in interest rates on the smaller depositors' savings accounts at the Savings Bank of South Australia is greater than the increase applied by other banks, and not less, as suggested by the question. The Savings Bank has increased its rate on that portion of balances up to $4 000 by ¼ per cent to bring the cunent rate to 4.25 per cent a year, whereas the other banks have not increased their rate on these balances but left it at 3.75 per cent a year. The rate of 6 per cent a year (previously 4½ per cent a year) now being applied by the Savings Bank to that portion of balances in excess of $4 000 is the same as the rate being applied by the other banks. The Savings Bank also pays 7 per cent a year on deposit stock, subject to only one month's notice of repayment; this stock is available for investments by all depositors, large and small.

In regard to the rate of 6 per cent a year on that portion of ordinary savings account balances in excess of $4 000, it has been necessary to apply in this sector a rale equal to that offered by competitor banks to enable the Savings Bank to continue to receive sufficient deposits to proceed with its programme of loans for homes (at cheaper rates than those charged by competitor banks), and to supply finance for institutional and rural development purposes and local and semi-government projects. The Stale Bank does not carry on savings bank business on its own account, but operates as an agent of the Savings Bank of South Australia at all branches and agencies.

VALUATION DEPARTMENT

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Under Treasurer has reported that the provision of $1 035 057 for the Valuation Department in 1973-74 represents by far the major valuation responsibility by the Government. The Valuer-General is presently responsible for more than 540 000 valuations, which are increasing at the rate of about 20 000 a year. Ancillary to the making of these valuations, the department provides a land price index service to the Government, the Commonwealth Taxation Office, and the real estate industry; the provision of land use identification for research surveys into animal health, agriculture, transport, town planning and other fields; and the preparation of cadastral land ownership plans of all land within (he State, except non-taxable pastoral leases for the State mapping authority. Certain minor valuation functions, mainly associated with the acquisition of land and property, are carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply, Highways, and Lands Departments, and the amounts allocated for these purposes this year are $54 720, $186 000 and $93 000 respectively.

BOY SCOUTS ASSOCIATION

In reply to Mr. VENNING (October 18).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Boy Scouts Association has riot sought financial assistance towards the staging of the jamboree this year. A request was made for such assistance as the various Government departments may be able to offer to the association in staging the jamboree. I approved that request, and much valuable assistance has been given to the association, particularly by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. A financial grant of $2 500 has been provided on the Estimates under the Minister of Community Welfare Miscellaneous line by way of a general grant towards the association.

EXPORT MEAT LEVY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (September 23).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture expressed strong opposition to the principle of introducing a heavy tax on meat exports. Since that time there has been an announcement that no such tax will be introduced.

SHACKS

In reply to Mr. HALL (October 9).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands stales that, as already announced, those persons who consider that they have suffered substantial monetary loss

through their shack site licences being terminated should write to the Lands Department giving full details of their complaint.

DRAINS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not economically feasible to cover open concrete-lined drains in the Adelaide metropolitan area to prevent entry by the public. The installation of obstructions within the drains would interfere with the function of effective stormwater disposal. Grids placed completely or substantially across the channel are not feasible, because of debris which will inevitably be caught and restrict flow, with consequent danger of flooding. With regard to the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, projecting ladders have been provided at about 1 200ft. (365 m) intervals along the concrete-lined Sturt River channel, and access ramps are installed at several locations. It is intended that both these facilities provide some measure for the contingency of a person needing to escape stormflow in the channel. In addition, the complete channel reserve is fenced and provided with locked gates to deter accidental and unauthorized entry.

HAHNDORF SEWERAGE

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (October 23).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The preliminary designs for a sewerage scheme are being prepared, but the exact extent of the scheme has not yet been defined. The well built-up areas will be included in the scheme but, as in all country townships, there are isolated houses or small groups of houses which it will be economically impracticable to sewer until there is further development.

NORTHFIELD WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. WELLS (October 23).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During recent years, there have been several burst mains in Stewart Avenue and adjoining streets. Northfield, which resulted in the interruption of the water supply to consumers in that area. To give immediate relief, the area was rezoned and the pressure reduced to about 40 pounds a square inch (276 kPa). At the same time, the condition of the existing mains was thoroughly investigated and subsequently approval was obtained to replace 11 000ft. of 4in. (10 cm) main and 1 380ft. of 6in. (15 cm) main at an estimated cost of $52 000. Work on this project commenced on Monday last, and should be completed before Christmas. The area will then be rezoned when the water pressure will revert to its former value.

FIRE PROTECTION

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (October 17).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture is gravely concerned at the serious potential fire hazard which exists throughout the State this year. The extraordinary seasonal conditions in practically every part of South Australia have produced an abundance of growth, and even areas which traditionally are barren are lush with grasses and other vegetation. The ripening of this vegetation has so far been delayed by the weather, but a period of warm, dry conditions will cause it to dry out quickly, and when this happens the situation will be dangerous in the extreme. The Minister appeals to the public (particularly those people who live in country districts and in the Adelaide Hills) to make an assessment without delay of the fuel situation around homes and farm buildings, and to take urgent action to clear protective areas around all buildings, before vegetation dries and creates a serious hazard.

Over the past few years, frequent publicity warning of the fire danger, and co-operation by the public, have combined to avoid extensive outbreaks of bush fires, and it is intended to repeat warnings this season. All members will have received copies of the report of the Bushfire Research Committee and a booklet entitled *Bushfire Protection in South Australia for the* 1970*s*. The Government commends both of these publications to the careful attention of members. The booklet, in particular, is a valuable textbook on fire prevention which has been prepared by two highly experienced officers involved in this field. It has been widely distributed throughout the State, and it is recommended that it be studied by all responsible people. The Minister of Agriculture wants to make clear that he is most perturbed at the extremely dangerous situation which is developing, and the Minister urges everyone to take positive steps now to reduce the hazard wherever possible.

WHYALLA LAND

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (October 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Initial construction work in the new industrial site in the hundred of Cultana is nearing completion. Water and power are complete and the road is expected to be completed early in November. A survey of allotments is in hand. To gauge the requirements for land in the area it is desirable that persons interested contact the Lands Department. The price of land has not been fixed.

REPATRIATION

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (October 11).

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: There is no objection by the Minister of Lands to soldier settlers transferring or bequeathing their war service perpetual leases in the same way as is done with other Crown leases. Tn cases where the transfer does not come within the scope of the war service land settlement scheme however, the mortgage to the Minister and advances not yet due (if any) have to be repaid prior to issue of consent to transfer and the transferee is not eligible to receive advances under the scheme. The war service land settlement scheme provides that in the event of the death of the war service settler his war service perpetual lease may be transferred or transmitted to the widow, or if she is deceased, to a son, without payment of the unmatured balances of amounts due to the Crown being required. In these circumstances the widow, or son, becomes an eligible person under the scheme and enjoys the status of a war service settler.

In addition, it is now permissible for a war service settler, during his lifetime, to obtain consent to transfer his lease—where circumstances justify such a transfer—to a son or son-in-law without repayment of the mortgage to the Minister being required. In order to obtain consent it must be shown that the son (or son-in-law) has the ability to manage the holding satisfactorily and that he can be expected to meet all financial obligations to the Lands Department. He would not be eligible for further advances under the scheme. A war service settler may also transfer his lease to enable a joint tenancy to be created between *(a)* the settler and his wife; (*b*) the settler and one or more of his children; and (*c*) the settler, his wife and children.

Such a tenancy may be effected without repayment of the Crown mortgage and without affecting the eligibility of the settler for further advances. The cases that the Minister of Lands has outlined relate to transfers which

involve a mortgage to the Crown. As already indicated, in the absence of such a mortgage, a war service lease may be transferred in the same manner and under the same conditions as any other perpetual lease. There is no requirement that a war service lease must be sold or that a son must buy the property on the death of his widowed mother. Children of deceased war service settlers may enjoy certain concessions in the event of the property being willed to them, although in some cases it may be that repayment of the mortgage and payment of any arrears in respect of the lease would be required before consent to transfer was issued. The Minister of Lands is at a loss to understand how misconceptions such as those occurring in the letter quoted by the honourable member could have arisen as factual information is readily available from the head office or local representatives of the Lands Department.

GOOLWA BARRAGE

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (October 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The water level at the Goolwa barrage is at design pool level of RL 109.50. At present a total of 352 gates on the barrages are open. Further openings will be made during the next month to maintain pool level at the barrages. This method of control is essential to maintain normal levels in Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. To reduce the pool level at the barrages would deprive the lake divertees of irrigation water. It should be understood that the governing factor causing high river levels in the Blanchetown-Purnong reach is the high river flow, which creates a steep river level gradient. Reducing the level at the barrages will have little effect upstream, but would seriously affect lake divertees.

LAND ACQUISITION

In reply to Mr. EVANS (October 9).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I explained to the honourable member regarding his question about the future of properties within the Baker Gully area, there are financial difficulties involved. However, the Government does not wish to see any individual suffer loss by reason of land acquisitions which are necessary for the benefit of the community. The case mentioned by the honourable member, and any other request, will therefore be investigated and dealt with sympathetically in the light of the hardship involved and in relation to finance available from time to time.

COOBER PEDY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. GUNN (October 9).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Efforts made earlier this year to supply an extra room for Coober Pedy were thwarted by the rains which made it impossible to transport the unit to the school. To compensate for the inability to provide temporary accommodation at very considerable expense, it was decided to build a four-teacher open unit of Samcon construction. Present plans provide for this work to begin in March, 1974, and to be completed by September, 1974. As part of the Australian Government scheme to provide accommodation for migrant education, a dual transportable unit is planned for supply by the beginning of the 1974 school year. Because of these proposals and the cost of supplying and transporting transportable buildings to and from Coober Pedy for a limited period, no temporary classrooms for ordinary school work are to be supplied before the provision of the new permanent buildings.

BANKSIA PARK HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (October 18).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is hoped to establish a track 4 class at the Banksia Park High School in 1974 which the student to whom the honourable member referred would be able to attend. If there is no such class at Banksia Park, the student would be directed to the nearest high school offering these courses. They are available at Strathmont Girls and Boys Technical High Schools and Para Vista High School.

JAMESTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VENNING (October 18).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of the very great demand for single-teacher housing, the Housing Trust's reserves arc fully committed to meet requirements for housing about 100 additional single teachers in 1974. No further requests can be considered by the trust until the latter part of next year and, therefore, the suggestion regarding the provision of single-teacher units at Jamestown cannot be considered at present. However, the Education Department purchased a residence early this year: it has been furnished and equipped and is being used temporarily to house single teachers.

TEACHING BONDS

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 25).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The major portion of outstanding bond money is received as a result of action by the Bond Recovery Section of the Education Department. Difficult cases are referred to a debt collection agency or the Crown Solicitor for recovery action. Policy in respect of bond repayment provides that debtors undertaking full-time university studies, because of small earning capacity arc permitted to pay their liabilities at the special rate of $100 a year for the duration of their full-time studies. Accounts in this category represent between 15 and 20 per cent of all accounts and between 25 and 30 per cent of the outstanding amounts in the main bond ledger. At any one time, there are about 1 000 debtors who owe bond money to the Education Department. However, recovery action is a constant process dependent on the co-operation of the debtor. The major factor increasing the total amount owing in recent years has been increases in average bond liability rather than in the number of debtors.

From the beginning of 1974 the Education Department will offer no new bonded scholarships for students commencing degree courses at Adelaide or Flinders University or degree or diploma courses at the South Australian Institute of Technology. For graduate students undertaking professional training al the universities or the colleges of advanced education next year, scholarships will be offered on the same basis as at present. These carry a basic allowance of $2 000 with a one-year bond. This allowance together with all other special allowances is currently under review by the Barnes committee.

University or South Australian Institute of Technology students admitted to first degree courses for the first time in 1973 will be offered the option of retaining their bonded Education Department allowance or of transferring to the Commonwealth allowance without penalty. Entrants to colleges of advanced education will be able to choose whether to take unbonded or bonded scholarships in 1974; All students who held a bonded scholarship in 1974, including those entering a college for the first time in 1974 on a bonded scholarship, would be expected to complete the terms of their scholarship agreement including the relevant period of service in the school. Action to

collect moneys paid as allowances will continue to be taken, against students or teachers who break bonded agreements.

BUSH FIRES

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 25).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As soon as weather conditions are suitable, the fire break on the southern side of Belair Recreation Park, adjacent to Upper Sturt Road, will be attended to by staff of Belair Recreation Park.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 25).

The Hon. G. R. BROOM HILL: The members of the Coast Protection Board are as follows: Stuart Beaumont Hart (Chairman), B.Sc., F.T.P.I., F.R.A.P.I., M.I.E.Aust., M.I.C.E., M.I.Mun.E., Director of Planning; John Ronald Sainsbury, E.R.D., F.I.C.E., M.I.E.Aust., F.C.Inst.T., Director of Marine and Harbors; Edwin George Correll, Dip.Pub.Admin. (Melb.), A.A.S.A., nominee of the Director of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau; John Joseph Bronte Edwards, O.B.E., M.C., E.D., E.M., J.P., being a person with a knowledge of and experience in local government; and Robert Culver, B.E., B.Sc., F.S.A.S.M., F.I.E.Aust., being a person with a knowledge of and experience in the technical problems of coast protection. The board also uses specialists and professional services from within the Public Service.

TOURISM

In reply to Mr. BECKER (October 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau did not continue with the compilation of its estimates of the number of interstate and oversea holiday and business visitors to South Australia because there were some weaknesses in the statistical base. South Australia has joined with the other States and the Australian Tourist Commission in commissioning a survey of Australian domestic travel, which will provide more accurate information. However, we are satisfied from various indicators that the volume of travel to South Australia has increased since 1970; for example, counts at the Renmark fruit fly road block showed interstate cars entering South Australia at that point rose from 52 000 in 1970 to 58 000 in 1971 and 61 000 in 1972, which represents an increase of 17.3 per cent over the two-year period. Since the Tourist Bureau commenced business in their new Adelaide office, the volume has grown 50 per cent. Pleasing reports of increased business have also come from a large number of tourist operators.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In view of renewed concern about the environmental consequences of the proposed Redcliffs petro-chemical industry and the imminence of the expected announcement of the successful consortium selected to undertake this project, I wish to make crystal clear the determination of the State Government that, categorically and without any reservation, no pollution of Spencer Gulf will be allowed, no air pollution will be countenanced, and all industrial waste will be disposed of without detriment to the human population or wild life of South Australia.

We will insist on the minimum physical disturbance to the land surface of the Redcliff Point area, south of Port Augusta. We do not hide the inescapable fact that there must, inevitably, be some discharge of waste, both to the gulf and into the air, but these discharges will be controlled to such an extent that there will be no long-term harmful effect. It has been made plain several times already, and most particularly by the Minister of Development and Mines in this House on October 16, that the old idea of "development at any cost" has been completely discarded. We will have no more Lake Bonneys. The State Government, contrary to ill-informed opinion, is insisting on rigorous environmental controls.

Industrial concerns that have been negotiating with us on this project realize this very well and accept the position. Knowing how much is at stake and knowing the determination of the Government that the gulf remain free from contamination, they have accepted our demands. An immense amount of consultation has already taken place, and there will certainly be much more. To list all the technical considerations now being examined by officers of the environment division of my department would be a lengthy business. I have the list here and can make it available to members. The considerations are concerned with every possible aspect of the proposed development, and certainly they have not excluded the sociological aspect, involving primarily the impact on the town of Port Augusta.

I understand there is some suggestion that the Government is judged to have been secretive about these arrangements. On the contrary, we have at all times been quite frank and open about what is going on in our endeavours to protect the natural surroundings of the proposed industrial site. Because the media have not always found it possible to get all this information out to the public, some members of the public, especially those most keenly aware of ecological consequences of ill-judged development, do need reassurance, and I can provide that reassurance here and now. The prawn industry will be put in no danger whatsoever, and the gulf will not be harmfully contaminated, either chemically or thermally. The tests we are insisting on exceed in rigour the kind of test we are proposing in our environmental impact procedures for which we intend to legislate later in this session.

Should any person, especially any expert in biological sciences, doubt our *bona fides* on this front, we invite him or her to consult our environment division. That person will be completely free to inspect all our working documents. Everything is there on record to be consulted. We are hiding nothing. We invite inspection, and we welcome criticism, asking only that it be constructive and well informed. I am not sure that our critics realize that we are now operating in an entirely new atmosphere, having learnt lessons from the past. I leave any other questions about Redcliffs in the appropriate hands, but I must insist that on the environmental front the situation is completely under control and will remain so. That is our firm pledge.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say why he has made his statement today and what significance there is in its timing? Has the page of the previous report which the Premier said was lost been found? I refer to the report on the environment and its protection in the area of Redcliffs. The Premier claimed that, before the State election, a full-scale investigation—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What is the honourable member's question?

The SPEAKER: Before continuing his explanation, will the honourable member for Goyder repeat his question?

Mr. HALL: I shall be pleased to do so. Why did the Minister of Environment and Conservation make his statement today about conservation and the protection of the environment at Redcliffs, and has the page, which the

Premier said previously had been lost, been found from a report that, according to his claim, dealt with a full investigation that had been made before the last State election into protecting the environment at Redcliffs? Although the question is somewhat self-explanatory, there must be some reason why the Minister has made his statement today without there having been recent proddings from the House to produce it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: I would like to clear up the allegation that was made previously concerning this matter—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: —which the Premier had said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not comment while he is explaining his question: his explanation must relate strictly to the question he has asked.

Mr. HALL: I have asked whether the page has been found. I have asked why the statement was made today, and I wish to explain my reason for wanting to know this. I think that is a proper explanation. I will refresh the memories of members about the matter. The basis for my question is that the Premier previously claimed to have a full and comprehensive report on the matter. When questioned in the House, he said that the relevant page concerning this aspect had been lost from the file. I want to know whether that page has been found and, if it has been found, whether its contents are now part of the Minister's report.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I thought I made clear that I believed that I should make a Ministerial statement on the matter because there had been much uninformed opinion circulating in the community (no doubt promoted by the honourable member in questions such as the question he has just asked), with suggestions being made that the Government had not taken sufficient care to ensure that the work at Redcliffs would not have a detrimental effect on the environment. I believed that I should answer some of the charges made and indicate publicly exactly what the Government was doing, making clear that we had nothing to hide and were taking all possible steps to ensure that the surrounding area of the site at Redcliffs was not being affected in any way. If the honourable member had not promoted ill-informed opinions of what the Government is doing in this area, it would not be necessary for me to make the statement.

RAIL STRIKE

Dr. EASTICK: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Transport I direct my question to the Premier, as the co-ordinator of the Ministry. Will the Premier say what action the Minister of Transport has taken in an attempt to prevent the 24-hour rail strike that is threatened to commence at midnight tonight and say how he intends to provide sufficient public transport for workers who have already been forced to leave their cars at home because of the petrol strike? The Minister must be aware that the rail strike would, at this time, have a much worse effect in South Australia than elsewhere in the Commonwealth because of the crippling petrol shortage. Indeed, I believe that yesterday additional trains were needed to cope with increased numbers of passengers as motorists turned to public transport to travel to and from work. It is therefore reasonable to question whether our bus services, plus the Glenelg tram service, will provide sufficient public transport to meet the extreme demands that will be made on these services. Will the Premier say what action his colleague has taken to prevent this disruption and whether he believes that the remaining public transport facilities can cope with the inevitable increased demand?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since we first received an intimation of a stoppage by enginedrivers at midnight tonight (that was prior to the completion of hearings before the court in Melbourne), we have made representations to the union concerning the effects that this would have in South Australia, especially at present. So far, those representations have produced no change in the decision. The difficulty facing us in this matter is that under the constitution of the union concerned the decisions are made by the federal council and, although representations in accordance with those of the South Australian Government have been made by the local officers of the union, we have so far obtained no change in the decision, which was made by the federal council, affecting four States. In consequence, we have now made further representations to the union and to the Australian Council of Trade Unions in relation to the matter, and at the same time we have commenced a working study of how alternative public transport may be provided. That working study is currently proceeding.

PETROL RATIONING

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier include Meals on Wheels helpers in the scheduled classes of person eligible to obtain a petrol permit? Within the metropolitan area the Labour and Industry Department has dealt well with the Meals on Wheels organization, and there has been no problem. However, in country areas to which the rationing of petrol has now been extended the local police officer is to issue permits. Although helpers of Meals on Wheels are not included on the list of those eligible for permits, permits are officially available to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Dog Rescue Association. Concern has been expressed that some policemen in country areas may not know that Meals on Wheels has been included (if not by schedule then by direction) in the metropolitan area. I should like to ensure that this organization is covered in respect of permits, because it is important that the care of aged persons in our society is covered as well as the care of dogs and other animals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Meals on Wheels has found no difficulty, on my instructions, within the normal metropolitan planning area. I know of no case in which it has been refused a permit in country areas and, if the honourable member knows of a case, I should be grateful if he would let me know about it. I will speak to the co-ordinator of the activity in the Labour and Industry Department to make certain that the appropriate instructions are given to police officers. I note that the honourable member has expressed concern without being able to show a specific case. I know of no cases, and I would think that the present administrative arrangements will cope with the situation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education lake steps to ensure that teachers are given a petrol permit where it is necessary for them to use a motor vehicle to attend their schools? Approaches have been made to members of our Party by some teachers who are incensed that their services arc not considered essential. As students are at present being prepared for final examinations, the importance of their work cannot be overemphasized.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter is in hand at present. The general procedure is the same as it was on the last occasion in respect of teachers, with one exception that relates to teachers who are involved with Public Examinations Board classes. An instruction was issued yesterday

morning and arrangements were made for teachers requiring a permit to obtain one through the Education Department. As the department will apply for the permit direct on behalf of the teacher involved, it will be necessary for a teacher in this position to contact the transport officer (Mr. Podger), whereupon the appropriate arrangements will be made. In the main, we have asked teachers, where possible, to adopt pooling arrangements and to use public transport so that we can effect the maximum economy in the use of fuel. The other feature of the situation which is relevant is that teachers other than those teaching P.E.B. classes who cannot get to their school should report for duty at the nearest school to their home, ensuring that appropriate notice is given to the school at which they are normally employed. These procedures, which are already in force, are identical to those that were followed last year, with the one exception to which I have referred. A circular on the matter has been distributed to the schools through the department, the South Australian Institute of Teachers also having been informed.

STALE MILK

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to have investigated the delivery of stale milk to milk vendors in my district by Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited? Several milkmen in my district have approached me complaining that milk delivered from the Mile End depot of this company is at times four, five and even six days old before the vendors receive it for delivery to their customers. As some of these milkmen have lost custom because of the stale milk that has been distributed (in one case a woman cancelled her order of seven pints), they are most embittered about this. After they had complained to the Metropolitan Milk Board, the position improved for a short period, but it is now worse. Will the Minister have this matter investigated as a matter of urgency to ensure that my constituents receive the fresh milk to which they are entitled?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a serious complaint and I will certainly ask the Minister of Agriculture to have it investigated as soon as possible to see what can be done and whether the allegations made by the honourable member are correct.

ADELAIDE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is now considered that the present Adelaide Technical High School sports oval in Conyngham Street, Glenside, will be required for or affected by the proposed development of an oil and minerals complex in the area? If so, what steps are being taken to provide an alternative site for the school sports ground? This subject has not been raised in this House for some time and in the intervening period there has been much development on the eastern side of the Glenside area. I have been told that there is growing concern again that with the industrial development in the area the Adelaide Technical High School sports ground could be at some risk.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure of the exact details of our proposals in relation to the redevelopment of this school, but I will ensure that the details are available for the honourable member. We have not agreed to any redevelopment that docs not provide effectively for the Adelaide Technical High School and its recreational needs, and the proposals we have been sponsoring have that objective in mind.

EMERGENCY HOUSING

Mr. DUNCAN: In the absence of the Minister in charge of housing, can the Premier say whether his colleague is aware of the shortage of emergency housing in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area for families in need of immediate shelter? Will he ask the Minister to consider approaching the Commonwealth Government for use of the old Smithfield migrant hostel as an emergency housing facility? There is an acute shortage of emergency housing for people awaiting Housing Trust accommodation in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area and. although I am loath to see temporary accommodation used in such circumstances, the former migrant hostel at Smithfield could provide a facility that would relieve the current housing shortage. Although this would be a temporary measure only, it would relieve the plight of people awaiting Housing Trust accommodation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague to examine the proposition.

VALE PARK KINDERGARTEN

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say what is the present position in relation to acquiring land adjacent to Vale Park Primary School for the purpose of establishing a kindergarten?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire of the Kindergarten Union to see what is happening about this matter. It would not be possible for me, as Minister of Education, to acquire that land for a purpose not directly associated with the activities of the Education Department. I have not had any recent correspondence on the matter, but I will give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

PETROL STRIKE

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I move:

That, in view of the gravity of the growing industrial turmoil and the inconvenience and economic loss it is causing South Australians, this House call on the Government to directly intervene on behalf of the public and to take action which will return the refinery employees to work forthwith.

I accuse the Government of condoning the breaking of the law. duping and misleading the South Australian public, and being guilty of putting the fortunes of its Party before the fortunes of the people of this State. I do so on the basis of the latest information that I have, namely, that the two parties who have been in disagreement in the refinery dispute have met in Melbourne to consider the dispute and have concluded their meeting. The union will meet tomorrow, the matter will be discussed at a full union meeting, and the two parties will go before Mr. Justice Moore in Melbourne on Friday.

From that time table, which is the latest I have, one cannot expect any resolution of the strike, of course, until the weekend, or near that time. We are becoming used to this type of disruption, and I shall read from *Hansard* of last year to show what we went through then. On July 25, 1972, the Premier said he wanted to get the parlies back to the conference table in order to see that the issues could be effectively talked out. He also said:

The disastrous situation facing us in government in Australia is that the Commonwealth Government is urging one side in the dispute not to go to the conference table.

Last year this Government's attitude to the strike was that it was the Commonwealth Government's fault. However, this opinion seems to be distinctly lacking from the Government's statements this year. On July 27 last year, the Premier said:

I will certainly convey to Mr. Hawke the thanks and congratulations of the people of South Australia for the part he has played in trying to break a deadlock between unions and the oil companies.

The Premier also said:

With regard to the effect on petrol prices of a 35-hour week and a $25 a week pay increase to all employees of oil companies, it is estimated that the additional cost could be as high as 2c a gallon if related only to motor spirit.

The thanks to Mr. Hawke lasted for little more than a year, and Mr. Hawke has been called on again to settle a dispute between employees and management in an industry in which the employees are at the top of the wage scale in South Australia. There seems to be no end to the possibilities of disruption in this field, as well as in other fields allied to transport. All members have heard, with much dismay, that there is to be a national railway stoppage from midnight tonight. This will be magnificent, with the South Australian public discomfited, inconvenienced, put out of employment, and losing the means of earning a livelihood—all because of the inaction of this Government and the Commonwealth Labor Government! These Governments are directly responsible for the present inconvenience to South Australia.

We move from a brief consideration of the difficulties of the disruption last year and the blame that this Government put on the Commonwealth Government. This year the scene has changed: the Commonwealth Government has changed; no longer can it be blamed for delaying settlement of a dispute. The present Commonwealth Government is of another political colour, the same political colour as this State Government. What has the Premier said in the House this year? On October 23, when replying to the member for Torrens, he said:

We have no position in this dispute which we can exercise to obtain a settlement.

In the face of a repetition of last year's disastrous dislocation of private, public and industrial interests, the Premier has said that he has no position! Having said that on October 23, he altered his story on October 24, when he said:

As to the industrial situation here, we have been in touch with the unions. The basic dispute which has caused this present position is a dispute that has arisen in Victoria and the union concerned is negotiating with the head office of the company in another State. It is not possible here to determine that dispute at the moment. However, as soon as the dispute affects other unionists in this State, it is the policy of the Trades and Labor Council that the matter should be referred to the Trades and Labor Council of this State . . .

The Premier has not taken any action to put this matter before the Commonwealth conciliation and arbitration tribunal, yet he will obey the dictates of the Trades and Labor Council to take the dispute there; so he sits supinely by while the aggravation of the living conditions of the public continues at the behest of a few score of people at the top of the wage scale. The Premier adopts a supposedly neutral attitude, and members of the public suffer. He awaits action from the Trades and Labor Council. He has no position in this dispute, except that on October 25 he said:

The Minister of Labour and Industry has been in touch with the unions involved in the dispute and with the industrial officer of the Port Stanvac refinery. In addition, a meeting held at Trades Hall this morning was attended by the past President of the Trades and Labor Council, the member for Florey.

Subsequently I asked a question of the member for Florey who, according to the Premier's own statement, had become implicated in negotiations aimed at settling one of the most disastrous strikes in South Australia this year, but that honourable member would not say anything; so at that stage it was obvious that the Premier was in the hands of the Labor movement in South Australia and that the past President of the Trades and Labor Council was taking a leading hand in negotiating, but the Premier was not. Therefore, I move from a situation where at the beginning of the week the Premier has no position to a situation at the end of the week where he has handed the matter over to the member for Florey, apparently on behalf of the Government.

At this level we continue to have South Australia's future fuel needs, on which almost everything in this State rests, discussed at back-bench level on a Trades and Labor Council basis, with the Government not having tried to invoke the Commonwealth arbitration machinery. Instead of doing that, the Premier has welcomed Mr. Hawke for the second time. Last year he was selected to settle the dispute, and I suppose the Government will call him back next January to settle the issue when it flares again on the 35-hour week issue. The Government will thank and congratulate Mr. Hawke every time he comes to South Australia to settle a dispute.

The President of the Australian Labor Party and President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke) has come here as a conciliator. What position does he lake officially? I will not bore the House by repeating the oft-quoted measures adopted by the Labor Parly in the Commonwealth sphere or the State sphere, but one only needs to examine Labor Party literature to know what position Mr. Hawke must take. He is not a conciliator: he is the most partisan person in Australia that could be selected to act as a conciliator. No member of the House can deny that, and that applies to the Premier and the member for Florey, who apparently is the main Government negotiator on this issue. The Premier, who has washed his hands of the issue, has selected the most partisan person in Australia to conciliate. It is a ridiculous situation wherein, every time there is a disastrous strike such as this, the President of the Australian Labor Party and President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions should be welcomed into the situation like some fabled Clark Kent, *alias* Superman, to settle the strike on behalf of the union movement, which began the strike and which condones its continuation.

Where is the Commonwealth Minister for Labour? Where is his lieutenant, Mr. Foster? Why are they not here? Mr. Cameron, who was on the other side of the Commonwealth House last year, is noted for being outspoken on this issue. On August 7 last year, he was reported as saying that the oil dispute had been won by the unions; that the dispute was "based solely on the oil companies' refusal to negotiate", and that on that day there would be "a conference, which was exactly what the Government had told the oil companies not to agree to". At the time, Mr. Cameron said that he was still considering whether to bring up in Parliament evidence that he said he had of collusion between the Government and the oil companies over the dispute. He went on to say that he would not discuss the nature of the evidence on television. "It could be of a defamatory nature, and therefore I feel it should be brought up under the privilege of Parliament," he said. "Of course, the Government wanted this strike to go on as long as possible," he added.

Mr. Cameron wanted to take the people's mind off the real issues confronting the country. He wanted to settle the strike last year; he wanted to conciliate. On the day following the day on which Mr. Cameron was reported to

have made these statements, he was reported as saying that a Labor Government "would support a union's substantiated claim for a 35-hour week". The Minister believes in one of the basic claims which the union is making and which is one of the causes of this dispute; indeed, this claim will cause further trouble yet at the refinery unless negotiations are successful. The Minister has said that he wants conciliation and the Premier has said that he wants conciliation: if this is so, why do they condone breaking the law, which I accuse them of doing? Before I refer to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1972, and before the Premier snarls at that legislation, let me remind him of his own Party's policy on "principles of action" and "constitutional matters", as follows:

Constitutional action through State and Australian Parliaments . . . The restoration of Parliament as the principal organ of democracy and social and economic change.

Therefore, the Premier's Party supposedly believes in the supremacy of Parliament. A Commonwealth Act of Parliament was passed in 1972. Still current, it imposes certain obligations on people who come under its jurisdiction. The storemen and packers here and in Melbourne are employed under a Commonwealth agreement, which is registered with the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and which, as such, is binding under section 25 of the Act, subsection (1) of which provides:

As soon as an organization or an employer becomes aware of the existence of an industrial dispute affecting the organization or its members or affecting the employer, as the case may be, the organization or employer shall forthwith notify the relevant Presidential member, or the Registrar, accordingly.

Subsection (2) provides:

A Minister who is aware of the existence of an industrial dispute may notify the relevant Presidential member, or the Registrar, accordingly.

I take it that the Minister must be a Commonwealth Minister, as this is a Commonwealth Act. First, both the refinery management and those who lead the Storemen and Packers Union are breaking the law of Australia; and secondly, the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, whose home is in South Australia and who was elected by South Australian people, may notify the commission. The Premier or his Ministers can ask the Commonwealth Minister to do this, or they can ask the union or refinery management and owners to do so. However, nothing like this had occurred prior to 12.55 p.m. today, either in Melbourne or in Adelaide. Now we will see who is fooling and misleading the South Australian public! We will see who is calling for conciliation and not prolonging this strike! Both the union and management are at fault and are breaking the law of this country. The Premier, neither privately nor publicly, has asked them to notify. Nor has he requested the Commonwealth Minister for Labour, whom I am sure the Premier knows well, to do this.

Therefore, the commission is playing a *de facto* role; it has not been officially notified and, instead of this dispute, in its early stages, coming within the field of conciliation under the auspices of the Arbitration Commission, it will not reach that stage until Friday. People are queuing up and fainting in queues on the streets, yet the Premier has not asked his Commonwealth colleagues, management or the union to take action. He has invited Mr. Hawke (the most partisan conciliator anyone can think of in Australia) to do something. It is not funny to the Government now. The Commonwealth Minister has, through his previously recorded statements, shown his hatred for private enterprise. The Premier, who has placed the matter in the hands of the Trades and Labor Council, awaits its decision.

The commission is not notified of the matter, and it is a disgraceful state of affairs, when those responsible for this situation have in the past blamed others for a lack of conciliation and for not conferring. Everyone here knows that there is a resident conciliator in South Australia and that a conciliator should have been engaged in a conference with the disagreeing parties as far back as early last week, long before this week when people in queues have had to conform to a national security situation in South Australia. The Government, in this situation, as in the situation involving the rail strike threatened to commence tonight, uses an apportioning and rationing psychology ("Do not get to the root cause of the trouble; ration out what you have"). The Government is totally blameworthy and responsible for the extension of this strike, which, by its inaction, it condones.

This strike does not exist on popular support in the community; it has been caused by people at the top of the wage scale in a certain calling. That is not to say that those people do not have some claim on their employer. Indeed, the subject involving unions and salaries will always be one of dissension, claim and counter-claim, and I do not enter into that argument today. However, I state categorically that, as everyone here knows, the present situation involves people in a certain job who are at the top of their wage scale. There is no public support for a strike. The call of the public would be to the conference table, not for strike action. No member here would deny that.

Reference is made in this morning's press to what the wage offers really mean because of the complicated loadings, leave, overtime and weekend work, which must be calculated. There is a difference of opinion whether the sum is $8 600 or $7 800, the union saying it is $7 800 and the writer of the press article saying it is $8 600. Whichever way it is, this is the top of the wage scale, and the solution to this dispute should not reside in strike action and the holding hostage of the South Australian community by these people. No member here can say that strike action is warranted. Clearly, the Government should have urged the workers back to work and to the conference table. The Government knows that, if this had been done, conciliation would have proceeded last week. The Government knows every one of those things, and it has not denied any of them.

The fact that the Commonwealth Government, the Commonwealth Minister, or the State Government has not pressed for action to be taken nationally has prolonged the strike, and everyone who has studied this aspect of the dispute knows that statement to be true. We know the Premier will deny this and come up with his old charges of anti-unionism. He has done this in front of Parliament House, he has done it here. This morning in the press showed him riding on a bus, but fewer and fewer people believe him. Indeed, there could not be a more graphic picture of the public's troubles than the picture of the Premier who stands guilty of prolonging the dispute.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: Whether the picture is staged or not, it clearly demonstrates the public's concern in respect of its own problem. The picture clearly indicates the public's problem. Indeed, the Premier is guilty (and I accuse him of being guilty) because he has not taken the steps he should have taken. Further, if he says that he has no influence with his Commonwealth colleagues, I do not believe him. It is no good the Premier saying that he cannot persuade his Commonwealth colleagues to enter into

negotiations because, as I said earlier, Mr. Hawke is President of the two main organizations which influence and control the Labor Party in Australia: not just in this State, but in Australia.

The Premier knows that he has not the courage to stand up to the blandishments of that man and those who support him on this issue. Indeed, all he can do is call him in as a negotiator and conciliator, but he dare not ask publicly for the arbitration system to be used in a reasonable manner. I question the strength of Governments when they cannot support public demands in this way because, if the Premier went out into the street, he would find that 90 cent cent of the people would support his using the machinery of the arbitration system to obtain conciliation, which could have been entered into within hours of the commencement of the dispute.

Surely, last year's problems were a forewarning of what has now occurred. The Premier cannot say that he let the dispute run for a few days because he did not know what the result would be: the result was clearly indicated in *Hansard,* in the press and in his own department's files in respect of what occurred last year. The Premier should have moved within the first hour of the dispute occurring, not in the second or third week, and not by inviting the most partisan conciliator in Australia to become involved. Whatever the Premier may say (and I am sure he will say plenty), I accuse him of failing to use the machinery at his disposal. I accuse him of failing to urge publicly the resumption of work, of adopting a falsely impartial attitude, and of doing so knowing that the arbitration system could have led to a far earlier solution of the problem. I say this knowing that people trudge the streets of Adelaide looking for petrol, that petrol tanks are being milked in parts of Adelaide, and that all the problems of rationing have resulted because the Premier has allowed this situation to develop. If the Premier had taken adequate action this situation would not exist, and I accuse him and sheet the responsibility home to him and his Cabinet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): In seconding the motion I desire to speak briefly to it before other members speak to it and before it is put to a vote, which I hope will be an affirmative one. No doubt, the member for Goyder has covered this point but I point out that, because of the situation in which we find ourselves, this matter should be disposed of today. If it. is not disposed of today, it will be shown to be a farce and that the Government is unwilling to face the situation by its trying to pul off the motion. I hope that there is no move to do that.

The first matter that occurs to one in such a situation is how far a Government will let an industrial dispute go in disrupting the community before it takes definite and decisive action to settle the dispute and to see that the disruption to the community ends. I hope that, whatever else is said in reply by the Government, there will be an answer to that question, because many people in the community are now saying that definite action should be taken to see that petrol comes out of the refinery. This situation was raised yesterday by way of a question asked by the member for Alexandra of the Minister of Works, and all members will recall that the Minister tried to bluster his way out of it—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Saying what the effect would be. The member for Alexandra knew what the effect would be, and so do you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —saying what the effect would be. How long are we and the people of South Australia to accept that argument? Are we to accept that argument until the community is on its knees?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There is—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At what stage does the Government take a stand?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us about the stand you took—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the—

Mr. Langley: You did nothing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me remind the member for Unley and the Minister what a former Commonwealth Labor Government did in the late 1940's in respect of coal production in this country.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: There goes the old Colonel.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I am pressing the Minister of Labour and Industry I always get from him (and I am not sure whether it is abuse or flattery) comments on my Army activities. He tries to put me off and divert everyone from the topic. That is a well known ploy he has been using since he became a member. I am happy about that, but I now refer to the point I am making. I am glad the Premier is here, because he will reply to it even though his Deputy yesterday would only answer with bluster. How far does a Government go before it lakes decisive action to protect the community from the sort of disruption that we are now experiencing? Chifley took it in the 1940's in the coal industry, so a point may be reached when even a Labor Government will take drastic action to protect the community. Of course, there must be a point, otherwise the objective of many people in the community (and I refer now to Communists), to bring the community to its knees by disruption, will be attained. In the light of the apparent inactivity of the Government, we want to know just when the point will be reached when it will do something, and what it will do about the situation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What action do you suggest?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are plenty—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Tell us!

Mr. Hall: You know what you haven't done.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Goyder made clear one course of action which apparently has deliberately not been taken by the Government. Another course of action that could have been taken (and I referred to this last week in the House) was to criticize roundly and condemn those involved in this dispute for what they were doing. A Labor Government can never do that, because the people who are causing this disruption are its supporters and it cannot afford to lose them. That is as plain as a pikestaff; it need not even be said. Those are two courses of action the Government should have taken. If the situation should get worse, the Government should take other courses of action. I should like to know from the Government how bad things would have to get before—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's all you'd do! You wouldn't do anything else?

Mr. Hall: That's better than you've done, which is nothing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Eventually, if the situation got bad enough, it would be necessary to take action such as that taken by the Chifley Government in the 1940's.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You'd put the Army in. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the situation eventually got bad enough, of course that would have to be done. Let the Premier deny that it would have to be done.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You're saying you'd call in the Army.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was done before in relation to another industry, and the Premier cannot deny that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that what you're saying?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How long would you wait before you sent the Army in?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How long did Chifley wait?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You tell us when you'd put them in.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now that the Premier is biting well, let me ask him whether he intends to take further action to settle this dispute and whether in any circumstances he would ever take such direct action as calling in the Army to get petrol moving again. Let him answer that question when he speaks. I hope for the good of South Australia he will give a straight answer and not try to avoid the question or throw it back to me because, for good or for ill (and we have our own opinions on that), he is the bloke in the position to take action on the matter, and we want to know what action he will take and when.

Mr. Max Brown: What did you do when you were in office?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla comes in with a bit of abuse, asking me what I did when there was a dispute. Last week when, under Standing Orders, I could not reply, the Premier had some fun, saying that when we were in office and I was the Minister of Labour and Industry, our Government did nothing but appeal to him to settle disputes. Is he suggesting that those involved in this dispute and trade unionists generally are not his friends and supporters with whom he has (and if he does not have, he should have) some special influence? Is that what he is saying? He is silent now because he knows that these people prop up the Labor Party and that in fact the Labor Party is (and I do not say this in arty spirit of criticism) the political wing of the industrial labour movement. Why should anyone not suggest to members of the Labor Party that they should use their influence with unionists whether the Labor Party is in office or out of office?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What else did you do when you were in office?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did my best.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You didn't do a damn thing, and you know it.

Mr. Max Brown: You've condemned yourself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla says that I condemn myself. I do not know why he should say that or why members opposite should laugh. I do not know to which dispute they are referring, but I know I always did my best with those involved in disputes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But what did you do?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In which dispute? The Minister of Works will not answer that question. I always did my best in negotiations with the Trades and Labor Council over industrial disputes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You answer the question I'm asking you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let us come back to this dispute. Does any honourable member opposite suggest that during the time we were in office there was such a grave emergency as this one?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There were more man-hours lost in your term than in the terra of any previous Labor Government. Between 1968 and 1970 the rate was the highest since 1961.

Mr. Hall: You're the most yellow Government that's ever been in.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When he speaks, let the Minister deny that this is the most serious industrial situation South Australia has had in recent years. Certainly it is more serious than anything that occurred while we were in office. Not only have we a petrol strike but apparently we are to have a train strike as well. If that is not likely to paralyse the normal life of the community, I do not know what is. No such circumstance arose when we were in office. What is happening in the community today? In King William Street yesterday, and again today, there have been queues, which must have been a quarter of a mile long, of people waiting to apply for petrol permits. I have heard of cases of people waiting for three hours in the queue only to be told when they get to the head of the queue that they did not have their registration papers, or something else that was necessary, and that they must come back again. This is an enormous hardship for people to face. I do not criticize the officers who have been given this job in an emergency. However, I point out that a hardship has been imposed on people in the last two days in this respect.

Earlier this afternoon, the member for Kavel asked a question about the position of schoolteachers. I can tell him that his Party is not the only Party that has been approached by schoolteachers about the present situation. I have been approached by a girl who lives in the northern suburbs and who teaches at a high school in the eastern suburbs: she is 5½ months pregnant; she takes first-year, second-year and third-year classes; and she has been told that when she runs out of petrol she must report to a high school near where she lives. This teacher cannot possibly get to the high school at which she teaches by using public transport. She says that it is essential that she be with the boys and girls she has taught this year, because they face a final examination in the next few weeks. However, no provision has been made in her case or in similar cases. These are only examples of what is happening generally in the community. There is widespread disruption and disgust at what is going on. We keep hearing from the Government that everything possible is being done to settle the strike, but we never hear what it is actually doing, and that is why this motion has been moved. I hope that we will now hear something from the Premier about what he is doing and about how far the Government will let the situation drift before it takes decisive action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. I have listened with interest to what the members for Goyder and Mitcham have said. It is obvious that on the eve (as they well know) of the settlement of a serious industrial dispute —

Mr. Millhouse: You told us last week we wouldn't need petrol rationing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —the only motive of those members is to vent political spleen and to make political mileage in this House, regardless of the public interest. That is their only motive, and it is an utterly dishonourable and despicable one.

Mr. Mathwin: You can't take criticism.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can take criticism, but what has been said today does little honour to those members who have spoken and, if the member for Glenelg agrees with them, it does little honour to him, his sense of public responsibility, or his understanding of the facts of the situation. Is the honourable member proposing to his constituents that the State Government should be putting the Army into the refinery? I can only say that he will not last long in his present seat if that is what he proposes.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why doesn't he get up and say it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: J hope the member for Glenelg will get up and say whether he agrees with the member for Mitcham on an action that would bring this State to a complete and utter grinding halt, would create the most utter disaffection and division, and lead to an impossible situation industrially, the like of which this. State has never seen. That is what members who have spoken now propose.

Mr. Hall: There you are, being deceitful again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham was asked whether that is what he proposed, and he said that we had to get to the stage of saying when we would put the Army in. I suggest to the member for Goyder that, before he accuses me of misrepresenting the situation, he should stay here and hear what his supporter has to say.

Mr. Hall: I was here all the time, and that is more than you are.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Everyone in this House heard the member for Mitcham, in reply to an interjection, say what he did about the Army.

Mr. Millhouse: I asked you how far you would let the situation go, and you would not answer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member said he would act to protect the community!

Mr. Hall: You said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder and the member for Mitcham have already spoken in this debate. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has accused us of not doing what we should have done and of not having acted as Chifley did in the 1949 coal strike, and he has asked me how far we would go before I put the Army in. That is what he demanded to know. I do not intend to put the Army in, and I do not intend to do any such thing in relation to an industrial dispute of any kind in this State.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It is an incredible suggestion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is utterly incredible, and it is disgraceful that any member should suggest that. The member for Goyder has accused the Government and has said that I stand here as a guilty man in relation to this dispute. He said that last week (in fact, while the parties were meeting in an endeavour to conciliate this dispute) I should have sought the Commonwealth Minister's assistance and had the parties brought compulsorily before the Commonwealth tribunal. That is what he said I should have done. Presumably, the basis of his suggestion would have been that they should be brought before the Commonwealth tribunal in order to have penalties imposed. That was the only alternative. The parties were already meeting in an endeavour to conciliate the dispute. The situation was different from the previous Commonwealth strike, because at that time, at the behest of the then Commonwealth Government, the oil companies refused to meet the strikers. This time, however, they have met the strikers, and we have kept in touch with what has been taking place in moves for conciliation. The action of this Government has been constantly to see that the people concerned in the dispute should go to the conference table, and they were at it.

Unfortunately, the conference broke down, although not for want of trying by both sides. However, I have been criticized for being partisan in not accusing one side of being at fault in the matter. I was aware of the matters that came before the conference, and some new demands were introduced by the employers' side of the conference. In these circumstances it would not have helped the conciliation of this matter for me to condemn the unionists alone, although that is what the honourable member always demands that I do. That is how much he is non-partisan and concerned with conciliation. When the conference had finally broken down and every move by this Government (and there were constant moves) to obtain agreement and gel the men back to work had. broken down, I asked the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to intervene. He intervened with great effect and, what is more, contrary to what the member for Goyder has said about him as a partisan conciliator and someone who should not have been brought into the dispute, his intervention in the dispute was welcomed by the employers. They attended the three-hour meeting held in Melbourne yesterday under his auspices, arranged the meeting that has taken place today, and issued a joint statement with him last evening.

However, the honourable member accuses me of inaction in bringing in Mr. Hawke, although both sides in this dispute have welcomed his getting them together and making effective proposals for ending the dispute and the submission of the differences of the parties to an agreed arbitration by Mr. Justice Moore. That is what he has urged on them and that is what is being achieved, but, although that is being achieved, all that the member from Goyder can do is attack not only me but also the man who at my request has arranged that that should occur. Does the honourable member really think that that is in the public interest and will assist the settlement of the dispute? Does he think it will help get the men back to work and ensure that services are provided for the public? Of course he does not think that, because that is not what he is interested in. The only way to be certain that we got something out of the intervention of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration was to have the parties agree on that course. The other course would have been to bring them before the court and impose penalties.

The honourable member has said it is a dreadful thing that we are now getting in South Australia another dispute that will inconvenience the public. I point out to the honourable member that the fresh dispute has arisen from an application before the Commonwealth court. So far from it being effective, it is producing a situation that will take place at midnight this evening. Unless the parties agree to go before the court, the necessary result will not be achieved. However, the honourable member did so little in the way of conciliation when in office and involved himself to so minimal an extent in these matters, that he was never able to achieve by the intervention of himself or his Ministers any conclusion in an industrial dispute. So bad was it that, as I pointed out, the member for Mitcham used to ask us to intervene with our associates in the Labor movement and use our good offices in order to settle disputes, always in favour of the employers according to his request. When, this afternoon, he adverted to this and we asked him what he did himself he said, 'Why should we not ask the Labor movement to come out and get its friends to agree to what we are proposing?"

Mr. Jennings: He did his best!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That, apparently, was his best. The honourable member knows so little about the process of conciliation and arbitration and its history in this country that he does not know that the course he is proposing would produce exactly the situation that will take place at midnight this evening in South Australia. Does he think that that is a conclusion to the benefit of the public? Does he think that that is conciliation? Can he pretend that that is getting men back to work? How

does that protect the community—and that is what he is advocating? I was sitting here wondering what it was we should have done that we had not done in this dispute, and the only other proposal was that we should indicate that at some specific time in the future we were going to put the Army in, or perhaps, taking up a suggestion that came from another member opposite yesterday, put Government workers from other areas into the refinery. Precisely how other trade unionists could be induced to go in as strike breakers I am blessed if I know, but if the honourable member thinks that we could conciliate and get the workers to return by putting the Army into the refinery he is living in such a slate of fantasy that apparently he cannot detach himself from his own military occupation to return to the real world.

Mr. Hall: It's something for you to hang on, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, he introduced it.

Mr. Hall: You have no facts to back you up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have quoted what the honourable member said and I notice that he does not make the protest that the member for Goyder makes.

Mr. Millhouse: I protest as strongly as I can, because you have completely misrepresented me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Every one of us here heard the honourable member demand of me when I proposed that the time had come—

Mr. Millhouse: No fear, J didn't say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member demanded that I tell him when the time had come when that action would be taken.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, it is in *Hansard.*

Mr. Millhouse: We will see about that tomorrow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I sat and listened carefully to the demands made of me.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you say I said, and we will check it against *Hansard?*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member demanded to know when I would say the limit was reached in an industrial dispute to take the action that Chifley took in 1949 in relation to the Army in an industrial dispute.

Mr. Millhouse: And what is your answer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said that in no circumstances in a dispute such as this would I say such a stage had been reached.

Mr. Hail: That was being factual.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member did not propose that I should do it, why was he saying that in relation to this motion? The motion is to take action to "intervene on behalf of the public, and to take action which will return the refinery employees to work forthwith". Why did he raise it?

Mr. Hall: Now you are asking him, aren't you? You don't know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am making a perfectly obvious and reasonable comment on what the honourable member had to say. I want to know. I listened to him carefully as to what action he thought we should take to get the workers to return to the refinery. There are only three things. The honourable member said we should (I do not know what he is suggesting now, although his motion says that we should do something) last Friday have seen that the Minister called in the Commonwealth tribunal compulsorily, with the threat of penalties.

Mr. Hall: I didn't say that. You know I said it should be conciliation. You said it ought to be last year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I said nothing about going before the Commonwealth tribunal last year, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Hall: There is a difference: Mr. Hawke can conciliate but not the law of the land—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that this afternoon I have outlined the history of this matter, and he cannot misrepresent me. I have pointed out that Mr. Hawke has arranged that this matter should go before the commission, and both parties have agreed that arbitration would be accepted: that is what is vitally necessary in this matter. The honourable member demanded that I get the Commonwealth Minister to invite the commission to call the parties together compulsorily, and the difference there is that they are called in on the threat of penalty. If the honourable member does not know it, he ought not to be talking in this debate.

Mr. Hall: That is what I said ought to be done last week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A moment ago, when I said that the honourable member was saying that we should call the, men in on the threat of penalty, he said that was not the case.

Mr. Hall: I did not say threat.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member does not know what the difference is between the two he ought not to be talking here, because he does not know the law of this land in relation to arbitration and conciliation. We have taken the necessary steps. There is now an agreed arbitration. What more does the honourable member now suggest? His motion demands that we take now some action to get the men back to work when in fact they are meeting, with the recommendation that they return to work and go to an agreed arbitration. What is it that he demands we should now do? There is nothing that has come from either of the honourable members to suggest what the Government should now do in the terms of their motion. The whole purpose of this motion is to misrepresent the Government's position to the public and to try to gain some headlines for the Liberal Movement. They concern themselves not with the general benefit, not with getting men back to work, not with getting people petrol, but with trying to advance the cause of the member for Goyder's transmogrifying himself from the back bench of this Parliament to the Commonwealth Senate.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I think we all greatly deplore the situation we are experiencing, which has been brought to a head by the present petrol dispute. First, I dissociate myself completely from the comments already made in the debate. The fact that this matter comes under Commonwealth jurisdiction should have been realized by those who have spoken, and I believe therefore that the motion should have been handled differently. The dispute does not come within the province of this Government. I move:

To strike out all words after "That" and insert:

> this House condemn the present industrial unrest whether occurring in this State or elsewhere in the Commonwealth, and call on all trade unions to adhere to the principle of conciliation and arbitration before instituting direct action, and that, in view of the inconvenience and economic loss suffered by the public in this State, the State Government adopt a more responsible attitude to industrial unrest.

I am widening the debate because we are concerned about industrial unrest in this State. There is much industrial unrest in this State at the moment, and we oppose the direct action that is being taken. We promote the principle of conciliation and arbitration as a matter of prime importance in this State. Apart from the refinery strike, which we deplore, we have heard today of the threat of

brickmakers to go on strike. What is the implication of that? The building industry will be affected, thus grossly delaying house construction, about which the member for Elizabeth asked an important question earlier this afternoon. There is at present a delay of two months in getting bricks from the brickyards, and this is unfortunate.

Further, we have heard that the railway enginedrivers are about to start a strike, and newspaper reports state that about 1 300 workmen have been laid off at General Motors-Holden's owing to a dispute in another State. In addition, a postal overtime ban has been in operation for some time. These are only a few of the industrial disputes from which this State is suffering at present, and this is a serious matter.

The Minister of Works has referred to statistics for a few years ago, and I also am aware of those statistics, because I was Minister of Labour and Industry then. What is the present position? The Premier stated last week that, of the total man-hours lost in Australia through disputes, 3 per cent occurred in South Australia. The latest figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics show that from January to July last year 33 200 working days were lost in South Australia. Tn the same period this year 53 000 working days have been lost, which is an increase of 40 per cent over last year.

Last year was a Commonwealth election year and the boys were told to go quietly. I and most other members would recall that Mr. Whitlam, then Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Cameron, the present Minister for Labour, when they were in Opposition, said, "Righto, Australians, vote us into office. Then we will have a Labor Government in office in Canberra and disputes will be things of the past." We have the Australian Labor Party in office in Canberra and in South Australia, and industrial disputes in this State have increased by 40 per cent in that time. Since July, we have gone further. What has "Stormy Normie" Foster, the great troubleshooter who was supposed to settle all these disputes, been doing in the meantime? We have not seen him in action much.

The Minister of Works also may have forgotten the Charlie O'Shea case and other disputes in other States that affected the figures for the period about which he was talking. I tell the Minister, especially in the presence of the member for Florey, with whom I have been closely associated, that much work was done in this State to settle industrial disputes, and I would be the first to pay a tribute to the member for Florey. I only wish that he was not here but in his old job: perhaps he should have both positions.

The Liberal and Country League's defined policy is that the emphasis should be on conciliation, and that is part of the amendment to the motion. We always have regarded conciliation and arbitration as being inextricably bound up. In my view, the emphasis should be on conciliation, and arbitration should be a last resort. I am talking not about wage cases but about disputes.

It is a fact of life (and I am sure that the Minister of Labour and Industry will agree with me in this) that one of the major factors in the total number of disputes in a State is the bugbear of demarcation, or inter-union, disputes, and I suggest that a large proportion of all disputes and working days lost is caused by that kind of dispute. The State Government can play a big part in lessening the effect of demarcation disputes: we had an example of this recently at Gillman. That was a clear case of a demarcation dispute between Mr. Goldsworthy's union and Mr. Apap's union.

Unfortunately, several similar disputes have occurred at Whyalla. The State Government can play a big part in this realm in fostering conciliation and overcoming these difficulties. That is one reason why we have slated that the State Government can and should do more in this regard. It has a duty to do more. I regret that the Minister was not in the Chamber yesterday. I understand that he was attending a conference in another State. I am pleased to see him back today.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I'm pleased to be back to hear you, but don't tell me conciliation hasn't been going on.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not suggesting that for a moment, but I am referring to what I have incorporated in the amendment. I have dissociated myself from many of the comments made by the mover, and the seconder of the motion, especially those regarding the Army. I will not have a bar of that.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I agree with you.

Mr. COUMBE: There should be more emphasis on the whole process of conciliation and arbitration, particularly conciliation. Most present disputes have concerned unions that work under Commonwealth jurisdiction, and anyone who has studied the matter knows that that jurisdiction is outside the province of this Government. However, many disputes in this State, including some that are occurring now or are likely to occur, come within the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Commission. That is why we have worded the amendment stating that we deplore the fact that there is a wave of industrial unrest at present, and I am sure no member from either side would support that unrest.

These disputes bring much hardship to many members of the public, in many cases to a man's own mates. This is the sad fact of the matter, so we suggest strongly that the motion should be amended as we propose so that it can be put forward as a constructive way of supporting the principle of conciliation. There are many aspects in which that can be done in this State, and the Government should take more action in this regard than it has taken in the past.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I consider that the amendment puts the original motion in much better perspective. We have before us a particularly grave situation, and immediately we should take stock of this and its effect on the State. About 500 000 motor vehicles in South Australia are now grinding to a halt and the whole State is being held to ransom. Industrial blackmail of the worst order is now being carried on. Industrial operations in this State are under threat, as arc the freedoms of people in the community and the principles of our democracy. The only thing not under threat is the authority of our Cabinet, and that is because no authority of Cabinet is left: Cabinet has already been clearly over-ridden by the trade unions of this State.

The storemen and packers are carrying on at present as though they run the State. One of the main objects of the current strike has obviously been to by-pass the conciliation and arbitration system up to this stage and, of course, this is a deliberate plan of the trade unions and the A.L.P. to break down this successful system that we have developed over the years. As Labor supporters would like to replace this system with one of collective bargaining, I think this is a good opportunity to examine the effectiveness of collective bargaining, realizing how it has failed. Collective bargaining has now been ignored, and the Labor Party at long last (and far too late) has come back to recognizing

the Arbitration Court.]f the Government is guilty of anything at this stage, it is guilty of not taking action long before this.

The member for Goyder has already pointed out some of the areas in which the Government should have acted but, instead of taking this action and trying to settle the current dispute, the Government has paid more attention to trying to overcome the effects of the dispute. However, we know that one does not overcome the effects in the long term unless one settles the original dispute. The Government has turned the public's attention towards petrol rationing and has tried to make the meagre supplies remaining serve the State as best they might. But the Government has not paid adequate attention to the original dispute, and of course we see why: the Labor Party has supported the very issues involved in the current dispute. It has encouraged, to say the least, the introduction of a 35-hour working week in this State and throughout Australia, and it has encouraged higher pay rates for workers. One needs only to refer to the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders* of the South Australian Labor Party to realize how that Party is encouraging the sort of dispute that exists at present. At page 41, under "Industrial Relations", it states:

Legislation to provide a system of bargaining between employees and employers to achieve voluntary agreements which can be registered and become common law.

It goes on to refer to achieving a 35-hour working week and then refers to the "removal of penalties for strikes and lockouts" and the "immunity of unions and their officials and members from action for tort in respect of torts alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of a trade union in contemplation or furtherance of an industrial dispute". Therefore, we see that the Government has done nothing but encourage the present industrial trouble in this State. However, once a strike has occurred, the Government is too scared to take action which may settle the dispute; it is willing only to try to minimize its effects.

We should turn our attention at this stage to the Prime Minister, because he had much to say during the petrol strike last year. It was easy for Mr. Whitlam, as the then Leader of the Opposition, to tell the nation what action should be taken by the then Prime Minister (Mr. McMahon) to settle the petrol dispute existing at the time. What have we heard from either the Prime Minister or the Acting Prime Minister in the last week? We have heard absolutely nothing. I admit that the Prime Minister is overseas, but his Deputy could take some action to solve the dispute here in South Australia.

In the *Advertiser* of July 31, 1972, Mr. Whitlam (then Leader of the Opposition) said that the Government could end the strike by taking four simple steps. One wonders why, if it is so simple, the present Commonwealth Government has not taken those four simple steps during this dispute. It is obviously because the Labor Party was being two-faced then and was hiding behind the protection of being in Opposition. Now it is ignoring the facts and its responsibility as a Commonwealth Government. Mr. Whitlam suggested that one step required a moderate amount of goodwill by the three parties to the dispute: the Commonwealth Government, the oil companies and the unions. The present Commonwealth Government has had an excellent opportunity to supply that goodwill it said should have been shown last year. Where is that goodwill this year? It has not been seen or heard anywhere. The article continues:

The A.C.T.U. and some of the companies have already demonstrated by their actions that there is ample basis for a settlement on terms honourable to all parties.

This relates to last year's strike, and continues:

Firstly, it is absolutely essential that the Caltex Oil Company co-operate fully in the A.C.T.U. arrangements for a partial work resumption. There should be no question whatsoever of a lock-out by Caltex tomorrow.

Of course, this is where goodwill is relevant. It continues:

Secondly, as a reciprocal gesture of good intent from the union side, Mr. McMahon should arrange with the South Australian Government and the A.C.T.U. to have oil distributed in South Australia through at least one of the companies not covered by the A.C.T.U. arrangements.

Of course, the Commonwealth Government has done nothing regarding that matter. It would be easy for the Commonwealth Government to adopt the first two of the four points that Mr. Whitlam boasted could be easily adopted last year, but not one of those points has been adopted by it during the current dispute. Indeed, we can see before us the highest degree of lack of activity and concern in the right quarters to solve the current dispute. The State and Commonwealth Governments stand condemned for this lack of action, and I am sure that South Australians will also condemn them in future.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the Hon. D. H. McKee's motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Wright. No—Mr. Rodda.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 1: Report of Select Committee to be brought up.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Thursday, November 29, 1973.

Motion carried.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 37 (clause 4)—Leave out "or".

No. 2. Page 2, line 38 (clause 4)—After "undergoing" insert "examination or".

No. 3. Page 2, lines 38 and 39 (clause 4)—Leave out "by a veterinary surgeon".

No. 4. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 39 insert:

(3) This section shall not apply to the keeping or confining of horses, sheep, cattle, swine or goats for the purpose of de-horning, branding, shearing, sale or slaughter.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 *to* 3.

Mrs. BYRNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 3 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 1 is only a drafting amendment. Amendments Nos. 2 and 3 relate to the same clause. The result of the amendments will be that, whereas clause 4 previously contained the words "while the animal is undergoing treatment by a veterinary surgeon", it will now

read "while that animal is undergoing examination or treatment". I consider that these amendments will be in the best interests of the animals which the Act seeks to protect. Farmers as well as veterinary surgeons treat their own animals for the eradication of vermin, parasites, etc., and it is necessary to confine the animals while the treatment takes place. Under these circumstances, the animal should be excluded from the provisions relating to cage or receptacle size.

Mr. EVANS: I support the motion. I will not debate the matter, because it is important that the Bill get through today, this being the last day for private members' business.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4.

Mrs. BYRNE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

I am dealing with this amendment separately because it is a new subclause. Modern management of stock demands that animals be confined for short periods. This new subclause provides for exclusions from the clause in certain circumstances. I consider this to be a reasonable amendment, because I am sure during the period of confinement no undue harm will occur to the animals.

Dr. EAST1CK: I support the amendment. I believe it brings into the Bill matters that were overlooked in the earlier discussions. If this provision is not inserted in the Bill, inspectors will be obliged to turn a blind eye to what is recognized as normal husbandry practice or they will have to prosecute, and I believe no court would do other than recognize it as a transgression of the law, although it would know it to be a normal husbandry technique.

Motion carried.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2 (clause 2)—After line 4 insert new subsection (2f) as follows:

> (2f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to this section, where the court is of the opinion that a festival or proposed festival is of substantial historical, traditional or cultural significance and that there are substantial grounds warranting the grant of a licence under this subsection, the court may grant to the body or authority responsible for the administration of the festival a licence authorizing it, subject to such conditions as the court thinks fit and specifies in the licence, to sell or supply liquor of any kind and in any quantities to the public during the continuance of the festival at such times over such a period not exceeding three days (which may include a Sunday) and at such places as the court thinks fit and specifies in (he licence.

Mr. McRAE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

We are in a peculiar situation whereby you, Mr. Chairman, introduced the Bill and, because of the procedure here, you are now in the Chair considering an amendment made in another place. No doubt members appreciate that it is with your authority and consent that I am dealing with the amendment, which concerns the authority that administers the Bavarian International Festival. From time to time, this authority organizes functions, which need a licence, in the Mount Gambier area. It is with your authority, Mr. Chairman, that I ask the Committee to agree to the amendment, which in no way affects the principle of the Bill. Furthermore, as a private member and without your authority, Mr. Chairman, in making this comment, it seems to me that it is a practical and commonsense amendment, because several festivals of this kind are held from time to time in country districts and, indeed, in some parts of the outer metropolitan area where similar licences are useful. Proper provision has been made for scrutiny by the courts of the organization that conducts the function.

Motion carried.

OFFSHORE RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, and particularly the Senators irrespective of their Party allegiance, to oppose by every means in their power the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before that Parliament,

which Dr. Eastick had moved to amend by striking ou "the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and".

(Continued from September 26. Page 965.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the amended form of the motion, for which there is support in the Commonwealth sphere and concerning which I believe that Commonwealth Opposition members of Parliament have made the necessary representations. However, there is opposition to the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill. The Leader rightly reminded the member for Mitcham that even the honourable member had modified his approach since he moved his original motion, and I believe there is every opportunity now for him to support the Leader's amendment, which adopts a responsible approach and makes the motion a more responsible one. Our Commonwealth Parliamentarians have the responsibility of deciding, and I believe that the Liberal and Country League members here have made the necessary approaches.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, support the amended form of the motion. Some weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition made a significant contribution to this debate. It was interesting to me to find (and the member for Fisher alluded to this fact) that the sponsor of the original motion (the member for Mitcham) had changed his ground somewhat in the light of subsequent experience and made statements at the recent Constitution Convention which indicated that he preferred the terms of the amended motion. The fact that the member for Mitcham was a delegate to the convention is a matter of some interest to the House—

Mr. Millhouse: And regret, too, no doubt!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —and to me personally, as he replaced me at the convention while I was overseas on Parliamentary business. I do not doubt that the member for Mitcham had a good deal to say at the convention, reports of which I have read with interest during the last few minutes. He will no doubt impute to me feelings of envy or some other motive for my mentioning this matter, but I wish him well. I knew all along that he wanted to be a member of the delegation. My criticism is levelled not at him but at a Government that has indulged in some of the dirtiest political trickery one could think of.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the motion and the amendment. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not a bit green with envy nor do I regret that the member for Mitcham was present at the convention, but I regret the way in which it took place.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the motion about the member for Mitcham being present at the convention. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In his speech, recorded at page 964 of *Hansard,* the Leader of the Opposition referred to some of the remarks made by the member for Mitcham at the convention; this indicated to me that he had had a change of heart about the motion. The whole vexed question of the relative powers of the State and the Commonwealth is inherent in the motion. I think that my Party's position is clear as a general philosophy and that the Labor Parly's philosophy is equally clear in this regard. Perhaps it is expounded in different ways by the Premier and the Prime Minister, who is probably the centralist to end all centralists (and these tendencies have not gone unnoticed in other places). Nevertheless, I consider that the amendment immensely improves the motion. The Commonwealth is interested in getting hold not only of the reins of power but also of the means of production within the States and, with this end in view, it is interested in mining and minerals. I think the amendment will be accepted by the mover (indeed, I do not see how he can do otherwise) and, as it is eminently sensible. I support it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I suppose the conventional phrase to use here is that I am sorry to disappoint members of the Liberal and Country League but, in fact, I am not really sorry about that. However, f do not support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. He moved it, of course, to save embarrassing his Commonwealth colleagues, as the policy of Liberal Party members in the Commonwealth Parliament is to oppose one Bill and not to oppose the other. The Leader does not want, if he can avoid it. to embarrass his Commonwealth colleagues from South Australia. Therefore, this amendment is not for my benefit and not because of any alleged change of mind that I may have had, because I have had none on this matter. It is simply a way of protecting the Commonwealth Liberal Party members in the Senate and the House of Representatives. Let there be no mistake about that. That is the only reason why the amendment has been moved. That is what Liberal Party members in Canberra want to do, and it is what their Party meeting has decided will be done, and the L.C.L. is simply getting into line with them.

The Leader omitted this aspect altogether. The only point he made was a reference to me and to what I said at the Constitution Convention. He tried to twist what I had said into some sort of support for the amendment. I said at the convention that a certain matter concerning intrastate shipping had, by an error made at the convention, not been dealt with as intended or as it should have been. There is a wealth of difference between saying that and, the Constitution having been set, allowing the Commonwealth Parliament to ride roughshod over a matter that I do not believe it should dominate. If the Constitution is to be amended (and I remind the Leader of the Opposition that this was the tenor of all I said at the convention, but he saw fit not to quote me in this respect), it should be done by agreement at a Constitution Convention, and then by submission to a referendum. What I said at the convention does not support to any degree at all the Leader's amendment. However, I have said more than enough on that matter.

I reply now to the motion itself. We all know that the Premier of this State (I do not know about his colleagues) has bitterly resented the action taken on this matter by the Commonwealth Government in pressing on with both these Bills. It is only because he puls his Party ahead of his convictions and the interests of this State that the Premier has not more openly protested against what has happened. All members have read the press reports (and I have no doubt that they were, in substance, true) that at the June conference of the Labor Party the Premier was anxious to raise that matter and to bring some pressure to bear on the Labor members in the Commonwealth Parliament to ensure that these Bills did not proceed. However, he was talked out of that for the sake of putting up a facade of Party unity.

This matter is far too important to be brushed under the carpet in this way. I believe we, as a Parliament and certainly as a House, should do what we have done on other occasions: express our own convictions and ask our Commonwealth colleagues to support us in this matter. That is precisely the reason for this motion. If these Bills are passed into law, it will mean not a resolution of the matters at issue between the Commonwealth and the States but a prolongation of argument and debate, this time in the courts, for many years. That is a completely wrong approach. The Bills should not be proceeded with, and the Commonwealth and the States should get together and come to an agreement on legislation that is acceptable to both sides of the Commonwealth compact. I oppose the amendment, and I hope I will receive support for the motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Coumbe, Mathwin, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Hopgood, Virgo, and Wright.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (2)—Messrs. Hall and Millhouse (teller).

Noes (39)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee (teller), McRae, Nankivell, Olson. Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, and Wells.

Majority of 37 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

MINISTRY OF SPORT AND RECREATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Becker:

That in the opinion of this House a Ministry of Sport and Recreation should be established in this State.

(Continued from September 12. Page 715.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I have nothing to add.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I thank the two members who spoke in this debate. Needless to say, I am pleased that the Government has accepted my motion and established a Ministry of Recreation and Sport in South Australia. During the last two weeks, I have presented petitions containing 1 688 signatures. Although 500 petition forms were distributed, the Government's acceptance of my motion prevented other petitions from being completed. The appointment of a Minister of Recreation and Sport will be of tremendous value to amateur sport in South Australia.

It is encouraging to know that the Minister has already announced that he intends to form a sports advisory council. It will be interesting to see the Minister's performance next Sunday at the great race from the city of Adelaide to Glenelg. No doubt the various politicians competing in that event will appreciate the opportunity to start their regular fitness programme. The portfolio of Recreation and Sport is a worthwhile addition to the South Australian Ministry.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden, the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, and the apparent determination of the Commonwealth Labor Government to proceed with fundamental and authoritarian alterations to our medical and health services, the Government of South Australia should request the Prime Minister to re-evaluate his plans and arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the medical profession, and representatives of private hospital managements before proceeding,

which Dr. Tonkin had moved to amend by striking out all words after "Prime Minister" and inserting the following:

> to arrange a working conference with State Ministers, members of the nursing and medical professions, representatives of hospital funds, representatives of private hospitals, and other interested parties with a view to improving the present health scheme by covering all low-income earners while still preserving the advantages of the present scheme in maintaining the highest standards of health care.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1427.)

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): The mover of this motion did not seem over-keen to proceed with it. If I remember correctly, it was transferred on the Notice Paper quite a few times and then only by the good graces of the member for Fisher who, on at least two occasions, found himself in the position of having to explain the situation to the Speaker before moving for the item to be continued on the Notice Paper. If the member for Goyder began with zeal, shortly after that, it would seem, he had much less zeal and application to continue with the motion. Eventually he moved the motion, and, having heard the speech in which he did so, I found it a great deal easier to understand the lack of zeal he had displayed previously. It was quite clear that he had nothing with which to support the motion, or, if he had, certainly he did not produce it to the House in his speech.

We were given the usual mish-mash of half-truth and verbiage we have come to expect from the member for Goyder. He did not disappoint us: he gave us that sort of thing and did nothing to justify moving such a motion. To give one example, I shall quote from page 1425 of *Hansard,* where the member for Goyder made the following statement:

> One fact that alarms many people is the claim made by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) that the scheme will cost less than the present scheme costs users.

He went on to say:

> This claim is difficult to substantiate: information from the medical profession proves that it is wrong and that the Commonwealth Minister is over-stating his case in regard to what the public will pay.

He did not suggest that the medical profession was doing any over-stating, but he was happy to suggest that the Commonwealth Minister was doing that. Further on, and this is an example of the typical half-truth and half-fact, half-guesswork and half-invention (so now we have more than one whole, which does not surprise me in the slightest from the member concerned), he said:

> One can accept that most families will pay much more for medical and health services than they pay now.

Quite calmly (no facts, no evidence, nothing) he made just that bald statement. We are used to this sort of thing from the honourable member, but one would hope that on occasions at least he would produce facts to back up his arguments. He said, further:

> I am pleased that the Australian Medical Association is conducting an excellent campaign—

and so that his remarks will not be taken out of context I shall continue to quote—

> and that the community is now becoming aware of the real danger that exists to our medical and health services as a result of the doctrinaire approach of the Commonwealth Government.

I was interested to see that he introduced such a statement, especially the first part, because it is clear to many people that the Australian Medical Association is conducting a campaign; whether or not it is an excellent one is quite another matter. It is clear to me (and, I am sure, to many members of the public) that a campaign is being conducted, but to my way of thinking it could not be described in any way as being excellent.

It might be argued that the devotion of finance to the campaign and the skilful distortion used in advertisements supporting the campaign of the A.M.A. are excellent, but certainly one could not apply the same adjective to the motives and the ethics involved. Nevertheless, having quoted the member for Goyder, it occurred to me to see when and for how long this campaign might have been going on, apart from in recent times. I went to the *Medical Journal of Australia* to do a small amount of reading, and in the issue of June 27, 1970, at page 97 in the supplement, in a speech by the then retiring President (Sir Clarence Rieger), I found the following interesting remarks:

> Tn 1938 the threatened introduction of a national health service based on the British capitation system was narrowly averted. In 1948-49 compulsion to use Government prescription forms was defeated—

and here he is speaking of the action of the A.M.A.—

> and action was taken to assist in a change of Government.

This is not a statement quoted out of context and it is taken from no publication other than the official journal of the A.M.A., a statement in the name of Sir Clarence Rieger, at that time retiring as President. Strangely enough, I find myself in agreement with the member for Goyder. I agree that a campaign is being conducted and it goes back, as we have seen by reference to the words of a former President of the association, to 1938. It is clear that the A.M.A. has been guilty of conducting a campaign which does not in any way properly take into account what the whole matter of health care of the Australian people is about.

I refer to the remarks of the only other speaker to this motion, the member for Bragg, who, in his opening remarks, continued this pattern of half-truth, mish-mash, and distortion. In speaking to this debate, the member for Bragg said:

> That is what I have referred to previously in questions as elective surgery, about which I had been given the brush-off by the Minister. The honourable member stated that few State or Commonwealth Liberal politicians had made any protest about a nationalized health scheme.

So, we have it: it is a nationalized health scheme. That is typical of what has been done by opponents of this scheme, which has been designed by the Australian Government for the health care of the people of this country,

and it is a national health insurance scheme and not a nationalized medical scheme.

Mr. Mathwin: Of course it is.

Mr. PAYNE: It is not. I am making an issue about this kind of statement by the member for Bragg, and I am showing that, in the words of the member for Goyder who moved this motion, a campaign has been operating from 1938, which is a long time. It has been of a political nature because, according to the words of Sir Clarence Rieger, action was taken to change the Government: not a change of health care or to try to assist people who may not be able to afford medical treatment, but action to effect a change of Government. The motion states:

That in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden, the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, and the apparent determination of the Commonwealth Labor Government to proceed with fundamental and authoritarian alterations to our medical and health services, the Government of South Australia . . .

As members will notice, the first part states "in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden" and the second part refers to "fundamental and authoritarian alterations to our medical and health services". In referring to these matters the mover of the motion is suggesting that something is wrong with this sort of action. How can any member of a political Party (whether in Opposition or in Government) suggest there is anything "authoritarian" about proceeding with a scheme designed to provide better health care, in accordance with promises made before an election at which people, having had this matter clearly placed before them, have endorsed that policy? Yet the member for Goyder considers that this action, the result of a democratic process, is "authoritarian". Is it authoritarian to keep promises made to. electors that were outlined in a policy speech and after a Party has been elected to Government? To call that action authoritarian is a load of rubbish, because it has been a democratic action from A to Z. I believe I have disposed of what little substance, if any, there is in that part of the motion.

Turning to the other part of the motion "in view of the provocative statements made by Mr. Hayden", the meaning of "provocative" in the *Oxford Dictionary* is "act to excite and inflame, to irritate". If the member for Goyder attributed that meaning to the word, it is fair, when opposing the motion and any amendment to it, to examine the situation and ascertain what has been provocative in this matter, and, from this examination, we can determine whether anyone has been provocative or not. As the Commonwealth Government has been so "authoritarian" as to try to proceed to carry out its election promise, we have had several distorted, untrue—

Mr. Keneally: Unethical!

Mr. PAYNE: I thank my colleague for that prompt, because I was searching for that word.

Mr. Mathwin: He is a good prompter.

Mr. PAYNE: I am sure that I have no need to worry about my colleague's prompt, because it would be correct and I accept it without question. I would not accept prompts from Opposition members, as a result of my previous experience. A leaflet has been provided as a public information service by the A.M.A. Apparently, the association is not keen for people to know whence it comes, because that part of it is printed in very small print. However, I am sure that many people can read it Under a so-called humorous cartoon, we notice the same distortion that was apparent from the member for Bragg, because the leaflet states, "So what's wrong with nationalized health?". It does not refer to a national health scheme. Perhaps that could be considered a minor distortion. This pamphlet purports to tell people about the Australian Government's proposed national health insurance scheme. The motion suggests that Mr. Hayden has been provocative and that the Australian Government has been authoritarian. In the pamphlet someone (whatever stooge the A.M.A. could line up to produce this junk) says:

It's not Mrs Brown any more, its patient No. 64-75-323. To make this nationalized scheme work they are planning to set up a giant computer system in Canberra.

Actually, computers manufactured nowadays are smaller than they used to be. The pamphlet continues:

And you and everyone else are going to be given a number. The computer will have your number stored inside it along with records of all the medical services you receive. The politicians say these personal records will be kept secret. We sincerely hope so.

Note the snide suggestion: can you actually trust the Government you have elected? The pamphlet continues:

But we would feel a lot happier to have your records kept safely locked up in doctor's filing cabinet and not rattling around inside a Government computer.

Note that it is not simply a computer that is referred to, but a Government computer. The suggestion is that there is something terrible about Government computers, as distinct from ordinary computers. That pamphlet is just one example of the kind of literature being produced on this matter by the A.M.A. (I presume the pamphlet was put out by the A.M.A., because it says so on the back of the pamphlet.) Let us contrast that pamphlet with the kind of literature that the Australian Government is making available to the people.

Mr. Mathwin: The Government should make it available because the people pay for the literature.

Mr. Keneally: All of the doctors' material is really paid for by the people, too.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe that the member for Glenelg will try to follow me in this debate, so I can understand why he wants to get in now while he has some self-respect left. The Australian Government's pamphlet says:

Does this mean I'll be paying more or less for health insurance?

Mr. Gunn: More.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member knows so little about this subject that he may learn something if he concentrates very hard, but it would be difficult for him to do that. I am contrasting the literature produced by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security with other literature on this matter. The Australian Government's pamphlet gives the following answer to the question I have quoted:

The great majority of people will pay less than they would under the present scheme. If you're a middle-income earner or a low-income earner, you'll pay less. If you're a high-income earner, it will cost you more.

Note that no attempt is made to evade what is involved, in the scheme. The pamphlet states that it is worth remembering, that one will pay a fixed levy of $150 a year if one's taxable income is above the level quoted. I could quote other examples from this excellent publication, which has come from a Government that Opposition members have referred to as authoritarian. The publication tells the plain facts of the matter, as its title suggests. The motion asks us, in effect, to he censorious about the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security because, it is alleged, he has been provocative. Also, the motion asks us to be censorious about the Australian Government. Actually, what the Government has done is keep its election promises that it will give the people a better health service and that the cost of that service will be more equitably spread than it

has been in the past. The Government has never suggested that the scheme will be free, as has been claimed by some people who want to draw red herrings across the trail. I shall quote from an address given by Mr. John F. Cade, A.C.I.S., A.A.S.A., (General Manager of the Medical Benefits Fund of Australia) to Sydney Jaycees on August 16 of this year. After analysing the present and proposed schemes, he said:

> Those who are not covered by voluntary health at any given moment are mainly people who are willing and able to meet the total cost of hospital and medical care without help and this must be their privilege in a free society.

How far from the truth can one get? Would any member suggest that on his salary he would risk the disaster of being involved in a period of ill health while not having some kind of cover? Let us not even dream of the fear of not being able to gel medical care or of not being able to be hospitalized because we cannot afford either. We will not introduce that shocking aspect of it into the argument. This man claims that people who are not in the scheme at present are willing and able to fork out the great amounts of money that are necessary today to meet the costs of hospital care, for example.

So, once again, I have produced an example of the careless, distorted, and provocative way in which the opponents of the scheme are speaking about it. They are also printing false information generally in that respect, suggesting that many people in this country elect not to enter the scheme, that they are happy to fork out the money if they are unfortunate enough to get sick. That is not true. In case any member of the House is considering speaking on this motion, or perhaps interjecting, and is likely to say that the present scheme is all that can be desired, that it gives everything that the people of Australia could want as a medical health scheme, I should like to point out the opinion of the Australian Medical Association about the scheme as recently as 16 months ago, in February, 1972. At the A.M.A. Federal Council meeting this was recorded:

> The A.M.A., in its efforts to make the national health scheme work, recognizes that it has an obligation not only to its members, who do not always agree among themselves, but also to the community in ensuring the delivery of a sound and financially practical health service.

That is recorded in the proceedings of the Federal Council meeting of the A.M.A. Clearly, it states that the present scheme does not work and that it is trying to make it work; it is heavily involved in propping it up in an endeavour to get it to work. It is rather peculiar that it knows of this sort of thing that it has recorded in its own proceedings, yet it persists in opposing, by fair means and foul, the proposals of the Australian Government to institute a proper national health scheme, a scheme that has been, as I said earlier, heavily endorsed by the public of Australia by way of returning the political Party that had this as part of its policy at the last Commonwealth elections. Yet we hear suggestions from some sections of the community that the new scheme will not be in the best interests of the people and therefore should be opposed.

I believe that at this stage I have more than disposed of any faint or possible reason for this motion, with its amendment. We should give it no consideration at all and should not waste time on it. In these days of an acknowledged paper shortage, I wonder how the motion even got the space it did on the Notice Paper, after examining it as I have done. However, one or two other points have been raised by the member for Bragg in speaking partly in support of the member for Goyder and partly in promoting his foreshadowed amendment. He was suggesting there were some problems with the cost of the scheme and that many people would not be better off under the scheme that the Labor Government had proposed. The figures I have show that those people in the community who are less privileged than, for example, we are and are struggling along on low incomes will be considerably advantaged by this scheme. This is an aspect that particularly appeals to me as a person who would be required to pay considerably more money under the new scheme; that does not deter me at all: I am more than happy to accept what I regard as my responsibility in this area.

The figures I have here illustrate clearly the type of person who will be advantaged by the Labor Party's proposed national health insurance scheme. A man and wife with one child, on a present low weekly income of $51.50, pays nothing under the present scheme; under the Labor Government's scheme he will pay nothing. A man and wife with two children, on gross earnings of $54.40 a week pays 56c a week under the present scheme.

Mr. McAnaney: He must be a pensioner.

Mr. PAYNE: I am building up my case. The member for Heysen was out of his seat when he interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: However, his interjection was a kindly one; he was trying to ascertain the direction in which I was going. Perhaps he thought I was wandering, but the member who interjected would be, of course, one of the greatest wanderers of all time. However, I appreciate his motive in bringing me back to the point; I appreciate his kind action, just the same. As I was about to say, a man and wife with three children, earning an income of $57.50 (more likely to be realistic, on today's figures) pays $1.11 under the present scheme.

Mr. McAnaney: Where does he get the money from to pay that?

Mr. PAYNE: The important point is not where he gets his income and what he is getting but how much he will pay under the Labor Government's proposed scheme and how much he is paying now. If the honourable member will do me the kindness of allowing me to present my figures, there will be enough time when I have finished speaking for him to speak to this motion, if he so desires. As I was about to say, a man and wife with three children, earning $57.50 a week, would pay nothing under the projected Labor Government's scheme, but he is paying $1.11 under the present scheme. I will now move on and try to arrive at a weekly income that will satisfy the member for Heysen, who has been enjoying such a high standard of living (as I have) for several years that it is hard for him to picture the kind of person who has to battle on with that sort of weekly income. There are many people in this country who do that every week now: they have to struggle along on that kind of income. That is the kind of person that this scheme is designed to advantage—not us, who are well paid but those who have to struggle along finding the money for the ordinary everyday necessities of life.

Mr. McAnaney: I go along with you there.

Mr. PAYNE: I am pleased that I am satisfying the member for Heysen at this stage.

Mr. McAnaney: We have been ahead of you.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Heysen has the gall to sit there and say he has been ahead of us on this proposal, when every citizen knows that every worthwhile welfare benefit in this country has been introduced by a Labor Government—and the honourable member knows it, too. Let him deny that. The honourable member probably

is somewhat gratified because he succeeded slightly in diverting me. In case he did not hear what I said, I repeat that persons on a low income and with family responsibilities stand to benefit most from the scheme, and I support that. We have had innuendo, slur and smear from persons promoting opposition to the scheme.

The member for Goyder, who moved the motion, suggested that the Commonwealth Minister had been provocative and that the Prime Minister had been authoritarian, merely because they had set out to keep election promises. The absurdity of such a basis for promoting a motion is obvious. I oppose the motion and also the amendment moved so shabbily by the member for Bragg to put a little gloss on what stinks, namely, the original motion. I am not one person standing in a wilderness in this Chamber suggesting that the scheme has wide acceptance because it has gained acceptance by a wide group of people. As recently as October 11 a report in the *Australian* was headed "Survey reveals big differences on major issues of the health scheme." The report also contained many other statements, and it was in relation to an Australian Nationwide Opinion Poll.

Mr. McAnaney: They haven't been right once.

Mr. PAYNE: I assume that the honourable member means that A.N.O.P. has not been right yet, and the same statement may be applied to the honourable member because of his forecasts and, particularly, his statements on economics and his book that I once had the misfortune to read. I am trying to explain the position for people who are interested in the welfare of the country, not people who want to snipe, as the opponents of the scheme have done. I shall quote figures that show clearly that many people in Australia already have—

Mr. Mathwin: It's not usual to speak for more than an hour.

Mr. PAYNE: The suggestion has been made that I have been speaking for too long. The only limes that that suggestion has been made about me have been when L obviously have been scoring well and making point after point. Therefore, I do not have to make more points and I merely say that I oppose both the motion and the amendment, as well as the spirit that caused the motion to be placed on the Notice Paper in the first place.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): It seems unfortunate that the member for Mitchell has overstepped the principles in this matter and abused a right by speaking for so long in private members' time this afternoon, which is recognized as being the last day in this part of the session for such business. There are many matters on the Notice Paper and members wish to have them dealt with, yet the member for Mitchell has filibustered for an hour, saying nothing.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would appreciate the honourable member's speaking to the motion before the Chair.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And what about the restrictions the Government has put on?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, the Government has imposed restrictions on us and also, as our time in this House as Opposition members—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot reflect on a decision of this House.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment moved by the member for Bragg, because we do not want the Prime Minister to proceed with this scheme. In fact, we are pleased with the present scheme. It needs upgrading in some areas, and Liberal Party policy is to subsidize it in such matters as cases of hardship and the premiums of low-income earners. It is a myth to say that we have not a good health scheme at present. In the most recent issue of *Health Economics Service Bulletin,* Mr. Street explains the policy of the Liberal Party and states:

> The scheme is based on the principle of voluntary insurance and freedom for the patient to choose both his fund and his doctor. The vast majority of people already enjoy the benefits of such a system and it would be against our philosophies to deny them those freedoms. We will extend those benefits and opportunities to the small remaining minority. Low-income earners, whether of pensionable age or below, will have free medical and hospital treatment. Such medical treatment will be by a doctor of the patient's choice—

that is interesting: it is not what we get under the other scheme—

> who charges the scheduled fee, and hospital treatment will be in the public wards of public hospitals under arrangements to be negotiated with the States.

That is the type of scheme that we want. We have a national health scheme, and we do not want a nationalized scheme, about which the member for Mitchell has made much play. I congratulate the doctors on their campaign and I assure the member for Mitchell that that campaign is good and is not distorted. That honourable member referred to happenings as long ago as 1970, but when a scheme similar to the one that the Commonwealth Government proposes was introduced in the United Kingdom by Mr. Bevan after the Second World War, it proved to be a complete failure in its first year. In 1946, the first year of operation of the scheme, there was a deficit of about $A8 000 000.

The member for Mitchell has had difficulty in bolstering up anything that he has put forward. He read from the "Hayden haywire pamphlet". However, Mr. Hayden has seen the light. He has miscalculated doctors' earnings. It is much cheaper to get a doctor to the house than to get a plumber or an electrician. The people want to maintain the right to choose their own doctor, and they have the right to have him in attendance when they are in hospital. I support the amendment moved by the member for Bragg and his proposal for a working conference of doctors and nurses to assist in this matter. As we have several other matters on the Notice Paper—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not anticipate Orders of the Day.

Mr. MATHWIN: Because of the amount of business before the House and out of consideration for other members, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ISLINGTON LAND

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House is of opinion that the price being asked by the Government for the old Islington sewage farm land is scandalously high, especially in view of the oft-expressed Government intention to keep prices down and calls on it forthwith substantially to reduce the price sought.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1433.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. I wonder what the nomenclature body thinks of the name "Regency Park". Recently this body made front page news when it suggested that members of the public who referred to areas such as Somerton by other than their official name should be charged with an offence. Yet the Government, in its beautiful pamphlet, has called this area Regency Park, even though there is no such area. Why was it not referred to as the Islington sewage works?

Mr. Evans: Or estate.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, the Islington sewage estate. The people at West Lakes have offended by calling an area Wood Lake. Again, that name is not on the map, so that

is a chargeable offence. Land in the Dudley Park area, which is near Regency Park, was valued last year at $20 000 an acre. Land near the Port Wakefield road is being held back because of the Government's high prices for land at Regency Park. I believe that the Government will set the pace for future high land costs, particularly in this area.

Has the Government increased the price in this area because land there is to become residential? Did the board of the Somerton Home for Crippled Children know that 20 acres (8 ha) of industrial land in this area would be granted to it? It is intended to move the home from Esplanade, Somerton, to this industrial area. It is said that the children will then be closer to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Is it right that these handicapped children should be placed in what is described in the pamphlet as a wonderful area? I think it is bad to move this home to an industrial area. According to the pamphlet, this is to be a high-class industrial estate comprising 33 sites with a total area of 84 acres (34 ha). It is zoned "light and general industry". This is the area in which young children from the Somerton home will be placed. These children will be in the hospital there and go to school there, right in the middle of this industrial area.

The pamphlet says that this area is located in the heart of an intensive industrial area that is accessible via three main roads: South Road, Regency Road, and Grand Junction Road. It is 5 km (3 miles) from the Port Adelaide dock facilities and close to the Islington railway yards. It adjoins land set aside for the proposed Islington highway. It is intended to move railway works from Mile End to Islington. It is in this area that the children will be put, flanked by busy roads that are used constantly by heavy vehicles. Children at the home are encouraged to take walks, to go to shops and to take responsibility for themselves generally, but at Islington they will be limited in their activities because of the nature of the surrounding area. Would any member wish to live in such an industrial area, next to the railway shunting yards and close to such high-density traffic? It is we who are supposed to be helping the children. It will be impossible for the children to leave the area because of the surrounding heavy traffic.

Was the advice of the Director of Planning followed in choosing this site? Was speculation at the expense of the public in respect of this property involved in the decision to locate these children in this polluted area? Further, I believe that the prices charged for the land are excessive. Prices vary from $44 000 to $300 000. The Government is creating a yardstick for other nearby areas where land is currently being held back until it is seen how much land at Regency Park brings on the market.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the motion. As there is a considerable supply of industrial land available (and I refer to the area at the rear of Port Adelaide), if the price charged for land at Regency Park is too high, it will not be sold, because this alternative is available. The member for Glenelg, for whom I generally have much respect, is completely off beam in this matter. The Public Works Committee has investigated this scheme, which involves two high schools, a 40-acre park, and lovely surroundings for the crippled children.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the smell from the Dry Creek glue factory?

Mr. McANANEY: This would be a good site. The member for Mitcham has always opposed price control, so he is being politically inconsistent in moving this motion. The member for Glenelg did not do his homework: he has not read the very good report of the Public Works Committee. He therefore does not know what is. going on in the area. I strongly oppose the motion, because I am opposed to price control, which has never been effective. As there is a supply of industrial land around the city, if the price charged for this land is too high it will not be sold.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (3)—Messrs. Hall (teller), Mathwin, and Millhouse.

Noes (36)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McAnaney, McKee, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 33 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VEHICLE WIDTH)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 17. Page 1294.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I have read the somewhat brief second reading explanation given by the member for Fisher of this Bill, by which he seeks to increase the permissible maximum width of a vehicle under the terms of the Road Traffic Act. The Bill seeks to increase the width from the currently permissible 2.5 m (8ft. 2in.) to 2.6 m, which is slightly over 8ft. 6in. I do not think that the member for Fisher has given as much thought to the Bill as I. and most other road users would have liked, otherwise I am sure that he would have realized the dangers that could be created by increasing the permissible maximum vehicle width. If the Bill is passed, all vehicles 8ft. 6in. (2.6 m) wide will be able to travel on South Australian roads with complete immunity. I think the honourable member himself would be the first to acknowledge the grave danger that would be caused if, for instance, on Old Belair Road vehicles 8ft. 6in. wide were constantly going up and down.

Mr. Dean Brown: It's about time the road was repaired.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member may say that. However, he may be interested to know that Old Belair Road is in the process of being upgraded, the curves straightened and lengthened, and other work carried out so that the road will be more in keeping with today's standards. However, the situation we face is that the road is there in that condition, and it will not be changed overnight. That is only one road, but I use it as an illustration simply because of its association with the District of Fisher. I could refer to roads associated with the District of Davenport, and the member for Davenport would be completely irresponsible if he advocated vehicles 8ft. 6in. wide using roads from his district that lead through the Hills. The member for Davenport has probably not thought very much about anything, otherwise he would not go on with much of the clap-trap he uses. I suggest in all seriousness that the Bill has been introduced in an attitude of sour grapes.

Mr. Dean Brown: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We all know that the member for Davenport is rubbish: he does not have to keep reminding us. The plain facts are that the Road Traffic Board has, under the Act as it now stands, vested in it the authority to issue permits for vehicles wider than 8ft. 2iin. (2.5 m). The member for Fisher previously introduced

a Bill dealing with vehicle weights, and that provision is now in the Act. However, it is restrictive, giving the Road Traffic Board the authority, as it does, to grant permits in certain circumstances. That same sort of authority is vested in the board regarding widths of vehicles, and we can only assume from the introduction of this Bill that the member for Fisher thinks that the Road Traffic Board is not discharging its responsibilities properly. I refute at the outset any such suggestion. The board should be commended for what it has done and for providing adequately for those who use public transport in the city of Adelaide.

To go even further and apply this to every vehicle would indeed be dangerous. The member for Fisher stated that I had said there was a general tendency overseas to use 8ft. 6in. (26 m) vehicles. However, when I had made that statement I had been referring not to the width of vehicles generally but solely to the width of passenger buses. Whatever the case may be in determining a matter of this nature, one must be conscious of the nature and geometry of a road. If one considers some of the major highways that have been built in other countries, which have larger populations and therefore much more money to spend on constructing and improving roads, one will see that the situation overseas is much different from that which obtains here. Members should realize that much work has to be done on many of our roads to enable them to handle current traffic.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased the member for Rocky River agrees with me. It would be interesting to know whether he also agrees that vehicles 8ft. 6in. (2.6 m) wide should be permitted to travel both ways through the Pichirichi Pass. I think he would be the first to say that they should not be permitted to do so because of the dangers involved. Most of our country roads are between 20ft. (6.1 m) and 22ft. (6.7 m) wide and, when one considers the dimensions of modern vehicles and adds the width of protruding rear vision mirrors and so on, and also considers the wind resistance that is created when two large vehicles pass each other, one must realize the potential danger that will be involved if this Bill passes.

We in South Australia currently enjoy many benefits in relation to commercial transport that are not enjoyed in other States. Operating conditions in South Australia are adequate to meet the present situation. The Road Traffic Board is able, under the existing provisions, to examine specific cases and, where it considers that no road safety factor will be infringed, it may issue permits. Indeed, it is doing so at present. As the existing situation is desirable, it should not be changed. Accordingly, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am disappointed that the Minister will not accept the Bill. I remind him that Victorian roads are just as narrow and winding as those in South Australia, including Old Belair Road, yet the Victorian Government permits wider vehicles to use its roads. Further, Victoria's hills and mountains are just as steep as those in South Australia and there are many more of them. The Minister's argument does not therefore stand up in this respect. I introduced the Bill to try to achieve uniformity in this matter. The Municipal Tramways Trust, a semi-government authority in this State, is operating buses that are 8ft. 6in. (2.6 m) wide, for which I do not blame the Road Traffic Board. However, these vehicles are bought at public expense and, when the trust has finished with them, their width must be reduced by liin. (44.45 mm) on each side. To do this, the buses must be cut down the middle and the two halves put back together again. One can therefore see a ludicrous situation is caused by a conflict of laws.

Although I do not deny that the Road Traffic Board has to issue permits where necessary it is ridiculous that the trust operates its wide buses in the crowded streets of Adelaide with their heavy density of traffic. Although it is stated that hazards are created when wide vehicles are used, the. Municipal Tramways Trust is running such vehicles in Adelaide every day of the week, particularly in peak traffic periods. Most motorists are afraid when confronted by an M.T.T. bus whether it is turning or whether it is taking up a little more of a lane than normal because of cars that are parked at the kerb.

There are dangers on our roads with the vehicles that operate at present, and the board must decide whether to extend this authority to the private operator who experiences difficulty when he must go to the board for a permit. All members realize the problems experienced by some people in getting into the city square to seek this permission: it is not as easy as the Minister would have us believe.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are at Walkerville.

Mr. EVANS: For the average person who lives in an outer suburb or outside the metropolitan area, it means a trip into the city area. I have no doubt that some people find it unpleasant to have to come into the city to apply for this permission. Although there is a conflict in the law, there is no benefit in my pushing the Bill through and calling for a division on the second reading, because the Government has the numbers. For the sake of other members who have private business to be dealt with, I merely ask the Minister to consider this matter and at least enable other bus operators to run buses as wide as some of the M.T.T. buses. If the Minister will not permit this increased width to apply to other types of transport, be it motor car, caravan or truck, at least he should permit it in relation to private buses. Buses operating in Victoria carry passengers just as they do here, and the roads are little different; in the main, South Australian roads are better than those in Victoria and it would be safer to operate vehicles here than there. I do not think the Minister's argument stands. We do not have the numbers on this side to carry the second reading, but I ask members, especially Government members, to think about the application of this provision in future, at least as it applies to private operators.

Second reading negatived.

BRANDY EXCISE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

That in the opinion of this House the Commonwealth Government should act immediately to remove the additional excise imposed on the sales of Australian brandy by the recent Commonwealth Budget.

(Continued from October 17. Page 1295.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier): I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "the elimination of the differential on brandy excise and the removal, without an adequate period for adjustment, of the provision for arbitrary valuation of wine stock is harmful to the wine industry and should not be proceeded with."

In considering the action of the Commonwealth Government in relation to the wine industry on these two scores, I point out to the mover of this motion that it is necessary, in dealing with the actions in relation to the wine industry, to deal with the brandy differential rather than the increase in the excise on potable spirits. It is necessary also to deal with the provisions of section 31A of the Income Tax Assessment Act relating to the valuation of wine stocks. On these two scores I believe that the Commonwealth

Government has acted on entirely mistaken and ill-advised instructions.

Dr. Eastick: Such as the section in the Coombs report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it was as bad as that section of the Coombs report. The section of the report that recommended these changes in relation to the valuation of wine stocks was based on a view contained in the Coombs report that the wine industry had largely been taken over by foreign interests whereas, in fact, the figures of the Commonwealth Government and those obtained by my officers show clearly that, of the total crush in South Australia, less than 19 per cent is in foreign hands. The people who will be adversely affected by this measure are not the foreign owners of those wineries that have been taken over who have been using this provision as a means of deferral of tax, but the proprietary companies and the smaller wineries (the co-operatives are not affected by this section), including the family wineries that have been an essential feature of the wine industry in South Australia. They will be placed in an impossible position in relation to cash demands arising from revaluation in five years. I did get from the Commonwealth Treasurer a concession from three years to five years in the requirement for valuation of the stocks. It is not enough, however, and I told him at the time it was not enough.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think he will change his mind?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope he will. I have put my views on this subject in detail, with a fully prepared case (in co-operation with the Wine Board and the wine and brandy producers) to show that it is not possible for the wine industry to bear this change under section 31A, which completely ignores the needs of the industry. It is necessary for people to be able to hold their stocks without immediately having to pay taxation on them, simply to ensure that they are matured.

As to the change in requiring a full stock valuation, how in the world that can be obtained I am not certain, and no accountant can say how one could get a full valuation of wine stocks at that time. To require a full valuation of wine stocks will produce one thing in addition to the sale of the proprietary wineries: it will mean that winemakers have every motive to market their wine without maturing it, because they have to get a cash return from the sale of the wine so that they can pay tax.

Dr. Eastick: One would think the Treasurer would have acted more responsibly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not going to accuse the Treasurer of irresponsibility in this matter. I know that he gave it a great deal of consideration, that Treasury officers have argued very heavily in the opposite direction, and that there is a lobby in the Commonwealth Treasury that has been trying to get rid of section 31A since 1953, when it first came in. While the provision for extra excise on potable spirits is reasonable, to cut out the brandy differential ignores the fact that brandy is much more expensive to produce than comparable spirits, rum or whisky, which use a much more expensive raw material; but this process is more expensive and. under the law, we require brandy makers to mature their stocks for two years, a requirement not imposed in respect of other potable spirits. It is essential to maintain the differential between the brandy excise and the excise on rum and whisky. The result will clearly be not only that the Commonwealth will not get the revenue out of this that it expects, because there will be a fall in brandy sales: in addition, it means that the people who are growing doradillos in South Australia (and they are largely the growers in the District of Chaffey; although there are some in the District of Kavel, the biggest group is in the irrigated areas on the Murray River) will not sell a grape this year as a result of this process. I have put that, with all the force I am able, to the Commonwealth Treasurer. I bitterly resent the fact that the case that has been put by us has not been listened to more attentively in Canberra. I agree with the honourable member who has moved this motion that this is most harmful to South Australia. There could have been no area in which the State could be hit more directly than this.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think the Prime Minister should sack Dr. Coombs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not saying that, but I think he might have some second thoughts about some of the people sitting on that committee. These two measures hit South Australia much harder than they hit any other part of Australia. We account for more than 90 per cent of the brandy and nearly 70 per cent of the wines produced in this country, and these two measures are a grave blow to South Australia. I entirely support the representations made by the Wine Board and by the wine and brandy manufacturers on this issue, and therefore I have moved the amendment. I imagine the honourable member would be in accord with the sentiments of the amendment, which do not derogate from his original motion but rather extend it to the areas that I think need to be covered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN seconded the motion.

Mr. NANK1VELL (Mallee): I support the amendment, which covers the objections we on this side of the House have to this action of the Commonwealth Government. I endorse what the Premier has said. I shall be brief, because if we wish to vote on this matter it is important that this House should show its attitude to the action of the Commonwealth Government as well as reflect the stand of individual members of this House. We can only do that by taking a vote on the motion. I could not support more strongly the statement the Premier made about the proposed amendment to section 31A of the Income Tax Assessment Act which will require proprietary companies to change their system of valuing stock so that they may pay the Treasury within five years. As the Premier has informed the Commonwealth Treasurer, the valuation of the stock on hand will be a tremendous imposition on these companies. I believe one of the proprietary companies will be faced with a bill for $1 800 000. The purchase of grapes will be affected, because these companies will not be able to find that sum and also continue to purchase stock. They will run down their stocks, and it is unlikely that they will be in the market for grapes this year. This is a serious situation, particularly as the coming season should be extremely good.

I make clear that the wine-grape grower is not a person of great wealth: figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that the average net income is about $2 885 a year. I believe the Government is trying to strike at the multi-national companies in this matter (and they are companies of great wealth), but in doing so, because the Government has these companies in mind, serious damage will be caused to local companies; that is, the small proprietary companies but not the co-operatives. This action will seriously prejudice the chances of a good price for grapes for distillation in this year's vintage. I thank the Deputy Premier for extending the sitting of the House to enable me to make these comments, and I repeat that I support the Premier's amendment, because it is comprehensive and covers the aspect of income lax not previously covered by ray colleague.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): When listening to a radio broadcast about 10 days or 12 days ago, I heard a question asked in the House of Representatives in Canberra. A Minister was asked whether he agreed with the Premier of South Australia, who had said that the tax on the South Australian wine industry was worse than that imposed by a Commonwealth Liberal Government. The Minister did not agree so it would seem that this motion is necessary, because the Premier could not influence by negotiation, or in any indirect or direct way, his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the amendment, which increases the impact of the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I appreciate the Premier's attitude, which is in keeping with the standard that he has maintained on this matter since the 50c a gallon (4.54 *l*) wine tax was introduced, and I am pleased that he has maintained that stand. The member for Mallee indicated to me that he considered moving a similar amendment to include the revaluing of stocks held at wineries or distilleries, because the distilleries would reduce their stocks of brandy if this valuation were proceeded with and would not purchase any fruit this year with which to make brandy.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

[Sitting suspended from 6.6 *to* 7.45 *p.m.]*

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (WEIGHTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 25. Page 1463.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): There is no doubt that the situation that has been allowed to arise over the years has brought about a complete contradiction. It is a situation where speed limits that have become impracticable have been allowed to remain in operation, which has had (he effect of presenting a greater hazard to road safety than was the hazard that led to the original imposition of those speed limits. There are one or two other matters I shall refer to in passing, and I am sure they will be considered carefully by the Minister. The first relates to the measurement of weight. I do not quarrel with the imposition of weight or load limits in this Bill. As I said at the beginning of my speech, these matters are all interrelated, and speed limits cannot be relaxed unless braking and load limits are considered: they all go hand in hand. I am concerned at the proposed method of weighing—the split axle weighing. I do not know, but I am assured by people who should know that this method can lead to significant inaccuracies, and it is wrong, if there is any doubt at all, that these machines should be used. The loadometer, as the Minister has pointed out, is a portable and useful type of machine for use at the roadside, but it is of no value if it is not accurate. Further, if some officers have been prepared in the middle of the night to resort to the use of lights, placed by the side of the road at measured distances), and stopwatches to apprehend transport drivers exceeding the present speed limit (which has been a widespread practice in this State over the past two or three years), and if those officers (I do not say that this has been the general practice of the police) have been so concerned to detect offenders by using these methods, I hope they will arrive at the same degree of exactitude when it comes to estimating axle loads.

If there is any doubt (and the loadometer appears to have the potential to give rise to that doubt), that doubt must operate to the benefit of the transport driver. We must take every care to ensure that no-one is penalized simply because of the form of weighing device used. I agree with the exemptions outlined by my colleagues for primary producers. I cannot see there can be any harm in a farmer or a primary producer transporting his wheat or other primary produce by road in excess of the load limit, provided that he carries it to the nearest silo, in the case of wheat, or to the nearest point for unloading, and that he does it with care.

I give the primary producer every consideration. He is a responsible citizen and will not attempt to drive his vehicle, if it is overloaded, at speeds in excess of a limit required for public safety. In this case the limits should be applied by specification and not by the axle load limits. There are other citizens of this Stale who deserve special consideration because they live in outlying areas: I refer to the far north-western and the far north-eastern areas of this State. The member for Eyre and the member for Frome will be able to speak on this matter full well. Those people deserve special consideration. Generally, I support the introduction of this Bill, because the present situation is ridiculous. I believe the Bill is long overdue. The present Minister of Transport has fiddled with this problem as he has fiddled with many other problems in relation to the metropolitan transport system: for instance, dial-a-bus and many other famous matters to which he has given his attention.

Mr. Evans: Infamous, you mean.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, or infamous matters. One has only to mention the words "Breuning report" to bring back a host of memories to the House. The Minister of Transport has fiddled with this matter, and the introduction of these increased speed limits, together with the matching load limits and braking requirements, is long overdue. It does the Minister no credit that it has taken so long, but at least he has now seen the error of his ways. With the guidance of the committee he has introduced this Bill, which I support.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill, although I find certain aspects of it objectionable. In the main, I consider it a good Bill, necessary for modern transport. I comment now on a report that has been commonly referred to as the Flint report, which is excellent. However, I protest that only one representative of the primary producing industry was on that committee, which numbered 15 members. At present more than half the motor trucks in South Australia are owned by primary producers, but the primary producing industry had only one representative on that committee.

However, all in all, the report is excellent. I compliment the Minister on having made this report available to all members, which allowed them to become conversant with it. I lent a copy of the report to many interested parties, and I think it has helped the Bill to be reasonably well received throughout the State. I only wish that all reports brought up could be tabled and distributed to members, for it would be a great help to them, particularly when Bills were introduced as a result of those reports. In his second reading explanation, the Minister had this to say about the committee's report:

> The committee, however, acknowledged that excessive loading of commercial vehicles (that is to say, loading beyond the limit for which they were designed) is a factor that can seriously reduce standards of safety.

That may sound all right in theory but it is not proved in practice, particularly in this present case when we refer to primary-producing vehicles. Accident figures also refute that statement, because it has been proved that motor trucks have the lowest accident rate in the whole of South Australia. In fact, the rate is as low as 5.5 per cent, so the Minister's remark that the overloading of trucks was a factor that could seriously reduce the standards of safety was a little wide of the mark. I will now give the

percentage of accidents involving various types of registered vehicle in South Australia for the year ended December, 1972.

In that year, 2 766 buses were registered, 515 of which were involved in accidents, giving an accident rate of 18-6 per cent. The next highest figure is for semi-trailers. The number registered in that year was 2 993, and 543 of them, or 18 per cent, were involved in accidents. Regarding cars and station waggons. 406 123 were registered, 52 822 of which were involved in accidents, giving an accident rate of 13 per cent. For motor cycles, the total number registered was 19 577, of which 1 966 were involved in accidents, or an accident rale of 10 per cent. For panel vans and utilities, 43 494 were registered and 4 492, or 10.3 per cent, were involved in accidents. In the same year 41 463 motor trucks were registered and 2 280 were involved in accidents, giving an accident rate of 5.5 per cent.

It is recognized that primary producers' trucks are the least involved in accidents, so one may well assume that the accident rate for those vehicles in this State is about 3 per cent, and I do not know how the Minister will reduce that percentage by preventing trucks from overloading. It can be argued that buses and semi-trailers are exposed to more risk than are motor trucks. I agree with this, but this Bill does not deal with buses or semi-trailers: it deals mainly with motor trucks.

The Bill cuts across what I consider the Government should be doing at present, namely, persuading primary producers to cart their grain to the nearest silo or their produce to the nearest railway station. Because of this load limit on motor trucks, these farmers will not be able to cart wheat to the local silo, unless they take in about 30 bags of wheat a trip. I warn the Minister that these people will not register the trucks (and that will mean considerably less revenue to the Government) but will use them as hacks around the farm.

When they reap the grain, they will let the carting of it to large contractors, who will cart it direct to the terminal port. Therefore, the Government will lose in two ways, first in revenue and secondly in freight on the cartage of grain to silos. Last week I heard of a road haulier having paid $24 000 for a truck and chassis. To this he must add a tray, bulk bins, and necessary trailers, so this is one man who will be prepared for what will happen under this legislation. The Government should remember that over the years manufacturers of commercial vehicles have kept the gross vehicle weight down to a minimum.

Mr. Venning: For their own protection.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, they have done this for their own protection in the case of warranty. However, in the past few years the G.V.W. has been upgraded considerably on these vehicles. I consider that, if the older trucks were inspected, it would be proved that they could cart a far greater load than they are now permitted to carry. A few weeks ago a farmer inspected a new truck in Adelaide. It was similar to his 10-year-old truck, and the G.V.W. of it was thousands of pounds higher than that of the elder vehicle.

I agree with the provisions regarding speed limits and braking, particularly as this legislation will not become operative until July next year. This will enable truck owners to have their trucks upgraded, and it will be advantageous to have the provisions regarding the speed limit and braking coming in at the same time. I agree with the provision that the load limits will not come into operation until January 1, 1975. This will give people with smaller farm trucks two harvests in which to adjust and, at the end of the two-year period, if they cannot have their trucks upgraded from the weight-carrying point of view, they will not have to register them but they can use them for hacks around the farm, having their produce carted by road hauliers.

Another matter causing concern involves district councils and tip trucks. Most councils own their own tip trucks, which at present carry about 6 cub. yds. (4.5 m^3). That amount of road material can weigh anything up to 8 tons (8.12 *t*). Under this new legislation, those trucks most certainly will have reduced load limits. At present the Highways Department employs many of these contractors on an hourly basis, and I understand that the present rate is $4 an hour. When this legislation comes into operation, will the Highways Department still pay $4 an hour for the hire of these trucks and have the load reduced from 6 cubic yards to, say, 4 cub. yds. (3 m^3), or will these people be told by the Highways Department that they are no longer required? If they are told that, they will have to find other employment elsewhere, and this is another aspect that must be examined.

I consider that a speed limit of 90 km/h (56 m.p.h.) is suitable on sealed roads, but in the North of the State on floating surface roads, a semi-trailer travelling at 56 m.p.h. would create much dust and it would be difficult for a motorist to pass. One would have to travel at about 65 m.p.h. (104 km/h) to pass, and on strange roads and with the many bends there would be much risk in doing that. I consider that on this type of road perhaps 80 km/h (about 50 m.p.h.) would be a sufficiently high speed.

As we go farther north, the speed limit does not have effect, because on those roads a person cannot travel at even 40 m.p.h. (64 km/h) in a motor truck, so there is no problem in that area regarding speed limits. One instance that I should like to quote highlights what I have said about speed limits in the Far North. The owner of one cattle station on the Birdsville track must take his cattle 50 miles (80 km) before he reaches that road. The Birdsville track is being upgraded as a beef road and its condition is quite good, but the road for the first 50 miles that this station owner must travel is so winding and bad that when he has travelled that distance he must unload the cattle and load them again because many of them are down in the truck and cannot be got back on their feet. This shows that the speed limits will not worry the people in the Far North. I cannot see any point in requiring brakes to be applied to the front wheels of trailers. It is generally recognized throughout the industry that this would be quite dangerous, and I sincerely hope that this requirement is not brought into operation.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): As most aspects of this Bill have been covered adequately by my colleagues, I will emphasize only one point. I represent the Hills area, where there arc many dairy farmers and other farmers who own small trucks. I refer to the exemption granted in respect of the carting of grain and timber on level ground. What constitutes level ground? I do not believe the Hills area could be so categorized, but in this area it is not possible to travel at more than 30 miles an hour (48 km/h), and this is a safe speed. Accident statistics prove that there are fewer accidents in the Hills in comparison with the amount of traffic in that area than elsewhere. Although on occasions vehicles tip over into a gully, because they are travelling so slowly no-one is ever hurt. On the 15 miles (24 km) of highway each side of Tailem Bend, more people are killed than in the Hills area, because in the Hills the speed is lower. When

[first became the member for the district I used to be concerned about entering the highway from a small road in my district until I found that other drivers in the area were doing about only 20 miles an hour (32 km/h).

Farmers and others with smaller trucks in the Adelaide Hills will be disadvantaged in comparison with others in the community in respect of the exemption granted for travel on level ground. It is impossible to travel at 56 m.p.h. (90 km/h) in the Hills, where the speed travelled is more likely to be about 25 m.p.h. (40 km/h), and at that speed a driver runs less risk than he does at the higher speeds travelled on the main highways. In supporting what my colleagues have said, I hope that the exemptions will be applied to trucks in the Hills area, because these trucks do not travel at high speeds.

Many dairy farmers travel to the Mallee and elsewhere to purchase oats and other crops as fodder reserves for the coming year and, if they are required to keep their loads down, as will be the case if an exemption is not granted, they will suffer a big hardship. There are few serious accidents in the Hills in proportion to the traffic carried on Hills roads, and I ask that common sense be applied in respect of the carting of grain and other commodities in that area.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. However, changes are required to it, although the Bill is an improvement on the Bill the Minister tried to force on the industry during the last session. I believe some tidying up of the Bill will be done during the Committee stage. I congratulate the Flint committee on its report, which is a good report, providing much information for members to read and absorb. I know some members of the committee personally, and I know them to be most efficient men.

I welcome the increased speed limit to 90 km/h. During the past three years I have asked questions about the speed limit, because heavy transport drivers found difficulty in keeping within the current 35 m.p.h. (56 km/h) limit. The increase to 90 km/h is an improvement, because the old speed penalized not only the drivers of heavy transports but also other road users. Further, over the years many drivers have been penalized for taking what they considered to be a calculated risk in driving at more than the legal speed. However, when they were caught they then had to face the problems involved with breaking the law. They were caught at all odd times of the day and night, as traps were set for them, and the increased speed provided in the Bill is a necessary improvement.

The method of weighing trucks by departmental officers and police using a loadometer, a device weighing one wheel of a vehicle at a time, is a far from accurate method of weighing a heavy vehicle, as I am sure the Minister would agree. In respect of braking requirements, clause 7 provides:

(2) The braking system of a vehicle must comply with the requirements of the regulations both in relation to its design and construction and in relation to its performance and effectiveness.

(3) Every braking system on a vehicle must be of sound and strong material and capable of adjustment so as to maintain its braking power and must be maintained in efficient working order.

I consider that it is imperative (and this has been expressed to me by people with whom I have spoken) that trucks, buses and other heavy vehicles have boosting devices fitted to their brakes: they need power-assisted brakes. However, there is no specification whatsoever in respect of the type of braking system required.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What does the legislation say?

Mr. MATHWIN: Although many trucks and buses have air brakes, they are not currently required by law. I refer specifically to Westinghouse brakes. Although these are not compulsory, many owners of heavy vehicles and other vehicles have fitted them because they believe they are required.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are you suggesting?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister should note this information I am giving him and use it to the best advantage. A fail-safe system of braking is required. One such system is the auto-locking brake, which, when applied, stays applied until the pressure builds up. Another system of brake assistance, referred to by the member for Fisher, is known as the exhaust-retarder system, which has proved to be most effective and which can be used as a back-up brake in the event of brake failure or excessive wear on the brakes. Braking is important, particularly with regard to buses that travel to other States, but not so much with regard to buses used in the metropolitan area. We should have regulations covering the use of buses that travel to other Stales.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about country buses?

Mr. MATHWIN: We should classify the buses: those used in the metropolitan area and those used to travel to other States. At present any private bus or any bus used in the metropolitan area can travel to another State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's completely untrue. Start talking on something you know something about, and don't talk such rubbish.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am sorry that the Minister has taken that attitude.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Get on with the Bill instead of talking the rot you are talking now.

Mr. MATHWIN: Is talking about brake failure and brake systems absolute rot to the Minister? Every day he tells us about the interest he takes in road safety. This is the Minister who, at the opening of the road safety centre at Marion, was called a genius but who is now attacking me for talking about efficient braking systems.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're talking about any bus going to another State. That's untrue. You know that's untrue. Admit that, or admit that you're an ignoramus. They're both true.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections must cease. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Now that the genius has stopped interjecting—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You won't reply to me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: These buses are inspected every six months (I know that I am on a sore point as far as the Minister is concerned), and transports are not checked at all. The only way checks are made is by the six-monthly inspection: there is no inspection on a mileage basis. Any bus could do between 3 000 miles (4 828 km) and 60 000 miles (96 560 km) in six months, so the mileage factor must be considered.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: 10 000 miles (16 090 km) a month?

Mr. MATHWIN: I suggest that buses should be inspected not every six months but on a mileage and time basis, because a bus or truck could travel a considerable distance in the specified time. As buses travelling to other States would probably travel an even greater mileage, I believe that the check on them is far too lax. When a check is made, no distinction is made between a bus going to other States and a bus used in the metropolitan area, irrespective of the work they do.

Hitherto, everyone has concentrated on axle loading. Between Adelaide and Melbourne are between eight and 10

weighbridges, but no maintenance check has been required. Appendix II-2 of the Report on Commercial Road Transport that deals with the testing of brakes states as follows:

The testing of brakes on commercial motor vehicles shall be carried out:

(i) on a hard dry level surface free of loose material;
(ii) with the driver and, where practicable, an observer, under any condition of loading applicable to the commercial motor vehicle or trailer at the time of test;
(iii) in the case of omnibuses, with a driver and one observer and no other passengers.

Table A of Appendix II-3 sets out the requirements for the braking of commercial motor vehicles and the distances in which they should stop.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that it is not usual practice for an honourable member to read completely from a report. The honourable member has the opportunity to refer to the report, but he must not quote it entirely.

Mr. MATHWIN: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, the report consists of about 40 pages, and I have merely read three paragraphs from it.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that he must not read the other 39 pages of the report. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the assistance of the Minister of labour and Industry, who is still sore because I made him read a second reading explanation last week, which he has not forgotten—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: At least I read it out.

Mr. MATHWIN: You read half of it, and not in very good English at that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out that all remarks must be made through the Chair.

Mr. MATHWIN: Table A of Appendix II-3 states that, at a speed of 30 km/h, a commercial vehicle should stop within 12.9 m and an omnibus travelling at the same speed should stop within J T9 m; I believe that these statistics apply to empty vehicles. It reads very well on paper, but the tests were no doubt carried out on a good road surface, as stipulated in Appendix 11-2 of the report. I believe that that is not a good enough test. A bus may be loaded with as many as 50 passengers, particularly one that travels to other States, and have to go down a steep gradient on a very bad road surface. The test is unsatisfactory and entirely inadequate. I understand from the people who have given me the information that exhaust brakes reduced wear on the linings by up to 300 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you suggesting that those drivers were taking the bus down on brakes alone, and not using gears?

Mr. MATHWIN: Not for a moment, but there are times when this happens. As the Minister knows, it is easy to slip a gear and, once the engine is in neutral, you are finished! Some heavy transport drivers put their vehicles into neutral and coast downhill because the vehicle will go faster. For safety reasons, these matters should be taken into consideration. In South Australia the drivers of heavy goods transports and passenger buses are never tested. Tn the United Kingdom, however, drivers of buses that carry the public must submit to a difficult test. Although I do not support every aspect of it, I support the Bill generally. I will also support the amendments that I expect will be moved.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Opposition members have advanced an extremely good case regarding this Bill, giving valid reasons for the amendments to the Act contained therein. They have also advanced an excellent case why the Bill should be amended. Their reasoning not only sounded good: it was good sound reasoning. The members for Eyre and Gouger argued strongly why primary producers would be heavily penalized by the Bill. Both these members illustrated the disadvantages that the primary producers would suffer if the Bill passed in its present form.

L am sure the Minister of Labour and Industry would agree that industries in this State should achieve maximum efficiency, lowest possible costs in manufacturing their products, and the optimum in productivity. I hope the Minister realizes what all those aspects involve. If these are set as a general yardstick regarding the general economic efficiency of our community, and are applied to this Bill, we will need carefully to assess what the primary producers will require. We need to balance the requirements of primary producers with the safety factors on our roads. This State's accident statistics clearly show that primary producers' vehicles are not a major threat to road, safety. Primary producers can therefore safely load their vehicles to the present maximum permissible limit because there is no evidence to indicate that by doing so they will suddenly increase the risk of road accidents. It is therefore obvious that the case being advanced by country members is valid, and I hope that members of the Labor Party, occasionally being reasonable men, will listen to the cases that have been advanced by Opposition members and, therefore, support some of the amendments moved by them. I turn now to the metropolitan area, the facts regarding primary producers having been soundly and adequately advanced. I refer particularly to the Davenport District and the many trucks used therein.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Speak up. I can't hear you.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister would keep quiet, all members in the Chamber would be able to hear me. I refer particularly to trucks travelling from the quarries in the foothills through my district and other metropolitan districts. These trucks have posed a threat to road safety, as several times they have got out of control when their braking systems have failed. As a result, they have been involved in serious accidents. The amendments contained in the Bill are therefore reasonable and can only help to increase the safety on the roads leading from the foothills into Adelaide. I therefore support fully the provision regarding trucks in the metropolitan area.

It is pleasing to see that several of the quarrying companies, including perhaps the largest company in the Adelaide area, have already accepted the Bill's provisions. The company to which I refer has already purchased many trucks that are designed to carry the maker's weight specification plus 20 per cent. Those trucks will, therefore, carry loads within the permissible limit. Obviously, the closer the load of the truck is matched to the maker's specifications, the safer the vehicle will be. This has had the added advantage that the company concerned has had to install a heavier duty rear axle and, in doing so, has had to use, at a reasonable cost, reverse action or fail-safe brakes. This is probably the greatest advantage to be gained from the implementation of this legislation. We gain this advantage, despite the Bill's not specifying that such brakes must be used.

One aspect concerns me and many other people in my district. These trucks will be able to travel on the roads at a maximum, speed of 37 miles an hour (59.55 km/h), whereas until now they have been permitted to travel at only 30 miles an hour (48.3 km/h). In the short time that I have been a member of this Parliament, I have received many complaints, some of which have been unjustified, regarding the danger of these trucks and the way in which they have been driven. I know that the

quarrying company concerned is taking the greatest possible care in relation to its own trucks. However, not all the trucks belong to this company, some being privately owned, and it is difficult to impose on the latter category the sort of specifications and unwritten rules to which I have referred and which this company has already adopted.

These heavily laden trucks pose a great threat to road safety, particularly when they must stop in an emergency. I refer, for instance, to the several school crossings on Magill, Kensington and Greenhill Roads. These roads also intersect with other roads such as Portrush Road, at which intersections they also pose a threat, unless they have a suitable braking system and their drivers are carefully watching the speeds al which they arc travelling.

Although I support the Bill, I ask Government members carefully to consider the amendments that will be moved by Opposition members in relation to primary producers. I look forward to the time when we can expect in the metropolitan area even greater safety standards and a lowering of the accident rate involving quarry trucks travelling to Adelaide from the foothills.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I shall speak only briefly to the Bill put forward by the Minister of Transport, but I should like to mention one matter which is extremely important and which has been touched on already by other members. I agree that periodically the Road Traffic Act must be reviewed. However, when a section of the community has proved responsible and reliable in the ordinary course of its business, and when it has proved able to operate trucks safely and satisfactorily, I believe that should be fairly and reasonably recognized. In this instance I cannot accept that the Minister has taken into account the section of the community to which I refer.

Mr. Keneally: Which section is that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The primary producers of this State, who, by the statistics we have heard this evening, have proved to be reliable and responsible in operating trucks in the ordinary course of their business. The amendments introduced by the Minister in this Bill reflect on the integrity and common sense of these people. The motor vehicle accident schedule for South Australia, produced in this House by the member for Frome, shows clearly that primary producer owner operators are responsible and reliable people who run an effective business with an extremely low accident rate. The ratio, as outlined by the member for Frome earlier in this debate, shows that the primary producing sector of truck operators is to a very great extent the most responsible sector in motor vehicle operations in the State.

During that part of the debate the Minister was paying attention and I hope he was impressed by the comments of the member for Frome. The Minister can safely rely on those figures and on the primary producers' own records of safe operation. As to the amendments proposed, I fully support in particular the amendments—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are no amendments before the House and therefore the honourable member must not refer to them.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Those that I understand will be forthcoming, those which have been foreshadowed—

The SPEAKER: There are no amendments before the House in any shape or form; therefore they cannot be taken into consideration.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Then I shall proceed to say that I suggest the Bill as before the House should be amended to allow primary producers to carry their produce and associated primary requirements without the encumbrance of those matters covered in it.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): The first matter to which I must refer concerns farm trucks, because they are specifically affected by the proposed legislation. Put in their proper perspective, farm trucks arc vehicles used to a limited extent for restricted periods of the year. True, some are used more extensively, but the majority fall into that category. It must not be overlooked that, in the past, they have formed an important adjunct to farm operation. What is intended by this legislation is to impose restrictions on these vehicles to limit their load capacity, and in so doing inevitably to put added costs on the producer. It could be said that, if we did not treat them in this way, we would be making a special exemption for these vehicles, and that this would be privileged treatment of the farming community. However, while it may appear that way, we must remember that the added cost cannot be passed on. If a person is required to make twice the number of trips to carry the same quantity of grain as in the past, it is quite simple arithmetic to show that it will cost him at least twice as much.

In most industries that does not matter two hoots because that cost can be passed on. None of the things we do in this place that affect an intermediate industry really affect the person who has to pay the charge, because he automatically includes that charge in whatever cost he places on the service he provides. In this instance that cannot be done. I am generalizing in using the term "farmer", because it does not apply to all, but a farmer would be obliged to invest in a new truck with a gross vehicle weight equivalent to 8 tons (8.3 tonnes) axle loading if he were to be able to continue carrying the amount of grain he carries at present. It is easy to say what he should do, but no-one has said what this involves in the way of cost.

Mr. Evans: It could be $10 000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As my friend the member for Fisher has said, with a vehicle of this carrying capacity, such as a Ford 700 or a bigger truck, this could mean a cost of up to $10 000 in the purchase of a new truck. Many people buy such a truck and use it as part of their business, and they can make a living out of this investment. They keep the truck running, and any additional cost imposed on them is automatically passed on to the people for whom they do the carrying. I hope the Minister will listen to this point. If he is expecting that, by this sort of legislation, he is going to increase registration fees or that he will gain additional revenue for the railways, let me say that he is completely wrong in his thinking. What will happen (and I say this advisedly, because I have been told this by many of my constituents) is that, if they are obliged to cease using their vehicles as they do at present, and if they are faced with the situation of buying a new vehicle or using carriers, the majority of them, so I am informed, are thinking already of doing their carrying by contract cartage.

This does not mean they will contract cart to the nearest silo, which of course is what they mostly do now because of the limited use they can make of their trucks; it means they will be looking for a figure for cartage from their farms to the terminal port. If this is not a significant aspect to be considered with respect to this matter, I believe that the Government is being irresponsible. If the Government wants to build up a case to run down railway revenues and try to have further inquiries into the railway services and make some lines appear even less economic, it is going the right way about it. Because of the economics of operating a truck on a farm, because the cost cannot be passed on, and because most trucks (about 99 per cent of them) cart to the nearest silo and deliver

wheat to the railways, surely some consideration can be given to an amnesty or limited use of these vehicles if they conform to a certain pattern.

My colleagues have shown there is no evidence to support the claim that, because the vehicles are old and it is claimed now they are overloaded, they are creating a safely hazard and are a high accident risk. No reason can justify this action being taken except for the sake of uniformity. In some cases uniformity should be considered in relation to the reality of what is intended and the impact of such a decision on certain people.

I now refer to the question of weighing trucks. The Bill provides that, if a double-bogie is weighed, one set of wheels can be weighed then the other set and the aggregate taken as the total weight on the axles. In Victoria and other States this method has proved to be unsatisfactory, and weighbridges in those States have been extended so that dual bogies can be weighed together and not separately. I suggest that the Minister obtains a report on this matter to ascertain whether evidence is available to show that is so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I have done that already.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am pleased that the Minister has done that, and shall be pleased to hear the results and how local figures compare with those from other States. In principle I support the legislation, because much of it is common sense and good thinking concerning braking and speed limits, but I hope the Minister's attention will be drawn to the fact that, whilst his colleagues may suggest that special consideration is being given to a privileged class, some commonsense reason should be advanced as to why restricted usage should not be allowed for some periods of the year. I do not suggest this as a threat but as a commonsense statement in that the Government will gain nothing in safety and lose substantial revenue if it does not consider the special circumstances of the primary producer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): This has been an extremely strange debate, to say the least. I think most Opposition members have taken the chance to voice their expertise about transport but, strange as it may seem, their expertise is at variance with the expertise contained in the committee's report. I choose to support the expertise of the committee rather than that of Opposition members. If one were sitting in the gallery—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said that if one were sitting in the gallery, which I am not—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no reference to the gallery. I have called the honourable Minister to order, because there can be no reference at all to the gallery.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If one had heard the debate this evening and last week without knowing more of the details of the Bill, one could presume to believe from the remarks of Opposition members that this was a Bill to deal with the transport of goods of primary producers, and of primary producers only.

Mr. Venning: That's not true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is all we have heard about from most Opposition members: they showed their single-mindedness and their interest in one section of the community only—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —by merely talking about how the Bill would affect primary producers. They were not concerned about the general carrier or about road safety, but they were concerned—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —about primary producers. Apparently, Opposition members still believe that the primary producer is the only person existing in South Australia.

Mr. Chapman: The only one you have ignored!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member is well known for his attitude of starving the workers until they are on their knees, and I do not intend to enter into a discussion with him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Turn down the volume!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not need to, because the honourable member is one of the few who have not contributed to this debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I have been away.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the only reason, otherwise we would have heard the same story from the honourable member, because the member for Eyre, the member for Alexandra, the member for Goyder, the member for Flinders, and the member for Gouger all have said, "Please inflict this on everyone, but the primary producer."

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What rubbish the Opposition can talk!

Mr. Venning: I'll say this is rubbish.

Dr. Eastick: Why don't you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader is no better.

Mr. Gunn: What about saying something—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Some of the comments about railway revenue are so childish that they are almost unbelievable.

Mr. McAnaney: You wouldn't be game enough to talk about the railways!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, Opposition members are not aware of the details of this Bill.

Mr. Chapman: The details weren't—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are no railways on Kangaroo Island, so I cannot understand what the honourable member is talking about.

Mr. Chapman: We haven't got them like you have them on the mainland, either, thank goodness.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This Bill has nothing to do with railway revenue, but it has much to do with road safety.

Mr. Gunn: No-one complained about that.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's an ignorant statement by the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Eyre has complained about it. We have heard about the committee, but Opposition members gave lip service to it in their congratulations but then criticized it because only one country representative was a member of it. What a sin! It is a pity that honourable members did not check to ascertain who its members were. If they had, they would not have made these stupid statements. When I introduced the Bill, I paid a tribute to that committee as a committee of experts. I repeat my statement: I commend the committee for having done a mighty fine job.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish the honourable member had said that in his second reading speech, instead of being so critical—

Mr. Venning: I did say it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and complaining that only one country representative was a member. I believe the committee is 100 per cent correct: I do not pay its members a tribute on the one hand, and, on the other hand, criticize them. They have done a mighty fine job. When

they visited country areas and were able, without political interference, to explain the purposes of this Bill and what it was designed to do, they were given complete support. It was when they visited areas in which Opposition members, for their own petty, political benefit, decided to make a political theme out of this matter, that the committee experienced any trouble at all.

Mr. Nankivell: Not when they explained to people what it was all about.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The position is that, when the Chairman or other members of that committee went to meetings in country areas and were given the opportunity, divorced from Party politics, of explaining thoroughly what that Bill was all about, what it was intended to do, the effect it would have on the primary producer and other sections of the community—

Mr. Gunn: That is not correct.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —that committee's report was completely acceptable.

Mr. Gunn: That is untrue.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It was only when that committee went into one area where the member decided to make a political issue out of it that there was any trouble at all, and no-one knows that better than the member for Eyre, because it was in his district that it was decided to make a political football out of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: I told the people the true facts.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member could not do that because he does not know what the Bill is all about. The Chairman of the committee who went into his area was able to give the people the true facts, and the honourable member knew it. If the member for Eyre had kept his nose out of it, the people of his district would have been much happier than they had been before. There are one or two other points.

Mr. Chapman: Are there more? It is incredible.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It may be incredible to the member for Alexandra, for he and his colleagues have raved on for about four hours talking about the incredible things in this Bill. Let me look at one or two points that have been raised. We have heard much criticism from members opposite—

Mr. McAnaney: Constructive criticism; we have been a great help to the Minister and his committee.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have heard criticism of the machine, which many members have heard of for the first time this evening, called a loadometer. The member for Alexandra has never seen one in his life. He would not even know what one looked like, as is the case with so many other members, who are nevertheless prepared to stand on their feet and criticize both the machine and the operator, which is typical of members opposite. I doubt very much whether the member for Rocky River has seen one in operation—

Mr. Venning: Oh, yes. I have been "pinched" because of it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has been "pinched" for that—that is why he knows about it—but now he thinks apparently that there should be some special immunity for primary producers. Let me now look at some of the points (because they make interesting reading) made by various members. T am sorry that the member for Fisher is not present because I was intrigued by what he had to say. He said:

I suppose I should openly admit that I have driven on the road vehicles that have been excessively overloaded and, possibly, I have, when struggling to survive economically, driven vehicles with brakes that would not meet today's requirements.

I commend the honourable member for being so honest about it, but it is a fairly good reason why this legislation should be introduced. It shows clearly the deficiencies of the present situation. A little later the honourable member said:

Further, there is no doubt that, because some trucks are overloaded and drivers take gambles, particularly in the Hills, some serious accidents and some near misses have occurred. In one case there could have been a catastrophe involving a service bus; fortunately, through the driver's good judgment there were no injuries and no real damage to the vehicle. However, serious accidents of that type can happen.

The member for Heysen lives on the philosophy "Wait until the horse gets out before you shut the gate." That is not our philosophy; it is not the way we tackle road safety. We are attempting to prevent road accidents rather than provide a cure after the event.

Let me look at what the member for Eyre, who was most vocal, said. I remember the member for Goyder saying exactly the same thing, and he even called the member for Rocky River his "friend". It was a new-found friendship. He was severe on the member for Hanson and told him it was the worst speech he had ever listened to, but what the member for Goyder failed to do was to read or listen carefully to what the member for Hanson said. The member for Hanson (I cross swords often enough with him but on this occasion he was one of the few members who was right) said at the beginning of his speech that this was a Committee Bill and that the argument should be confined to proceedings in Committee. Unfortunately, his example was not followed by his cronies behind him. This is what the member for Eyre said:

I support the provisions in the Bill increasing the speed limits for commercial vehicles. For a long time, I have thought that these limits should be increased. Like most members who represent country areas, I have been approached many times by operators who have been charged with breaking the speed limit. I have been disturbed, as the member for Hanson said he has been disturbed, by some of the methods used in detecting these offences. Out from Iron Knob, people have stationed themselves in holes in the road at 12 midnight and 1 o'clock in the morning. . . . People who have been travelling at 35 m.p.h. (56 km/h) and 40 m.p.h. (64 km/h) have been charged. In one week, five or six of my constituents were charged, and they were not doing any harm at all—

except that they were breaking the law! The honourable member did not mention that: they were only breaking the law—they were not doing any harm. Within a short time of saying that, the honourable member suddenly realized, "My goodness, what have I done! Me and my big mouth again!" So he had something else to say. Although he had just been saying that those people who had been breaking the law had been doing no harm, he then said:

In no circumstance do I support people who deliberately flout the law.

Mr. Gunn: Read on.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall, because it is most interesting. The honourable member continued:

Unlike the Premier, I do not believe that people who break the law should not accept the consequences.

A moment or two earlier he was saying that those people who were speeding were doing no harm; they were only breaking the law. Now he is saying that they must accept it! The honourable member also states:

As a member, I have sworn to uphold the law and to be loyal to Her Majesty.

They are mighty words! The honourable member also said:

I would not make statements of that kind.

The Attorney-General interjected at that stage.

Mr. Gunn: He was out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member also is interjecting, so he is out of order. The Attorney-General interjected and stated:

You've no regard for your conscience. That's the difference between you and the Premier.

The honourable member then said:

I have regard for my conscience, but I believe that, if a law is obnoxious, one should uphold it and try to change it by democratic means.

Mr. Gunn: That's the point I made.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At that stage, the Attorney-General interjected and said:

Even though it's against your conscience?

Then the member for Eyre stated:

There are many things with which I do not agree. However, I do not intend to enter into a debate on that matter with the Attorney-General. We have seen the Attorney-General in action in the House on many occasions when he has been like Fred Astaire: he has done more quick footwork than any other member.

The Attorney-General then interjected:

You can't face up to that question.

This evening I give the member for Eyre the opportunity to face up to it. Has he a conscience? He would not face up to the Attorney-General.

Mr. Coumbe: Was this said in connection with this debate?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I am reading from the *Hansard,* record of this debate. The facts are that the member for Eyre was not really complaining in .true conscience. He was merely complaining that some of his constituents were caught, not that they were breaking the law. He thought that breaking the law was all right, but that it was crook when they were caught. The honourable member also stated:

No law should be made unless it will be enforced, and we should all support that principle.

Then he had second thoughts, because he stated:

Most of my constituents rely on road transport and feel strongly about these measures, which, if they are introduced in an iron-fisted manner or enforced without proper consideration or regard for the needs of people in outlying areas, will have a detrimental effect not only on the rural community but on consumers in those areas.

He is saying that we must have a law and let us make sure that it is enforced but, when it is enforced, do not enforce it on the primary producer. The sectional attitude of the member for Eyre is typical of that of so many of his colleagues on the other side.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Bird-brained.

Mr. Venning: We're proud of that attitude.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the honourable member is proud of being a bird-brain, as my colleague has said. As many matters will be canvassed adequately in the Committee stage, I see no point in further delaying the House at the second reading stage, and I urge that the second reading be carried.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to the constitution of the Road Traffic Board.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister say what will be the position when the Bill has been passed in both Houses but has not been proclaimed, if people comply with the requirements of the Act? The Minister, in his second reading explanation, has said that the new law would not come into operation until July next year.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I should have expected all members to realize that, until an Act is altered, it remains in operation.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

New clause 3a—"Constitution of Road Traffic Board."

Mr. VENNING: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. Section 11 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after paragraph (*c*) of subsection (2) the following paragraph :

and

(*d*) a person representative of primary industry nominated by the Minister of Agriculture.

The industry considers that, as the Road Traffic Board will be issuing permits to truck drivers throughout the State, it will be advisable to have a representative of primary industry on the board. The Minister will admit that the nomination by a primary producer's organization of Michael Shanahan to the committee headed by Mr. Flint was of great assistance to that committee. For that reason, the organization considers that primary industry should be represented on the Road Traffic Board.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which organization?

Mr. VENNING: The United Farmers and Graziers. I believe that a member of the rural industry, nominated by the Minister of Agriculture, should be on the board.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Frankly, I believe that, if the U.F. and G. considered that it wanted a representative on the board, it would have approached me. I should be interested to know from the U.F. and G. whether the member for Rocky River has its authority to make a statement in the House purporting to claim that it wants a representative on the board and whether that organization has authorized him to make the statement he has made. I suggest that the honourable member study the Road Traffic Act and he will see that a multitude of tasks is assigned to the board. The task that this Bill will inflict on it will merely be one more task to add to an already imposing list. I have every confidence in the constitution of the board as at present constituted. I do not accept for a moment the innuendo that the present members are incapable of properly assessing primary producers' problems, because they are honest, fair-minded and competent men who are capable of assessing a rural, metropolitan or city problem. As they have demonstrated their ability by their activities, I believe that the composition of the board should not be altered. I do not accept the amendment.

Mr. VENNING: The General Secretary of the U.F. and G. (Mr. Grant Andrews) requested that a primary producer be on the board.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've his authority to say that, have you?

Mr. VENNING: Just a minute. As a Parliamentarian I have the right to move what I have moved.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not the point. I'm asking you whether you have the authority of the U.F. and G. to do what you have done?

Mr. VENNING: I was approached by the General Secretary regarding rural industry representation on the board. Why did the Minister grant a nomination of the U.F. and G. to be on the Flint committee? Although the

Minister said that he had complete faith in the present board, he would be better advised on several of his Government departments if he had better representation from rural industry.

Mr. GUNN: I support the new clause. We are discussing matters that will have a vital effect not only on road transport operators but on all sections of the road transport industry. As a primary producer member who represents a large number of truck owners in the State I believe that the board should comprise a wide cross-section of people involved in industry. What is wrong with having a member of the U.F. and G. on the board? The Minister this evening has engaged in personal abuse of the lowest and worst kind, and has told untruths about me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As we are dealing with a proposed new clause that deals with a representative from a certain organization, I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister went wide of the mark in his vicious attack on the member for Rocky River.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is reflecting on the Chair. He must confine his remarks to the proposed new clause.

Mr. GUNN: Only last week I discussed this matter with the General Secretary of the U.F. and G. and his words to me were the same, in effect, as those used by the member for Rocky River. The General Secretary was of the opinion that the primary industry section of the road transport industry should have a representative on the board. If there has been an oversight in the past, what is wrong with correcting the matter when the legislation is before Parliament? The Minister wants to deny people their democratic rights. He and his colleagues talk about the rights of the majority and of people to be properly represented, yet on an important matter such as this he is not willing to take a democratic course of action.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's not a representative board but an expert board.

Mr. GUNN: All right but, if that is so, why should it not have people on it who have a good knowledge of the industry?

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: It is obvious, when one examines the Flint report and when one listens to members of the committee, that some people do not have a full appreciation of the effect of the legislation on primary producers and on the other sections of the community that will be affected. The member for Rocky River stated it was difficult for members of the U. F. and G. to get even one representative on the Flint committee.

Mr. Keneally: Do you agree the unions should have a representative on the board?

Mr. GUNN: I am not opposed to the unions having a representative on the board. If members opposite, who claim to represent trade unions, are not capable of arranging such representation, that is not my fault. I represent the people who elected me and the people who will be seriously affected in my district, and I make no apology for saying that. The Minister has the numbers and, with his typical iron fist and arrogant attitude, he will force this legislation through, but I hope that another place inserts this new clause.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister say whether he would consider, if progress were now reported, further representation being made to him?

Mr. HALL: I am inclined to support the member for Rocky River, although, there is a tremendous gulf between me and the member for Rocky River on many political topics. The honourable member has been rather persuasive and the Minister has been convincing in his reply, so I should like the member for Rocky River to be less reticent in respect of the representation that should be made on the board. I take the Minister's point that, unless there has been some proper representation, perhaps a request from the U.F. & G. for a member on the board, it would be foolish for this Committee to direct that a member of that organization be on the board.

Mr. VENNING: I move:

That progress be reported.

This is an important aspect of the Bill and the carrying of this motion will enable the U.F. & G. to send a delegation to the Minister.

Motion negatived.

Mr. HALL: Now that the member for Rocky River has been unsuccessful in his move to gag the debate, I ask him again what is the manner and detail of the representation that has been made to him in respect of a request about a member of the Road Traffic Board.

Mr. VENNING: I have been in consultation with the General Secretary of the U.F. *& G.,* and he has asked that a primary producer be appointed to the board.

Mr. GUNN: If a direct approach were made to the Minister, would he be willing to have a member of the U.F. & G., representing primary industry, on the Road Traffic Board?

Mr. BLACKER: In supporting the amendment, I point out that the U.F. & G. is not mentioned in it.

Mr. McANANEY: How can the U.F. & G. be involved in an appointment to be made by the Minister of Agriculture? The amendment simply requests the Minister of Agriculture to nominate a primary producer as a member of the Road Traffic Board. After all, primary industry has the greatest number of transport trucks of any group in the community. A wider range of expertise would be desirable on the board, and I am sure that the common sense of the Minister will allow him to accede to the request.

Mr. GUNN: I have tried to get information from the Minister, and I would expect that he would be eager to give the people of the State a reply in respect of this important amendment, which affects all primary producers in this State. I endorse what the member for Rocky River has said regarding this amendment. In the course of my duties as a member of this House, I seek information from a wide section of the community and, as this legislation affects primary producers, I have spoken about it to the Secretary of the U.F. and G., and he has suggested that primary producers be represented on the board. I agree entirely with that, and the member for Rocky River has acted correctly in moving an amendment to effect that suggestion.

Mr. HALL: Having followed diligently the explanation given by the member for Rocky River, I advise the Minister to accept the amendment on the basis that the board will have on it a representative of an area vitally affected by its decisions. If the Minister accepted that this representative should join this multiple group, it would not be a one-sided matter. The member for Rocky River has, correctly, not clouded his amendment with details, leaving it to the Minister to decide the way in which a selection will be made.

New clause negatived.

Clause 4—"Speed limits for certain vehicles."

Mr. BECKER: I move:

In new section 53 (1) to strike out "Penalty: Not less than twenty and not more than one hundred and fifty dollars" and insert "Penalty: One hundred dollars".

Now that the points demerit scheme is operating, it would indeed be harsh for anyone to be subjected to the penalty provided for in the Bill and, as well, to lose demerit points. I do not like legislation which provides penalties against those who, either wittingly or unwittingly, breach its provisions and which, therefore, can be construed solely as a means of raising revenue. The maximum penalty for a breach of section 53a, which relates to a motor vehicle carrying more than eight passengers and which is to be repealed by clause 5, is $100. I have therefore moved my amendment to make the penalty for a breach of new section 53 (1) more reasonable, and, indeed, more consistent with other penalties in the Act.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Having considered the amendment, I am not willing to accept it. Indeed, I should perhaps have discussed with the Parliamentary Counsel the possibility of increasing the penalty. Several factors must be considered regarding this matter, not the least of which is that speed limits are being increased. If we fix such a small penalty that it will pay drivers to run the risk of committing an offence, the legislation will be ineffective. Also, I have no hesitation in saying that a person who is driving a bus, and who is therefore accepting the responsibility for many lives, ought to be subjected to severe penalties for breaches of the Act. Certainly, I would not countenance a reduction in the penalty. Indeed, I should have been more interested had the member for Hanson moved to increase it.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister's reply is logical, except that the points demerit scheme is operating. If one commits only a few offences, under that scheme one can lose one's licence and, therefore, be unable to earn an income. Under the provision in the Bill as it stands the penalty would be extremely harsh. An owner-driver suffering a loss of income is in real trouble. An operator is likewise in trouble if he suffers loss of income, while professional drivers have little chance of getting suitable employment at a comparable remuneration. I am still of opinion that the loss of demerit points, plus the penalty I have suggested, is sufficiently severe.

Mr. GUNN: The present law is completely unrealistic. If a person is losing demerit points, that in itself is a serious penalty. The people being put off the road are the experienced and capable drivers.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Duty to comply with brake requirements."

Mr. GUNN: In company with the member for Flinders and with Mr. Crawford, who was a member of the committee, I attended meetings at Kadina, Chandada, and Ceduna, at which this matter was discussed. I told the people who attended that the committee appointed by the Minister to examine the requirements of this clause was charged with the responsibility of making a report to the Minister, and that I believed it did a good job. I also made clear that, as the member in this House representing Eyre Peninsula, I had an obligation to the people I represented. I believed certain provisions should be amended and I gave an undertaking that I would move to amend them. The people who attended the meetings were not against proper braking systems on their vehicles, but they were concerned that they might be forced to fit brakes to the front wheels of four-wheel trailers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where is that stipulated in the clause?

Mr. GUNN: It could be in the regulations. Restrictions can be imposed in this measure by regulation, and neither this House nor the other place would have an opportunity to make amendments. Can the Minister assure the Committee that it will not be a requirement of this legislation that people should fit brakes to the front wheels of four-wheel trailers? This could be a dangerous practice, causing trailers to jack-knife, thus resulting in serious accidents.

Mr. EVANS: This clause gives the Minister wide powers in relation to making regulations. I realize that such regulations must come before both Houses of Parliament and that members may discuss them. However, the matter of braking is one of the most important aspects of road safety as it relates to motor vehicles. Many farm vehicles, acquired from Government departments and similar sources, would comply with the strict regulations laid down by the Minister.

Most major road accidents have occurred as a result of the lack of braking ability in emergency situations, or where one braking system has failed and there has been no reserve braking system with sufficient capacity to stop the vehicle. I do not object to the provision and I hope the regulations will be sensible and practicable. The member for Eyre raised a valid point when he spoke of brakes on the front wheels of four-wheel trailers. A dangerous situation arises if the brakes operate simultaneously, but if a relay system is installed between the front and rear brakes so that the rear brakes are applied a split second before the front brakes there is no problem.

Because of the seasonal nature of their work, primary producers can experience problems with malfunctions because of infrequent use of vehicles, or perhaps because vehicles have not been fully checked before harvesting begins. Although I accept the concern of the member for Eyre I believe that, in the main, four-wheel trailers should be considered in braking regulations, together with the relay system to which I have referred.

Mr. RUSSACK: We do not know what the braking regulations will be, nor have any indications been given of the details. I attended meetings at which the committee discussed many matters, but I do not agree that everyone agreed with what the committee had to say. Can the Minister say why it is desirable to promulgate regulations concerning the braking system rather than include the details in this legislation?

Mr. MATHWIN: I hope that the Minister will reply to these important questions, particularly those referring to four-wheel trailers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to do that now that Opposition members have given me the chance to reply.

Dr. Eastick: Come on, now!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If that is the way the Leader wants it, I will sit down.

Mr. GUNN: Surely one can expect a responsible Minister to act in a dignified way. I am seeking from the Minister information that I asked for earlier in relation to the requirements of the regulations. Many people are concerned about this clause and how the regulations will apply to four-wheel trailers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not see any point in wasting time if members were not interested. The position is clear and simple, and every Opposition member knows it. This clause provides for regulations to be made: those regulations have not been made and I am not able to say what they will contain.

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, the Minister would not have introduced a Bill containing such a clause unless proper consideration had been given to it. The question of brakes is important, and we cannot amend these regulations after

they have been laid on the table. Many people in the community will be affected, and they want to know what will be required so that they can make the appropriate arrangements. The equipment required to be fitted to trucks and trailers may not be available later. Unless the Minister can give a reply to these important questions, I suggest that progress be reported, so that he can obtain the necessary information.

Mr. BECKER: The Committee is entitled to have spelt out to it what the braking requirements will be. The legislation was obviously introduced hurriedly and little consideration has been given to the braking system. We do not know the specifications or the types of brake. One recommendation was that braking systems should be in accordance with the regulations of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. If the Minister had wanted to be fair to the committee, he would have adopted its recommendations. It would be most unfair to introduce later in the session regulations on braking. If the Minister is not prepared to spell out what the braking regulations will be, can he tell us when the regulations will be introduced?

Mr. GUNN: Surely the Minister is not going to sit there in silence. This is an important matter. One of the Minister's main arguments for the Bill is road safety. The Minister has introduced legislation that will drastically alter the situation, so surely he could give us some information. Does the Minister intend to bring in regulations to force people to fix spring brakes or other safety devices to their brakes in case they fail? This matter has been discussed all over South Australia. The Minister has a competent department and the facilities of the Road Traffic Board available to him. He has access to that information. Surely he can indicate what he has in mind. At every meeting I have attended this matter has been discussed at great length. Perhaps the Minister will report progress so that he could get some definite information to bring back to the Committee tomorrow.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Eyre has put forward a convincing case that we should not proceed further until more information is available. I should not like to vote on this clause until we have further information. Therefore, it is logical that we should report progress at this stage, and I ask the Minister to do so.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, an attempt is being made to stymie the carrying of this legislation. The member for Davenport knows that as well as the member for Eyre does. This clause gives a regulation-making authority. When these regulations are made, they will be laid on the table of this House. At this stage, they have not been made, so obviously I cannot say what will be in them. That is put in simple and clear terms that the member for Davenport and the member for Eyre can understand, but they both choose to argue about what may or may not happen, and suggest reporting progress—in fact, anything to stop this legislation going through.

Mr. BECKER: When can we expect the regulations—next week, next month, or a matter of several weeks or several months?

Mr. RUSSACK: The committee admits that there is much debate and concern about this matter, and I am sure that the members on this side are expressing their concern because the regulations have not been drafted, and what they will contain is not yet known.

Mr. EVANS: I have expressed enough views in this Chamber about brakes in the last five years for members to appreciate how I feel on the matter. Every member will have the opportunity to see and debate the regulations when they are produced. If the Minister now attempts to clarify each area of braking that is involved, there will be so many doubts in the community and in sections of the trucking industry that they will not know where they are. I understand the concern of my colleagues: I also should like to know what will be in the regulations. However, when the regulations are introduced we will have the opportunity to tear them to pieces if they are unjust, but they may be fair. If the Minister can give an approximate time when the regulations will be available, that would be a good thing.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 1, at 2 p.m.