

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 17, 1961.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### MOUNT GAMBIER WATER SUPPLY.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Augmentation of Mount Gambier Water Supply.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF ENFIELD LOAN) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

### APPROPRIATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1223.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern): In addressing myself to this measure I wish to cover one or two matters that I had hoped to speak on during the Address in Reply but was not able to because time did not permit. At the outset I commend the Government for its fine record and, particularly, I congratulate the Treasurer, as the Leader of the Government, on his 22 years in office, during which time he has been able to balance the Budget. Members may all be immensely proud of that achievement because the economy of the State has benefited greatly from the confidence that has been engendered by the Government's policy. The Government has always handled the State's resources carefully and has made every endeavour to pursue the best course for the State.

Times change, but whether the time is ripe for a change or whether the policy pursued should be continued is a matter for the Government to decide. From time to time members may have suggested some acceleration on certain policies adopted by the Government. However, we have gone through the period to which I have referred with satisfactory results with regard to employment. There has been little unemployment and during much of the period there has been more than full employment. Natural expansion has resulted from the Government's efforts and that expansion has been largely responsible for the great number of people employed. Consequent upon that happy position, South Australia has been able to manu-

facture many articles that it would otherwise have had to purchase from other States or overseas. This has been of great advantage to South Australia.

During this period we have seen a general expansion in all aspects of life relating to industry and the various forms of agriculture. Perhaps even more important, we have seen a rise in the standard of living that I am sure not even many members would have anticipated 22 years ago. Often after a period of over-buoyancy and plentiful employment some troubles may occur that can have a tremendous impact upon the State's requirements in various directions. We have had a great demand for new schools, houses, water supplies, roads and many other amenities that many parts of the State now enjoy. The State also provides other amenities which the people have sought and have been able to afford. Today there are few people who have not a refrigerator, washing machine, television or wireless set compared with the position a few years ago. There has been a terrific demand for these amenities and this has been brought about with the realization that there has been fairly constant employment in this State and the desire of people to use hire-purchase for some of the commodities they needed. We must agree that perhaps hire-purchase has prospered to an undue extent, but on the other hand this was brought about by the fact that certain difficulties were placed in the way of banking institutions; and thus this system, although perhaps not deliberately or thoughtlessly, has developed. South Australia has relied largely upon the motor industry and its ancillaries for providing employment. Men have been pleased, when looking for a job, to go to General Motors-Holden's or some other motor works, and generally work has been available. The policy of many years ago, when men took no exception to being placed off work for a week or two, has recurred recently.

South Australia is indebted to the motor industry and those who have invested their money in it in this country. The other day I had the pleasure of visiting General Motors-Holden's works and was very impressed with the type of people working there, who evidently took a pleasure in their job. When an official party goes through factories the employees are often inclined to scowl, but on this occasion everyone seemed to be happy and the men appeared to be proud to be employed there. Because of the economic trends, General Motors-Holden's were forced to put off some

employees for a few days, but in spite of these trends we can be proud that this company has honoured and intends to honour its undertaking to extend this industry in South Australia. That is a very good thing. Whereas South Australia is providing a number of parts for various Australian factories, when General-Motors-Holden's new extensions are completed much more of that work will be done here.

Earlier in the debate the Hon. Mr. Shard, when speaking about bread carters, gave the impression that it did not matter much if bread was a little dearer provided that those who were engaged in delivering it received better remuneration. He said that these men often met obstacles, such as angry dogs. I have no great argument against these men receiving higher wages, but what concerns me is the tendency of prices to become so high that more and more difficulty is created for those at the end of the line. I refer to the primary producers who have to sell their wool on the world's markets and take what is offered for it. If we are to continue this lifting of costs and wages to all sections, irrespective of whether or not prices of primary products are high, we shall get to the stage where we cannot provide goods, in competition with other States or other countries, at a price that people can afford to pay. That is a matter of which we need to take continual notice. We must maintain a balance, as our Government has done over the years, so that we are not extravagant in any single regard, and perhaps niggardly in another regard.

The Hon. Mr. Bardolph is not here at the moment, but I do not think he would mind if I criticized one or two of his statements. He went to some pains to dissociate the Labor movement from Communism, but I believe that many events, and some recent ones, leave some doubts in the minds of the general public. For instance, the temerity with which the matter of unity tickets was approached comes to mind and also the matter of sympathetic consideration of infiltration by Communists into important positions in the State.

I have in my hand a copy of a statement made by Mr. Cameron, M.H.R., which appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 5, 1959. At that time he was President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party. That statement may sound innocent enough to many people, but others see in it a deep significance, a significance that induces many to feel that we must always be watchful against the possi-

bility of the infiltration of an unwanted ideology into this country. The statement included the following:

That Labor supporters should stop away from the "peace" congress to be held in Melbourne in November just because a few Communists might attend was "about the silliest thing I have heard," the State A.L.P. president (Mr. Cameron, M.H.R.) said in Adelaide yesterday.

"The next move—and it would be consistent with the mouse-like mentality of the opponents of this congress—will be to tell Labor supporters that they have to stop away from church if members of the Liberal Party or the Democratic Labor Party attend the same service," he said.

"All who know that nuclear warfare means the mass destruction of the human race must support peace, and organizations working to that end will always have my support. Labor believes in peace and it is the duty of every Labor man to do everything possible to awaken the public to the dangers of war. I am tired of seeing people adopt a purely 'anti' attitude to Communism. Fight them by all means when they are wrong; but let us not run away from the things in which we believe because some Communists happen to take the same view."

It is desirable, in view of the Hon. Mr. Bardolph's remarks, to remind the House of the urgent need to decide where we are going and follow a straight line rather than diverge into areas of doubt.

I appreciate that the railways have achieved better results and a cheaper service today by their own initiative. The department has used better rollingstock recently and has carried heavy loads of grain. The time when the railways must be bolstered by artificial means is nearing an end. In the depression of the 1930's, most States found themselves in the position of having to bolster the railways to enable them to carry on and produce a reasonable revenue. However, today there is a tendency to improve the system rather than rely on past methods. Last week-end a steam engine made a special trip to Murray Bridge and Goolwa as a farewell gesture to the general public, who paid a tribute to the services given to the State by that type of engine.

The need to bolster the railways by the retention of the Transport Control Board is past, and the board should be abolished. It is a relic of the depression years, and we should repeal Acts that were passed to help the railways in those times. From the point of view of the man at the end of the line, the primary producer, the policy followed by the board results in additional costs. Although it is possible that there should be some control of transport in its competition with the railways, no-one will deny that road

transport has become more economical and more satisfactory in many ways, and if it is more economical to the people who need it, then it is time something was done about the Transport Control Board. Of course, primary producers have had some benefits from the use of ancillary vehicles, but the board's view has always been that if the railways can handle the goods satisfactorily, it has to be an exceptional case to warrant the board giving permission for the use of road transport. When the legislation setting up the board was introduced, a system of controlled routes and areas was organized, which over the years has been condemned by individuals. Perhaps the community as a whole may have been pleased with it, but many people were hostile to the idea of controlled routes.

I can understand a road haulier, finding himself the proud owner of a controlled route in which he can make a good living, being in favour of the board. The board is not only bolstered by the Government and the railways, but by many road transport hauliers, and consequently it is desirable to bring to light some of the aspects which are causing higher costs to the primary producer and other people, who find it difficult to meet them. There has been set up in the near metropolitan area, say, within 50 miles of Adelaide covering Murray Bridge, Yankalilla and the Victor Harbour area, a vast network of controlled areas, for which licences are issued. It is interesting to note that all these licences have not been issued strictly from the point of view of giving service, although the board has paid attention to that fact and has tried to make sure that the licensed person carries out his duties to the district. In addition, the board is granting about 6,000 special permits a year, which would indicate that there is a great need for something to be done immediately with regard to the board. In these controlled areas a permit is issued at a fee of 10 per cent of the cost of the freight, and for livestock the amount is 5 per cent. On other lines an amount of 10 per cent of the freight is paid as a fee if the goods are carted by other than the owner's vehicle. We must take off our hats to the Legislature of the day for its foresight in providing for ancillary vehicles when the principal Act was considered. It has acted as a sort of brake on the board's activities. If I were a member of the board I would ask the Government to do away with these vehicles but, as I am on the other side of the fence, and want things

done as cheaply as possible, I would say that the provision dealing with ancillary vehicles was a good one.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: What would you do if you were the Railways Commissioner?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY: He has proved himself to be a capable officer and has handled railway business very well. He is called upon to do many things that as a businessman he would not want to do. I will not say what I would do if I were the Railways Commissioner because he is hedged around with all sorts of conditions that limit his capacity to have the Railways Department trade as a commercial undertaking. In my opinion the time has arrived when, if there should not be a complete abolition of the Transport Control Board, there should be some limitation on the present provisions. Everywhere we go people complain about the board. Fortunately section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution makes it difficult for the board to do many of the things it would like to do. However, on the other hand, private timber mills in the South-East complain that they cannot do much business in South Australia. They do about 80 per cent to 90 per cent of their trade with Victoria. The only way to get the South Australian trade is to have a number of consignments in one truck. If they want to send goods to Adelaide they must use the railways. Mixed cargoes cause trouble. At one time a part of a mixed cargo from a railway truck was unloaded at Keith, and the rest of the cargo was never seen again. Having cargoes for different people in the one railway truck is not the best, and that has been proved in the timber business in the South-East. Some people go over the border with their timber and arrange transport there, but other people more concerned about ethics do not do it. It is unfortunate that the South-Eastern timber industry is not getting the benefit of all the South Australian trade. Because of transport control South-Eastern storekeepers buy most of their goods from Victoria. Storekeepers in that area, up as far as Penola, can ring Melbourne one morning and order goods and have them delivered next morning by breakfast-time. This is done by the haulier bringing a number of consignments, some of which may be left at Mount Gambier, some at Kalangadoo and some at Penola. Our State is losing much because the area upon which we have spent large sums of money is doing considerable business with Victoria.

The day will come soon when we must grow more vegetables along the River Murray. Now the growers have difficulty in getting their

vegetables to Adelaide. They must be sent on the growers' own vehicles, on the railways, or by means of the good combined service through Murray Bridge. My point is that this costs the producer about 10 per cent more in freight charges. The old ways of handling stock have surely gone. Now a line of sheep may be sold in the morning and sent away soon after lunch by means of two or three road transports. If the sheep had to be drafted into paddocks and checked frequently whilst awaiting rail transport costs would be greatly increased, and in addition the 5 per cent would have to be paid to the board. There is a good case for a review of the board's activities. There was a time when the board fixed the fee that a road haulier had to pay to the board. It was on the basis of 10 per cent. The fees were fixed having regard to rail charges, but today road transport is giving a much better service than the railways and the fees are now fixed in an uncompetitive way with the railways. It is all a matter of pounds, shillings and pence, which is of vital importance to many people.

Reverting again to ancillary vehicles, in the matter of decentralization we would like to see the local storekeeper in a country town keeping a few bags of cement, some iron, and some superphosphate, but metropolitan business people send their own vehicles to country areas, which is permitted under the Act, and provide the required cement, iron and superphosphate. Whether that is desirable or not desirable, it is serious to country people because they have to buy goods from city people who do not allow the country carrier to bring the goods to the country. I believe a commission of 10 per cent or some other charge is levied, but the frustration suffered by the people is more important than the charge in many cases.

I refer now to the controls exercised by the board. Parliament has given the board wide powers and I shall quote sections of the Act to illustrate those powers. The ancillary carrier is constantly making inroads into country work and licensed carriers have been notified that the board did not approve of licensed services where such controls were also operating for ancillary drivers who operated detrimentally to the licensee for the particular area. The board became concerned not only that the railways should pay but particularly to ensure that the licensees who supported the railways in a continuation of this business were not being infiltrated by

vehicles operating ancillary services. Section 14 of the Road and Railway Transport Act states:

The board may, by order, in relation to any controlled route or routes, fix a day after which it shall not be lawful for any unlicensed person to operate any vehicle on that route or those routes for the carriage of passengers or goods or both for hire.

The term "appointed day" in this section means the day fixed under this subsection as regards the particular controlled route on which any vehicle is driven at a material time.

Section 16 reads:

(1) When the board has declared any route to be a controlled route it may by advertisement published in at least two newspapers circulating throughout the State invite applications for licences to operate vehicles on that route for the carriage of passengers or goods or both for hire.

(2) The advertisement may at the discretion of the board—

- (a) set out the number of persons (whether one or more) to whom the board proposes to issue a licence or licences:
- (b) set out any terms and conditions which the board proposes to insert in any licence or which the successful applicant will be required to comply with:
- (c) set out the charge to be made for any licence or whether an applicant for a licence is required to offer therefore a lump sum or a percentage of the earnings of the vehicles operated by him pursuant to the licence or a sum calculated on the mileage run by those vehicles, or a sum computed in any other way.

Section 17 provides:

(1) Applicants for licences shall conform to the requirements (if any) specified in the advertisement.

(2) In granting licences the board shall take into consideration—

- (a) the question whether the applicant is likely to carry on satisfactorily the service to which the application relates:
- (b) the transport requirements of the public in the area which the applicant will serve:
- (c) the condition of the roads over which the licence will authorize vehicles to be operated:
- (d) any other facts which, in the opinion of the board, affect the question whether it is desirable to grant the application.

(3) In granting licences the board shall as far as possible give preference to those applicants who prior to making their applications have been regularly carrying on business as carriers of passengers or goods within the State.

(4) Subject to the preceding provisions of this section the grant or refusal of any licence shall be at the discretion of the board.

This is where we find the board exercising that power. If the board is a board that

meets weekly the secretary may be the executive officer who necessarily deals with important applications that might arise between the sittings of the board. Section 18 provides:

(1) Every licence granted by the board shall specify—

- (a) the person to whom it is issued;
- (b) the period for which it is issued;
- (c) the route or routes over which the licensed person is licensed to operate vehicles;
- (d) the amount payable therefor and, when necessary, the times of payment and the amount of each instalment:

Section 36 provides:

(1) The Governor may, on the recommendation of the board, make any regulations necessary or convenient for carrying this Act into effect and for prescribing fees to be paid to the board in relation to any matter under this Act and for securing the due observance thereof, and may by any regulation impose penalties not exceeding fifty pounds for breach of the same or any other regulation.

In regulation 13 "person" includes licensee, and the holder of a permit to carry passengers for hire pursuant to the Act. This is the portion to which I particularly take exception. I shall not give actual names of persons or firms, but action has been taken which has created injustice to a community of free-thinking and free-acting people. No person may drive any vehicle operated pursuant to a permit to carry passengers or pursuant to a licence unless he is for the time approved as a driver by the board. Such approval shall be in writing signed by the secretary to the board and may be for such period and subject to such conditions as the board may specify therein. The board may, at any time and from time to time, if it is not satisfied with the conduct or driving of any approved driver, cancel such approval. Members will readily agree with the principle of having good drivers on the road. A man should not be permitted to drive a bus if he is likely to become intoxicated. Notice in writing of such cancellation, signed by the secretary to the board, shall be delivered to the person concerned, and, if he is employed by a licensee or permit holder, to such licensee or permit holder. In order to conform to the general tenor of the Act it has been found necessary to have a list of approved drivers for the various controlled routes. In practice a driver is approved only as a driver for a particular licensee. I ask members to particularly note that because it results in a complete injustice.

A man may be driving for a licensee as an approved driver but he may not be able to obtain work if temporarily out of employment

because he cannot drive for anybody else. If he does drive for another person he runs the risk of losing his permit and ceasing to be an approved driver. There is nothing in the Act to provide for alternative employment if a driver ceases to be an approved driver in this way. Having given up his job he is at perfect liberty to go to some other job but if he gives it up for a week and drives for some other person he may be prevented from carrying on as an approved driver. That is one of the tremendous injustices incurred under this Act and there is no justification for that in South Australia. I should like the Government to consider the point I have raised regarding the possibility of drivers losing their licences, and so lessen the difficulties and perhaps do away with the practice altogether.

I could recount many instances of the hardships caused by the operations of the board, but I will give only one example. People at Murray Bridge arranged with a farmer at Keith to supply a large quantity of hay. The hay was cut and stooked and was ready for carting, and the purchaser arranged for its transport. He found that on carting the first load he was infringing the Road Transport Act. It would mean that he would have to take the hay first to the railway yard to be placed in trucks, rope it down and cover it and after it had been carted 80 or 90 miles take it off and place it on a truck for removal to his farm. Consequently, the purchaser refused to take it, because the cost was so great.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Was it sheaved hay?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY: Yes, but on another occasion it was baled hay. The hay had become so loose that people would not handle it. I could give other examples. I admit that people may make mistakes sometimes, but this was not an actual mistake by miscalculation, but a deliberate mistake in pursuance of a policy. We should not condone that kind of thing. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the Bill, which provides for payments amounting to £91,544,000 and an estimated return of £91,547,000; and if everything goes to plan there will be a surplus of £3,000. It has been said several times during the debate that £3,000 is a very small margin to budget for. This phase has been freely discussed by various people, who have expressed the view that it is desirable to budget for a deficit. I cannot agree with this attitude. It should be the aim of any Government to budget

in such a way that the State is solvent, and not to budget for big deficits. There are times when certain contingencies demand that a Government must budget for a deficit, but wantonly to set out to budget for a deficit would be making a rod for the back of posterity.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you make a distinction between State and Commonwealth Budgets?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have never aspired for Commonwealth honours, but I think that the State should be run on that basis. The Commonwealth people have greater access to money than we have. It is peculiar that the States seem to be paying twice for the same money. Consider for instance the Snowy Mountains scheme and the operations of the River Murray Commission. The States are required to make their contributions out of Loan funds, whereas the Commonwealth pays for its projects out of revenue. The work of the Snowy Mountains scheme has been done out of revenue. It is certainly shifting the responsibility of the national debt from the central organization to the States. Probably in time this will cause much embarrassment to future South Australian Treasurers. If the object of the Commonwealth is to do away with the States, I can think of no sounder way to achieve its ends.

The Budget presented by the Treasurer has taken into account the rather difficult times through which we have been passing and which in some cases are still continuing. No doubt honourable members have noticed that the departments where large numbers are employed have received the greater increases in their spending capacity, which is a very proper thing when there is a temporary recession in industry and some troubles with unemployment. I remind members of these remarks of the Treasurer when presenting his Budget:

Overall, therefore, I believe there is, in this country, every justification for sober optimism, recognizing the problems to be met, but meeting them with confidence. The most important ingredient for rapid recovery is probably neither physical nor financial, but an attitude of mind—confidence.

It is the second time that these words have been quoted during this debate. Probably these people have placed a slightly different construction on what the Treasurer meant. I think that what he is aiming at is that we should not talk ourselves into being miserable. There is no easier way to bring about panic than constantly to talk panic. It will not help those people who have been displaced from employment to howl that the country is on the

brink of disaster, because that will make people button up more and more, more people will get depressed and before we know it we shall have a man-made depression on our hands.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Have we not that under a Menzies Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, but there has been a slight tightening-up of credit. No person has been asked not to spend his own money.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: A rose by any other name is just as sweet!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will deal with the honourable member a little later. We should not get too depressed about the position, but should get on with the job of improving the country's economy. I was interested to note that 97 per cent of the people in this State can turn on a tap and receive Government water, but I am more interested in the 3 per cent, representing 30,000 people, who cannot do that. Many of them live in my electorate. It is difficult in some of those areas to provide a water service which will return the required amount of revenue. In many of those areas if water could be provided the return would be sufficient to justify the expenditure and the remaining taxpayers having to subsidize the system. Two years ago the Government paid £950,000 to pump water to the metropolitan area, which was a direct gift by the Treasurer to the people of the metropolitan area and those on pipelines adjacent to it. Some consideration should be given to schemes which perhaps are not paying propositions at present, particularly in the Pata, Sedan, and Cambrai areas, as they would be a real boon to the people living there. In one case the person is only 10 miles from the River Murray.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Are you suggesting that people are not getting water who live within 10 miles of the river? I cannot get it and I am only two miles from a pipeline!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is for the people to whom the Minister is referring that I am speaking now. He apparently is within two miles of a pipeline and apparently has no permanent water. The people in the Murray Mallee have not any water either; they may have 400 to 600 grains in their supply, but it is not good water. The Minister is justified in asking, as I am asking, for a water service, and I think it would benefit the State generally and give those people some incentive to remain on their properties.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I cannot afford to pay for it, anyway!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Bymill: I have a place within four miles of the General Post Office and I cannot get water there. Do you think I could have it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I cannot imagine why the honourable member hasn't got it. If he sank a well there the natural water table would give him running water. It is difficult for people in areas of the Murray Mallee to find a permanent water supply which they can pump, and they are battling to try to make a decent living. I shall continue to raise this point because it is one scheme in which assistance could be given.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Isn't it a fact that metropolitan area water users are paying for the extension of schemes to those areas?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That may have been a fact once, but if the honourable member will look at the recent Auditor-General's report he will find that that is not the position now.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I suggest you get in touch with the proper authority who could advise you on this.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I can always find the proper authority from whom to get good advice. I was interested in what the Hon. Mr. Shard said about the Housing Trust. He said that it was only just keeping up with housing people moving from temporary houses into new houses and therefore nobody else was getting a fair go.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Only in one portion of the metropolitan area!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member did not make that clear.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Don't be silly. Why don't you read it? I never stopped saying "the western portion of the metropolitan area".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will not let the honourable member talk to me if he is going to be rude.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You should make a correct statement. You cannot get away with that one!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There were 1,194 houses built in the metropolitan area. I do not know how all these houses can be built in an area where a person works. In the Salisbury-Elizabeth area 1,222 houses were built in the same period.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not criticize that!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thought that was the mainstay of the honourable member's argument. He did not want people going to Elizabeth to live although houses were available, because the tenants would have some miles to go to their work. I do not know how everyone can have a house built for rental adjacent to his occupation. A good deal of industry is moving to Elizabeth, and it is a good idea to have some of the people moving into the clear, pure country air. Although Elizabeth is in the Midland district and it would be of some political detriment to me for more rental houses to be built there, it would be a good thing for the people.

This year the Housing Trust will receive £12,000,000 from all sources, out of which it not only has to build houses, but to make the necessary arrangements to buy land for the future, and also carry on with its country housing programme. It has built 898 houses in country areas during the last 12 months. If the honourable member says it is not building enough houses in the metropolitan area, which housing programme does he suggest should go short; should fewer houses be built in country areas, in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area, or in the metropolitan area? The Treasurer asked for an increased allocation of Loan funds for housing compared with previous years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: We know that was for the purpose of getting an increased Loan allocation at 1 per cent less interest!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was for the purpose of trying to house people and to keep people employed in building houses. I was amazed to hear there are so many people unemployed in the building industry. The honourable member would be in a better position than I to know the correct figures. I can only conclude that bricklayers and other tradesmen who are unemployed at present will be re-employed because of the work to be provided in building public buildings, by the Housing Trust and other schemes foreshadowed in this Bill. I cannot see how the honourable member can blame the Housing Trust or the Treasurer for not going any further than they have. The Treasurer has used a much greater amount of money than previously, and there are no other funds available. The honourable member may have other information on the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I suggested that it should have a higher deficit for building in one particular area.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I was interested to read the remarks in this debate by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph, who occupied some time criticizing the Party to which I am proud to belong. He drew public attention to the fact that the Party, of which I am a member, has always referred to the menace of atheist Communism.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: And done nothing to rectify it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will come to that later. I do not know why it was necessary for the honourable member to bring politics into the debate.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why are we here?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know why it was necessary for the honourable member to point out his attitude towards Communism. Obviously, to excuse oneself is to accuse oneself. It is useless to make excuses because our friends do not want them and our enemies do not believe them. The honourable member's reference to the Prime Minister was in bad taste. He said:

I do not mean to be uncharitable when I say that the Government fell to pieces and he abdicated in the face of the enemy.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: History records that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When Australia entered the war in 1939 Australia's population was about 6,000,000 people. At the time a considerable part of her Budget dealt with defence matters. She was then essentially a primary-producing country and was not geared for secondary industry. Great Britain was fighting the most bloody war she had ever fought. We had to rely exclusively on Great Britain for our supplies of secondary industry goods, and for defence requirements. Overnight Australia had to be geared to undertake secondary industry production in order that the war might be fought. Great Britain and her allies carried on the struggle for freedom unaided for two years. Then America came into the war. She came in after she had had two years of stockpiling of war equipment and food, and she had the flower of her nation available for war purposes. Great Britain and Australia were finding it difficult to keep troops in the field and at the same time gear themselves for war production.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Who was responsible for getting America to assist us?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Japanese, who dropped a few bombs on Pearl Harbour.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Be more charitable than that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Not a bit of it. When America came into the war her industries were ready for war production because she had been producing defence equipment for two years. America also had unlimited financial resources and plenty of manpower. At the time the Australian Government had acquired all the power it needed to fight the war. The controls were not available in the early days of the war. Loans could be raised easily in war-time because people were patriotic on the one hand, and on the other they felt that their money was of no value if the country was not protected. The great organization done by the Menzies Government in the early days of the war in getting four divisions of Australian troops into the fighting zone was most creditable. The troops did not go in ill-equipped. They had sufficient equipment to carry them through. They were not like the Americans who went into the war with refrigerators and cannons. The Australians went in with rifles and bully beef. To say that Australian troops were sent to New Guinea to fight with broomsticks was ludicrous.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You know all about armchair strategy. Tell us about the Brisbane Line.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am speaking about a few fallacies in the honourable member's speech. I do not want to get on to any new ones, because the time table limits this debate. I was on the Brisbane Line at one time and I know something about it. Those four divisions comprised a volunteer force, and they had the assistance of the Air Force and the Navy. Some of us will remember the great hue and cry that the Labor Party put up when the Menzies Government commenced compulsory military training. This hue and cry came from people who did not believe in conscription, and it was not in the best interests of the conduct of the war.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It was the Curtin Government that brought in compulsory training for the defence of the nation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I never cease to marvel at what was done by two organizations in training raw recruits. There was the Australian Instructional Corps, which comprised a small number of officers, and the Volunteer Rifle Clubs of Australia. We should be extremely grateful to them for what they did in the early training of these raw recruits.



The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: What about the nucleus of the militia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Those men played an important part, too.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why did the Menzies Government abdicate?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why did Coles vote them out?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We know Mr. Wilson very well. His main trouble was that he was interested in the wheat stabilization scheme, and although an Independent he said that his leanings were toward Labor at all times. He was the member for the Commonwealth district of Wimmera. The other gentleman, Mr. Coles, was disgruntled and jumped in and out of Parties.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: They are not here to defend themselves.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have heard quite enough about that. I heard a debate in another place where somebody who did not please a member was attacked by the whole of the Labor Party. Those people were unfortunate because they could not defend themselves. I may be in the same position next week but I am going to have my say while I am here. Judas had little on Mr. Coles and Mr. Wilson. They reaped a nice reward from the Labor Party for their treachery in turning out the Government of the day.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Your Government knighted them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the honourable member examines the list he will see that the Commonwealth Government did not knight them. We then saw how opposed the Labor Party was to sending troops to assist Malaya to purge itself of Communist terrorists. This happened a few years ago.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I said it happened in the early stages of the war.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This was included in the *News*. It was a statement on this Government's policy and performance and, according to the Labor Party, the sending of troops to Malaya made them an aggressive force. The honourable member quoted from a newspaper cutting. There was a hue and cry when the Menzies Government decided to send troops to assist Malaya. The Malayan Government had asked for troops. I was privileged to be present in Malaya at the time of the first thanksgiving service for the deliverance of that country from the Communist terrorists. The words spoken by Tunku Abdul Rahman

contained nothing but praise for the assistance his country had received from the Australian troops. It is interesting to get the facts right. I refer to *Hansard* of 1955 at page 1634 and it would do the Hon. Mr. Bardolph good to examine that page. Malaya was overrun by Communist terrorists. They were not Malayan terrorists but they were people planted in that country. Malaya is now one of our friendliest allies in the South-West Pacific area and we have something to be proud of in the fact that those people were liberated.

The next point dealt with by the honourable member was directed towards primary producers of Australia. They have been criticized because their leaders, through the Australian Wheat Board, have sold cereals to feed the starving people of China. Does that action of feeding starving people in China indicate anything but a realistic Christian approach on the part of the producers, the Wheat Board and the Government of this country to help women and children who have had Communism forced on them by their so-called liberators? Communist China, for the last two years, has experienced famine conditions that may be due to its system not working. It is impossible, for long, to force people to do what they cannot do. There is a permanent danger of Communism in this country. I speak of these things because they were raised by the honourable member. Finally, my honourable friend raised the sectarian issue and implied that His Holiness Pope John is a Socialist.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are running true to form. Why don't you quote the whole encyclical instead of dealing with part only of it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That was the part that intrigued me. I wondered whether the honourable member took that part out of the whole because it suited him. He did not read the whole of the newspaper cutting but he did use the portion that was useful for his purpose.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I took out an expression of opinion relating to that subject. I did not think that you would get so low in the gutter as you are today.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Does the honourable member deny that the policy of the Australian Labor Party is pledged to socialization of industry, production, distribution and exchange? He seemed to leave us in some doubt as to what the policy was.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Finish your quotation and tell us what the policy is because what you have stated is not the policy.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Why should the Deputy Leader of the Labor Party in this Council mention that if it were not the policy of the Labor Party?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I mentioned it to put people right with regard to the slur and villainous propaganda put out by your Party.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I asked the honourable member was it the policy of the Labor Party and the policy to which he was pledged and was it a policy of socialization of industry, production, distribution and exchange. That, I understand, is the policy of his Party.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But go on and continue it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have also heard a great exponent of the Labor Party say that we must have complete socialization with no softening up.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I did not say that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A close friend of yours, Mr. Eddie Ward, made that statement on a number of occasions.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Are you expressing the views of your Party, because your statements are in very poor taste and are made in a very poor spirit.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I belong to a Party that allows me to express my own opinions. That is a great thing. I do not have to stick to the Party line rigidly. I know that there are no greater haters of Communism than the four members of the Labor Party in this Chamber, but why it was necessary to vindicate the actions of certain groups affiliated with the Labor movement, I do not know. My honourable friends know that on this side we are completely uncompromising to Communism. We do not like Communists, and I do not think that my honourable friends like them any more than we do; but it is unfortunate that the honourable member should have stood up to make excuses, so to speak, for what someone else had said. I remind him that there is always a distinct possibility that if one lies down with dogs, one will get up with fleas. I suggest that the honourable member should join my Party and he will then be completely free from any stigma from people who are affiliated not directly with his organization, but get tangled up with it. Before the honourable member could join members on this side, his conscience would have to be free regarding Communism.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not a fair statement. You know that we have nothing to do with Communists.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have not left my friends with any doubt on that score, but it does not exonerate them when they attempt to vindicate the actions of certain people affiliated with organizations linked with the Labor Party.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If the honourable member ever did half as much as we have to combat Communism, he would be a hero.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think that I have made my point. The Agriculture Department is doing an extremely good job in controlling and eradicating pests and diseases that have gained entry into this State. Unfortunately, recently a new pest has arisen—it is not Communism, but the Oriental peach moth. It is one of those things, like codlin moth and fruit fly—once it becomes established it is persistent—and it will cost the growers some £80,000 a year in sprays to control it. Every effort has been made by a local vigilance committee to eradicate this pest before it gets out of the area. It exists on about 150 acres. I want publicly to thank the Minister of Agriculture and his officers for assisting with inspectors, financially, and with continued advice. I believe that this pest will be eradicated in the area where it is at present located and that we shall probably hear the end of this moth. In New South Wales, where it has been allowed to get out of control, it is almost as bad a menace as the fruit fly. The people in the river areas should be extremely grateful for the help the Agriculture Department has given them and also the financial assistance rendered by the Government.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Is it confined to the river areas?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: To 150 acres on the river. The work that the department is doing on the nematode and gummosis is encouraging, but these two pests will involve the expenditure of much money, both by growers and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. The nematode is one of the worst underground scourges we can get in our orchards. It has reduced production on some properties from 8 tons to the acre to 3 tons, and eventually the trees will die. Certain chemicals are being developed to combat them, but they are extremely expensive. I mention that because I hope that more research will be carried out. There are

thousands of types of nematode and the question of the isolation of the various groups is something far beyond the scope of the industry. Gummosis for some years has been under the notice of the department. The best that can be done at present is very light or no pruning, the burning of cuttings to ensure that the spores are killed and not liberated with the first shower and wind-borne to the next property, and the painting of wounds.

I want to mention also the breaking down of certain principles in the industry. For many years the river people and those in other parts of the State have been attacking very vigorously the problem of red scale. It is illegal to market fruit with red scale, which has been controlled within certain areas. It is reasonably easily detected on fruit going into the packing houses. When it is reported Government inspectors visit the property concerned to advise on its eradication. The campaign that has been in operation since 1935 has been financed entirely by a levy placed on every grower of citrus fruits in the Murray Valley. Sometimes there is a levy of 3d. or 6d. a case and sometimes it is collected on an acreage basis. This practice has worked extremely well, but recently we have had a slight change of heart and loyalty in the marketing of the fruit. Many growers are now selling their fruit for cash to New Australian dealers, who bring the fruit from the river in bulk and sell it in plastic bags along the arterial roads adjacent to Adelaide. People who sell their fruit in this way are avoiding two things—firstly, the detection of the scale, because the fruit is not going through certified packing sheds where it can be detected, and secondly, they are dodging their levies, which normally would be used for the purchase of tents, guns and labour for the eradication campaign. It may be necessary during the next session of Parliament to tighten up legislation to deal with that problem, and one or two other problems connected with the fruit industry, so that growers who are reluctant to pay their contribution voluntarily will be compelled to pay it. There are only a small number of people in the river areas who are not prepared to pay voluntarily, but there is always somebody who will not keep in line.

We are fortunate in this State in having the fruit industry organized as it is at present. Through the co-operative movement and orderly marketing, the fruitgrower has survived, but would not have been in the position he is today if it had not been for those two factors. Recently, people in Western Aus-

tralia have not been able to export their fruit, as they wanted to, to the eastern market, because they are in the hands of a tight ring of agents. These agents book a ship and allocate the space on it, and leave the fruit-grower in an awkward position if he does not pack and dispatch his fruit through one of those agents.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Are these agents members of the Liberal and Country League?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am dealing at the moment with a serious matter, and do not want to bring politics into it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I am only asking a question. I am not bringing politics into it!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think probably they would be.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I thought so; that is why they are treating the fruitgrowers in such a shameful fashion.

The Hon. L. H. Densley: Couldn't you deal with them the same as you do with other parasites?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think they could be brought under the control of the Pest Board. The individual grower in Western Australia is very foolish, because he is not organized and is at the mercy of anyone who wants to take him down. I am pleased to see that the Western Australian Government has set up a Royal Commission which is to meet on October 24 to go into the whole question of the marketing and packing of fruit in that State.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You have made a charge against the Western Australian grower and he is not here to defend himself.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure he will hear about this before very long. The Western Australian grower is paying 11s. 2d. to have a case of export fruit packed, while the hills grower in South Australia, through his co-operative organization, pays 8s. 6d. The hills grower in this State is receiving 22s. net for his apples while his counterpart in Western Australia is receiving 11s. This shows how fortunate we are in this State in having people with wisdom to place the Industrial and Provident Societies Act on the Statute Book, and that this Government in particular has supported the Loans to Producers Act and Advances to Settlers Act, and has provided an opportunity for many industries to develop, particularly the fishing industry in recent times, and it should be complimented. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I rise to support the Bill and wish to refer to one or two matters raised by other honourable members. Firstly, I congratulate the new member, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, on his maiden speech. He spoke very well at some length about a variety of subjects of which he obviously knew a great deal, and, furthermore, which he obviously looked into in order to ascertain certain defects about which he told this House.

I support his remarks about the building that houses the archives of this State. I was in that building recently. There are valuable documents there, and dedicated men looking after them. Mr. Kneebone spoke about the lack of proper housing and room for many of these documents, and I agree with his remarks. I cannot support him in his references to the Public Library, because I do not know as much about it as he does, as I do not live in the metropolitan area. I point out to him, however, that the attitude of this Government, and one reason why it has remained in power for many years, is that wherever it spends its funds it tries to make sure there will be a return from them in the foreseeable future. Many members of this Chamber over the years have probably been horrified at the lack of Government expenditure on matters of civic pride, and on matters which affect our life and our cultural development, but which from the point of view of cold hard realism contribute little of material worth to this State. Although I agree with the honourable member's remarks up to a point, I can also see the other side of the picture, that in this State with its natural disadvantages, there is more reason to put Loan funds and other sources of revenue to the best productive use possible so as to maintain our increased growth over and above that of other States, or I should say, of all other States except Victoria.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone's speech also gives me the opportunity to speak again on a matter which I dealt with recently, not perhaps to the liking of every honourable member, and that was compulsory political levies. Some weeks ago I raised this matter, and do so now, to enable a certain honourable member to interject if he wishes to do so. This is a courtesy which he did not give me in making his maiden speech a little while ago. I hope this is his own responsibility and that he is not carrying the banner for any other member of his Party who perhaps might have put him up to firing bullets that he himself was not game to fire.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are a long way from the truth there, brother.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I want to point out that no greater injustice can occur than by extorting money from people, particularly people who receive a weekly pay envelope and who are not as well off as a member of Parliament, in order to pay for some political Party's future. It is a dreadful thing to do, and I will refer to some electorates in South Australia to make my contention clear. Let us take the township of Terowie. No-one would say that that is an affluent town. It is a railway town and I feel that I have a nodding acquaintance with it because I have canvassed it house to house. That town voted in favour of the Liberal and Country League candidate at the Frome by-election. What right has a Party to ask the poor people who live in a railway township for contributions when they do not support that Party? I am interested in the legality of this matter. We all know the High Court decision in the Hursey case in Tasmania. It was said that political levies were allowable in connection with trade union activities.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not the policy of the A.C.T.U.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I do not care what is its policy. The High Court decision made it clear that the Waterside Workers' Federation was on the right side in demanding a political levy. I have no complaints about that. The crux of the legal argument was that so long as the constitution of the union said that political levies could be collected it was satisfactory.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Can you indicate a case where in South Australia there has been a compulsory levy?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I see the honourable member's point of view, but my question signified South Australia. I presume that the honourable member is referring to special political levies that some unions have prior to an election. Then there are the levies on members that are normally collected. The honourable member has me at a disadvantage because I cannot quote chapter and verse in this matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You don't know what you are talking about.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: People in South Australia have complained to me about having to pay political levies to a Party that they do not support.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They do not have political levies.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I will not change my attitude. Two people who spoke to me are members of the Printers Union, and they work for a newspaper firm across the road. I am friendly with the two of them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are misleading you.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I object to the principle of collecting political levies. I do not think anyone should take cash from anyone in this way because in my opinion it amounts to false representation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You stick to cows and bulls. You know something about them.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: We also hear a lot about unity tickets. If the Australian Labor Party can divorce itself, conveniently no doubt, from the policy of certain unions regarding unity tickets, where does it stand in connection with taking political levies?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We do not take compulsory political levies. There are none.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I suggest to the honourable member that my source of information shows that there are political levies.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your source is wrong.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am very pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition give voice in this way. It is a good thing to see that he is making use of his leadership. I was getting a little disappointed because he was sitting in his seat as a Pooch-Bah and saying nothing. I am glad that he is now coming back as he used to do before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You speak the truth and you will hear nothing from me.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am speaking what I believe to be the truth, but I respect the views of the honourable member and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone. I hope they will tell me later if I am wrong. In this matter I say that I am not wrong. I will say nothing further about it now.

I congratulate the Minister of Roads on the great amount of work that he has done over the years, particularly since his return from his overseas trip. I have heard him speak at country meetings. He has always been greatly welcome in country areas and his words of wisdom have been considerably debated after his departure. It is obvious that the future provision of arterial roads is proceeding very well. I know that limited access is unfortunate and unpopular, but I congratulate the Minister on being firm on this matter. Twin carriage-ways are already improving the outline of our city. The traffic flow has been greatly

increased. I sometimes wish I could say that about traffic islands. I can think now of one or two in particular. I know how they interfere with the flow of traffic rather than improve it. Obviously a man who has studied these matters as has the Minister, will have the answer to what I say. I have in mind a traffic island on the Victor Harbour to Port Elliot road. It must be 110ft. in length. Its main purpose seems to be to prevent traffic from turning near the apex of several roads, but it has completely cut off the livelihood of a man on the corner, without his getting any compensation. There are other similar traffic islands. I wonder sometimes whether we could not give a little more thought to having roundabouts, where the traffic count is not beyond a certain level.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Do you place much faith in traffic counts?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I have seen enough of traffic counts in the country to say that people get up to all sorts of activities in connection with them, and I have no doubt that the honourable member has also seen that.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You do not place the utmost confidence in them?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: We must do so, but it is a matter of how the count is made, and which mechanical method is adopted. I do not want to be particularly involved in this matter, but I do commend the Minister for the carriage-ways, the traffic control, the islands and all the facilities that we have for handling traffic. I support the Hon. Mr. Densley's reference to certain aspects of the activities of the Transport Control Board. I had hoped that the Minister would have an answer to a question I asked some time ago about removing the carriage of livestock completely from the jurisdiction of the board. Unfortunately, there was no answer. I give notice now that if the opportunity presents itself I will ask the question again tomorrow. The cartage of livestock by road transport is efficient, but cartage by any other means can be a most inefficient operation. The Hon. Mr. Densley said that 6,000 permits were issued by the Transport Control Board last year to permit road haulage of goods that would not normally be allowed to be transported in that manner. Most of those permits would involve the cartage of livestock. Obviously, if this is the case, the Government should seriously consider freeing livestock from the jurisdiction of the board. The anomalies in this matter are so great that I cannot see that it is worthwhile dogmatically trying to

retain control over the cartage of livestock. Permits could be given for the cartage of stud stock, cows, sows, weaner stock or fat lambs brought from the north to the hills districts. Permits in such cases are gained quite easily and I know of only one case where, for peculiar reasons, an application was rejected. Stock transported by road do not suffer from the buffeting that they receive on the railways. Permits are granted so readily and in such great numbers for the transport of cattle and weaner stock that I believe stock should be completely free from the control of the board. If a permit can be granted why cannot that item be completely free? My attitude on the jurisdiction of the Transport Control Board is not the same as my Leader's attitude. I can see some justice for its existence, particularly as it relates to areas not served by the railways, because it is able to allow a virtual monopoly for the cartage of goods in those areas. Without this licence and form of monopoly many of these areas without rail facilities would not be served efficiently.

However, I am back in my Leader's corner again when I say that I believe in a year or two the whole position must be reviewed. Traffic counts in Australia dealing with the increase in road transportation and our ability to handle traffic illustrate that Parliament should examine the need for such bodies as the Transport Control Board to see whether the efficiency of the whole State is not being penalized by their activities. Because this debate has continued for some time I now signify my intention to support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

On the motion for the third reading:

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): This affords me an opportunity of putting the Hon. Mr. Story right with regard to some of his observations. I did not know that I became so important overnight in this debate. The whole of the honourable member's speech was directed against some of my observations in connection with a campaign of calumny directed against the Labor Party. In his quotation of my quotations he was using the Communistic technique—just quoting one or two words or two or three lines in order to fortify an argument that has no substance. My attention was drawn to an article that appeared in the *News*. If members opposite want to play politics, let them play it properly and not play it by innuendo,

and do not attempt to create a smokescreen in fighting Communism; and do not attempt to construe words used by members of the Labor Party, which has always fought Communism, in order to justify what the Menzies Government did against Communism setting its roots in Australia.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: You are on the defence!

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am not defending the Labor Party. Statements have been used in order to cloud the issue that will confront the electors on December 9. Statements have been torn from their context and used as arguments in rebuttal. My honourable friend, Mr. Story, this afternoon said that I resented the fact that the Menzies Government had sold wheat to the starving people of China. I am one of those who believe that all our surplus cereal products should be given to China and other Asian countries, which need succour from a country well endowed with surplus goods. My honourable friend has lost sight of this point and attempts to say that his Party is fighting Communism. The Communist policy today throughout the world is not only for a cold war, but an economic war. I could recommend some books that he could read on this issue. In every country controlled by the Communist regime, and where credit has been given, there is default in the payment of those credits, and it naturally follows that the economy of the country supplying the goods is automatically upset. That is part of the Communist plan that is being promulgated throughout the world for the special purpose of upsetting the economies of the Western powers and the free democratic nations.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Don't you think that we shall be paid for this wheat?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I suggest that the honourable member consider this question more closely and not just run and read. This is an important subject and the Labor movement is fully alive to the situation. It is the only authoritative body that has taken a stand to prevent the growth of this iniquitous, atheistic ideology. My honourable friend said that he was a member of a training group during the war and I congratulate him on training the recruits in the early stages. I know that he played a prominent part and he should receive the commendation of those who are aware of his military activity. After the Curtin Government was in power for two years there was an election.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you talking about the Crimean War now?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: No. When an election took place after the Curtin Government was asked to take control of the Government there was emblazoned on the hoardings throughout Australia and in the columns of the press a cartoon with the wording "Look behind the curtain"; and the cartoonist drew Mr. Curtin and behind the curtain was supposedly the secretary of the Communist Party, who, they alleged, was supporting the Labor policy. I have been to meetings where these same people who attempted to decry the late Mr. John Curtin were loud in their praises of his leadership of the Australian nation. My honourable friend should realize these facts.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I did not mention him.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am merely stating the facts and giving statements in rebuttal of the innuendoes of my honourable friend, who had no qualms in charging me with raising the sectarian issue because I had the temerity to quote a section of an encyclical by Pope John on the question of Communism. It is a pity that my honourable friend does not read some of these encyclicals, because he would then be able to think more clearly on the problems facing the human family today. I mention that because there is to be an election on December 9. There is a splinter Party which they say is to be supported by the Liberal and Country League. I do not know. They charge the Labor Party, the same as the L.C.L. does, as being a Socialist Party and say that its policy is akin to that of the Communist Party. One of the highest authorities in the world gave his views on the matter. I finished up by saying that the policy of the Labor Party was one based on Christian principles. That is the answer to my honourable friend.

I now come to the question of the disintegration of the Menzies Government in the early stages of the Second World War—and not the Crimean War. I have been in this House for a number of years and I have always taken the stand that I never point the finger of scorn at any honourable member. I have never mentioned the name of any member of the House who was not present to defend himself. My honourable friend mentioned Mr. Coles and Mr. Wilson and said that they had carried out an act of treachery. If my friend read the history of the last war he would know that the reason given by Mr. Coles (who has

since been knighted) and Mr. Wilson was that they found that they could no longer support the Government because it was divided against itself. The war was pre-eminently in the minds of every member of that Party and prominent in the minds of the people of Australia and also in the minds of members of Parliament, so much so that the Curtin Government came into power on the support of two Independents. My friend said that the Menzies Government laid the foundation for the organization of this nation for war. I am not denying that, but I remind him that there was an Advisory War Council on which there were three members of the Australian Labor Party, thus showing their interest in supporting the activities of a non-Labor Government. On it was Mr. Norman Makin, who later became Minister for the Navy and Minister for Munitions and another member of the Federal Labor Caucus. They were the people who organized the nation for war during the latter part of the regime of the Menzies Government, so that if we are going to discuss these things let us do so fully. I did not quote anything from its context during my speech. I quoted from a commentary which appeared in the *News* and which was written by the Liberal and Country League, attempting to create in the minds of the people of this State an impression which showed that we as members of the Labor Party supported the Communist ideology. I am an Australian the same as are other members of the Labor Party, and have reared a family in this country. I want to see Australia progress as do other members of this House, and no action of mine will militate against the interests of Australia. I believe it is in the interests of every Australian to see that this country progresses as we all hope it will.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 663.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I am extremely grateful to the Minister for so elevating this item on the Notice Paper, because I have been waiting patiently and eagerly since August 31 to address the House; so much so, that when the Chief Secretary warned me today that this debate was coming on, I had to look for my notes with some zeal, and then I had to endeavour to interpret them, so that I am grateful for the

warning. However, I had no real need to remind myself of the crucial item in this Bill upon which I want to address the House. It is clause 6, because I find nothing to disagree with in the other clauses. The friendly societies to which the Bill refers are very highly regarded institutions, and fulfil a very noble role in their own sphere. Clause 6 is a clause extending the authorized investments which a friendly society may make use of to employ its funds. At the present time the investments, as the Chief Secretary said when introducing the Bill, are limited to investments which are not even as extensive as those laid down for general use by the Trustee Act, but this clause does not merely attempt to extend authorized investments to those of the Trustee Act plus perhaps ancillary operations of the friendly societies which are referred to, but literally gets out the dragnet and includes every possible form of investment, subject only to the necessity for obtaining the approval of the committee of management of the society and the consent of the Public Actuary and, even then, there is a further provision that the Public Actuary may impose conditions.

I would like to give a brief history of the investments that are in general use. I have had some experience, in common with other legal members of this House, in drawing wills, settlements, declarations of trust and so on, and before the last war, of which we have heard so much today, it was seldom if ever that one was asked to draw a will or settlement that included any investments other than Trustee Act investments. However, since the war inflation has been so considerable that Trustee Act investments have suffered very considerably, and that has meant that the ordinary run of people have thought more widely in terms of the uses to which their money can be put. It is fair to say that if it had not been for inflation, Trustee Act securities would be regarded, as they were regarded for many years, as the ideal form of investment, not only for trustees but for bodies of the nature that we are considering now. With inflation the money value of trustee securities has remained practically static, whereas equity share values in the main have increased considerably although not commensurably with the extent of the inflation.

Certain considerations apply to those shares. There is the old one that the higher the interest rate the higher the risk, and that in most cases is literally true. Shares returning low dividends on their market price are bought mostly by people who expect to be paying

high rates of taxation. They buy these shares in the hope of getting capital gains that will give them some money without being liable to the effects of taxation. This question is really a matter of something that has been pent up by the effects of the war, but the question is whether the day of reckoning might not be at hand when equity shares might not continue to have the history, at least temporarily, that they have had over the last 10 or 15 years.

The whole object of the trustee investments and, as I see it, the investments at present laid down by this Act, was to preserve the actual pounds, shillings and pence intact without loss and without gain. Inflation has altered that, but if one went gaily investing early last year, for instance, in equity shares and even in certain freeholds, one could already have found that the money not only did not remain intact but that considerable loss could have been made. I think, therefore, it is incumbent upon me to consider my responsibility as a member of this House in this matter to see whether I should be a party to widening out investments under this Act to the extent where greater risks are necessarily involved. I confess at once that it is a difficult problem, because on the one hand we are faced with the possibility of further inflation whereby funds if they merely remain intact in money value will depreciate in buying power, and on the other hand if the investments which may be permitted are widened out to the extent that is mooted, the money may not even remain intact. Every day in the newspaper we see the wide range of dividend rates. In today's paper a £1 share was quoted at 70s., which gives a return of 1.8 per cent in the way of dividend. Another share of 5s. was quoted at 30s., which is a return of 2.1 per cent. One share showed an even lower return of 1 per cent. If we were to have a real financial setback the people who paid 70s. for a £1 share might find that part of the 70s. was jeopardized. Recently, in connection with the Parkin Trust, we had a Select Committee considering a similar sort of proposition to that which we have before us now. It was the same sort of proposition in the way of investment, but it had a different application because the Parkin Trust is a private body created by one man for the purpose of benefiting a selected group of people. The committee's recommendation was that instead of giving the trust a total power of investment, as is mooted in this Bill, it should have power to generally invest money to the extent



of 40 per cent of its funds, with the remaining 60 per cent in ordinary authorized securities of the nature covered by the Trustee Act. The difference between that Bill and this is the fact that the public are very much more interested in this particular type of institution. I say "interested" in the sense of being financially interested, because the public at large are interested in friendly societies, whereas only a selected group is interested in the other trust. The question I have been asking myself is this: As the public at large are also interested in the Trustee Act, would I be prepared as a member of this Council to vote for a similar sort of extension of powers to those given to trustees under the Trustee Act? I can only answer myself in this way—"No sir, I would not." I can see many dangers that I would not care to contemplate. It is unnecessary for me to point to them at present. The Trustee Act is in a slightly different category because testators have the power to direct specific investments, or the money can be left outright to someone, in which case that person can do as he or she likes with it. The question here is what should we do in the interests of the friendly societies, which in turn means the interests of the people who belong to friendly societies.

The Government has done its best to protect the situation I mention by providing for the consent of the Public Actuary. I am not clear that he is the correct man to advise on the matter. One of my honourable friends mentioned the Public Trustee in this matter, but I think that was a slip of the tongue. However, it made me think that if there must be a consent, the Public Trustee would be a more appropriate authority than the Public Actuary. In saying that I do not in any way reflect on the Public Actuary, or actuaries as a class. On the contrary, I have the greatest admiration for the miraculous things they can do with figures. As far as I know, actuaries are in the way of being mathematicians and are not normally associated with the investment of funds. I imagine that one of the chief duties of the Public Trustee would be to handle investments on behalf of trust estates. I wonder whether the Public Trustee would not be a better authority, because it is more in his normal line of business.

Be that as it may, I do not think it matters because I would not adopt either of these methods if I had my way. I suggest that instead of leaving this at large, the Minister should do what he mentioned in his second

reading speech by enlarging the list of securities that may be adopted for friendly societies. I suggest that the enlarged list should include all securities laid down in the Trustee Act, other specified securities of the same sort that might bring the matter more up-to-date, and there should be ancillary powers for investment in legitimate trading as is contemplated for the societies. I believe that the securities that could be invested in should be specified in a list, in the same way as in the Trustee Act. The interests of everyone would be served by that, and it could be as easily amended from time to time as we amend the Trustee Act. Everyone would know where they stood and it would do away with the need to get anybody's consent. I trust that the Government will consider this suggestion and, if it does not agree with it, it should tell us what its general policy is regarding trustee investment, because my feeling is that this matter is very closely linked with the general law of the State relating to trustees. If anything of the nature suggested in the Bill is adopted, I believe there may be moves on foot to alter the Trustee Act. Although I would not be averse to seeing other specified securities inserted in the Trustee Act I would certainly vote against the insertion of any dragnet clause, such as we have before us in clause 6.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Are you suggesting an amendment about lists of securities?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No. I am asking that the Government consider it. I shall not move an amendment because I do not regard that as the function of a private member. I suggest that the Government, first of all, consider the insertion of a specific list of securities authorized under this Bill similar to that in the Trustee Act and the present Friendly Societies Act.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: If the Opposition moves an amendment will you support it?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That would depend entirely on the terms of the amendment. If it were drawn in sensible terms I would probably support it. I do not like giving blank cheques: it goes against the grain. What I ask is that the Government consider whether a specific list of securities should be included in this Act and also that, in doing so, the Government should tell us what its general policy is in relation to investments under the Trustee Act and other Acts, because in deliberating and voting on this

Bill members are entitled to receive that guidance from the Government as this is a far-reaching matter.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: It is the start of a chain.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It could be the start of a chain of events. I do not think I am asking too much when I ask the Government to tell members its total policy in this matter rather than give us one or two isolated Bills. Members should know what the total policy is, to guide them in their consideration of this particular matter. In the meantime I propose to support the second reading of the Bill but I would be glad to receive the assistance from the Government that I have asked for.

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

#### BOTANIC GARDEN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

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

#### HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

#### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's suggested amendments.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Roads): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*  
This is a consolidating and amending Bill, designed to improve our road traffic laws, and state them in a simpler form. The present legislation consists of the Act of 1934 with 33 amending Acts. The numerous amendments and additions made over a long period have

led to complexity and inconsistencies of language, while changing conditions of roads and traffic have made some of the provisions obsolete, and unsuitable for present day requirements. There is a strong case for re-writing and re-arranging the law.

Another object of the Bill is to achieve more uniformity with the traffic laws of the other States. In preparing the Bill, regard has been paid to the recommendations of the two Commonwealth committees which for some years have been engaged in promoting uniformity in the laws of the Australian States dealing with the equipment and standard of motor vehicles and the rules of the road. One of these committees, the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee, has drafted a code relating to vehicle construction, equipment, and performance standards, and this code has been used as a basis in preparing Part IV of the Bill. The other committee, called the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee, has worked out the principles of the road traffic code which the committee considers suitable for adoption as a uniform law in all the States. The code is not yet reduced to strict legal language and probably agreement between the States on the exact wording and form of the code will take a long while to achieve. However, most of the principles in the code are incorporated in this Bill and, if passed, the Bill will be a step towards greater uniformity between South Australian and the other States.

A third object of the Bill is to make improvements in road traffic laws based on the experience and recommendations of the various authorities concerned with traffic administration such as the Police and Highways Departments, the Road Traffic Board and local governing bodies. Suggestions made by the State Traffic Committee, legal officers and magistrates have also been considered. The Royal Automobile Association of S.A. (Inc.) has taken a keen interest in the new legislation, and has made a number of recommendations all of which have been carefully considered. A number of them have been included in the Bill. I will give honourable members a general outline of the Bill mentioning the main changes which are proposed. Part I contains the usual preliminary matters and the provisions as to interpretation.

Interpretation.—In the interpretation clause some new definitions have been included. It is proposed to define the term "barrier line" to mean the double lines on roads which indicate a legal duty to keep vehicles on the left

of the lines. The definition is for the purpose of drawing distinction between double lines which drivers are forbidden to cross, and other lines which are a guide to traffic but which may be crossed if necessary. The marking of barrier lines on roads will (as at present) continue to be under the control of the Road Traffic Board.

Another new definition is that of "dividing strip". This will take the place of the present definition of "median strip". We now have some roads with three or four separate carriageways, and the term "median strip" at present used to describe the dividing strip on a double road is not appropriate for a road with three or more carriageways. It is therefore proposed to use the term "dividing strip" to include median strips on a double road, as well as dividing strips on treble or quadruple roads, and to omit the definition of median strip. The expression "dividing strip" is already in common use in other parts of the world. For a similar reason, references in the Bill to "a double road" have been omitted and the words "divided road" have been substituted.

There is also a definition of a new traffic sign which it is proposed to use in appropriate places—namely the "give way" sign. This is defined as a sign marked with the words "give way" on the face thereof and its effect will be that drivers approaching the sign must give way to vehicles coming from either the right or the left. I will deal with this sign in detail later on.

Administration.—Part II (clauses 10 to 38) groups together the administrative provisions relating to the Road Traffic Board, traffic control devices, speed zones, closing roads and granting exemptions for road races, and the provision of weighbridges and weighing instruments for motor vehicles. It also provides for the appointment of inspectors by the Commissioner of Highways, and empowers the police to search for stolen vehicles and vehicles which have been involved in collisions, and to make inquiries as to the identity of drivers of vehicles. Nearly all the provisions are the same as the present law, but there are a few new matters to which I will specifically refer.

General duties of road users.—Part III (clauses 39 to 110), which is headed "Duties of drivers and pedestrians" sets out the rules of the road. Clause 39 provides that these rules apply to riders and drivers of animals in the same way as they apply to riders and

drivers of vehicles, except in cases where a particular rule cannot, because of its nature, apply in relation to animals. Clause 40 sets out clearly the exemptions from traffic rules which are granted to drivers of vehicles used by fire brigades, ambulances, and members of the police. The scope of the exemptions is the same as at present, with the exception that they will extend to the new speed limit of 60 miles an hour and the special speed limits in zones. No-one, however, is exempted from the laws as to careless or dangerous driving.

Accident reports.—In clause 43 an alteration is proposed in the law relating to the reporting of motor accidents to the police. The new provision is that an accident in which property only is damaged will not be reportable unless a fair estimate of the damage is £25 or more. At present trivial accidents need not be reported, but in many cases it is difficult to decide whether an accident is trivial or not. Moreover, under the present law, even allowing for the exemption of trivial accidents, a lot of very small accidents to property must be reported. This makes much work for police and the public, from which no commensurate benefit is derived. Another point is that as a result of the numerous reports of trivial accidents, the statistics of South Australian traffic accidents tend to give a wrong idea of the number of accidents in this State as compared with other States, where there is a monetary limit applicable to reportable accidents. Traffic authorities throughout Australia have been working towards the adoption of a standard minimum amount of damage for reportable accidents, and £25 seems likely to be accepted as the standard figure. It is favoured by traffic authorities in this State and is included in this Bill. Although accidents under £25 will thus not be reportable to the police, any persons concerned in such accidents will be required, irrespective of the amount, to stop and give their names and addresses to the other parties concerned.

Penalty for dangerous driving.—An alteration is proposed in the minimum penalty for a first offence of dangerous driving. The amount is now £50. The police and certain magistrates have suggested that this is too high as a minimum and have recommended that it be reduced to £30. One reason is that the corresponding minimum penalty for driving under the influence of liquor or drugs is £30 and it is anomalous to have a difference between these penalties. But the main reason

is that some cases of dangerous driving are not sufficiently serious to justify a minimum penalty of £50.

Speed limits.—Clauses 48 to 53 group together the various provisions relating to speed limits. Careful consideration has been given to these by governmental traffic authorities as well as by the Royal Automobile Association, and as a result of all the investigations and recommendations the Government has decided to ask Parliament to abolish some of the limits—namely the 20 m.p.h. limit for vehicles approaching level crossings within 50 yards thereof, and the 25 m.p.h. limit over intersections. Good reasons have been advanced for these repeals. The level crossing limit is regarded as being unnecessary at numerous crossings where there is a clear view and few trains. Motorists feel it is unjust to be punished for conduct which they consider to be safe and harmless. The Traffic Board's view is that where a speed limit is necessary on the approach to a level crossing, the proper course is to create a special speed zone. Under this system the limit will apply only where it is justified, and motorists will be clearly warned of their duties by notices on the road. As regards the speed of 25 m.p.h. over intersections, it is well-known that this is more frequently ignored than obeyed. It is not regarded as being of much value for preventing accidents, and no such limit is in force in other States, nor is it included in the uniform code. On many roads, if this limit were observed, it would in effect reduce the standard speed limit of 35 m.p.h. in built-up areas to a limit of 25 m.p.h. A special difficulty will arise in speed zones if the speed limit over intersections is retained. It is likely that on some main roads there will be speed zones of 40 m.p.h. on stretches of the road where there are frequent intersections, but unless the law is altered a 40 m.p.h. zone would be of little effect because of the duty to slow down at each intersection. The Government is advised that this limit has outlived its usefulness and suggests its repeal.

Speed limits for heavy commercial vehicles.—Clause 53 deals with the special speed limits applicable to these vehicles. After considering submissions from the South Australian Road Transport Association, the Government has decided to propose an increase of five miles an hour in the speed limit for vehicles above 7 tons gross weight on roads outside built-up areas. This will mean that the limit for vehicles between 7 and 13 tons will go up

from 30 to 35 m.p.h., and the limit for vehicles over 13 tons will go up from 25 to 30 m.p.h. The new speeds proposed are in accordance with the recommendations of the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee.

In addition to increasing speed limits for heavy vehicles, the Bill simplifies the weight classifications on which these speeds are based. At present the classification determining the permissible speeds in towns is different from that which determines the speeds outside towns, but the Bill proposes a single classification, based on the uniform code. An old speed limit of 6 m.p.h. for vehicles having any metal tyres is repealed.

Road Traffic Board.—It is proposed to give the Traffic Board two new functions. One is to promulgate information as to traffic laws and regulations, as well as road safety. It is thought that whenever any important change in traffic laws or regulations is proposed, the board should take steps to ensure that it is well publicised. The other new function of the board is in clause 31 which extends the powers of the board so that it can order the removal or modification of false traffic signs. It has been found that some persons, for advertising purposes, erect imitation traffic signs facing vehicles on roads. Some of these signs are confusing to motorists and dangerous. The powers proposed to be conferred on the board are restricted to cases where an imitation sign is likely to increase the risk of accident.

Speed Zones.—Clause 32 proposes a change in the procedure for creating special speed zones. No zones have yet been created, but preliminary investigations show that a number of them will be required, some relatively short. The exact limits of a zone may have to be determined experimentally, and changes made from time to time to secure the best results. Under the present law, zones can only be created by regulations made on the recommendation of the board. The board has pointed out that the creation of suitable zones may be hampered and delayed if regulations have to be made in Executive Council for every change of a zone, however small, and asked that it should have power to fix zones without regulations being made. However, as a result of amendments made in another place, the Bill now provides that the board may itself make the regulations declaring zones. This will mean that the control of Parliament over the zones will be retained, but the procedure for declaring the zones will be simpler and more expeditious.

**Safety Salls.**—In another place a clause was inserted in the Bill authorizing school committees and other like authorities, with the approval of the Traffic Board, to place safety salls on roads in the vicinity of schools. The legal consequences of having a safety sall on the road are not stated, but no doubt it would have the practical effect of warning motorists of the need for special care. The Government suggests that the clause be accepted.

**Ferryman Inspectors.**—In clause 35 there is a new provision that persons in charge of ferries under the Local Government Act will be inspectors under the Road Traffic Act. This provision is inserted at the request of the Commissioner of Highways, who is revising the arrangements for the management of ferries following upon the enquiry into the accident at Kingston. It is proposed that the ferrymen will have power to give directions as to the driving of vehicles on to or off ferries, and the places to be occupied by vehicles on the ferry. In addition they may question drivers as to their names and addresses, the nature of the loads on their vehicles, and the weight of their vehicles.

**Roads marked with lanes.**—In the provisions of the Bill dealing with the driving on the left and overtaking, some new rules are proposed with respect to laned roads—that is roads marked with two or more lanes for vehicles going in the same direction. Clause 54 provides that where a vehicle is being driven in a lane it need not be as near as practicable to the left of the carriageway. This will enable the faster moving vehicles to remain in the right-hand or centre lane even if the left lane is clear. Clause 56 provides that where lanes are marked, drivers wherever practicable, shall keep within one lane and shall only move from a lane where the movement can be made with safety. Clause 58 permits overtaking on the left on laned roads. These provisions have been included in the Bill on the advice of traffic experts who consider that conditions on some of our major roads now justify special rules for traffic moving in lanes. The rules in the Bill are similar to those in force in Victoria.

**Right of way.**—Clauses 62 to 69 deal with the circumstances in which drivers are required to give the right of way. A new principle is introduced into this law by the provision for “give way” signs which I previously mentioned. A “give way” sign at or in an intersection or junction will mean that drivers must give way to traffic approaching the sign from either side. Such a sign may be erected either

at the entrance to an intersection or junction, or within an intersection or junction—for example, between the plantations at an intersection on the Port Road. By the use of “give way” signs it will be possible to clarify the rights and duties of motorists at such intersections and junctions. In the past there has been some doubt and confusion about the right of way at these places. In other respects the Bill does not make any alteration of substance in the general rules about giving the right of way, but they are stated more simply and some differences in the wording of the various clauses dealing with this topic have been removed.

**Driving signals.**—Clause 74 makes one change in connection with driving signals, in that it requires the driver of a vehicle with left-hand drive, or which is more than seven feet wide, to give driving signals by means of approved mechanical or electrical devices, and not by hand. Hand signals have proved to be unsatisfactory in these cases.

**Traffic lights.**—In the present Act the meaning of all the various circles and arrows shown in traffic lights is set out in detail. It has been pointed out, however, that some of the traffic lights now in use are not in accordance with accepted standards and that from time to time changes will be made to secure greater uniformity or improvements. In order that these changes may be made without having to wait for legislation, it is suggested that there should be a code of regulations dealing with the significance of traffic lights and that the Act should not prescribe all the details, but should merely lay down a general rule that drivers must comply with the requirements of the traffic lights as laid down by regulations. This suggestion has been accepted and accordingly all the details concerning the traffic lights (including the “walk” and “don’t walk” signs) are omitted from the Bill.

**Level crossings.**—Clauses 80 and 81 deal with the duties of drivers at level crossings. One alteration is made. The present law requires a vehicle carrying inflammable gases to stop at a level crossing. There is some doubt whether petrol is an inflammable gas within the meaning of this rule. To clarify the matter the Bill provides that the duty to stop at level crossings should apply to vehicles carrying inflammable liquids as well as inflammable gases; but this rule will not apply to a vehicle carrying petrol only for use as fuel for its own engine.

**Ranking and parking.**—Clauses 82 to 85 set out the general rules relating to the standing

of vehicles in streets. In the past we have not had a general rule that stationary vehicles must stand parallel to the kerb. Some councils regulate parking by their by-laws and resolutions and enforce ranking where considered necessary, but in many places there is no rule in force and motorists park as they think fit. Traffic accident statistics show that angle parking is more hazardous than ranking, and the Government is advised that in the interests of safety it is desirable to restrict angle parking. Clause 82 therefore lays down a general rule that standing vehicles must be parallel to the kerb, except when standing in a place appointed by a council for vehicles to stand or in a place marked with lines or signs so as to indicate that angle parking is permissible. In view of certain comments I would stress the fact that this clause is not intended to take away from councils their present powers of regulating standing vehicles by by-laws resolutions and notices. The object is to provide that ranking is to be the normal thing except where a council introduces some other system by one of the methods open to it. Clause 82 was amended in another place with the object of further safeguarding councils' powers, but it is doubtful whether the amendment does all that is required and further amendments are being considered.

The power of the Government (which it has had for 40 years) to make overriding regulations in special cases is retained. The Bill makes some other minor changes about stationary vehicles. The present law requires a stationary vehicle to be drawn in as near as practicable to the left-hand side of the road. However in some one-way streets vehicles commonly rank on both sides and clause 82 allows this. Clause 86, which deals with the removal of unattended vehicles on roads, extends the existing law on this subject. By section 150 of the present Act members of the police force or officers of councils can remove unattended vehicles which are likely to cause danger or obstruct processions, but they have no power to remove vehicles which only obstruct ordinary traffic. Clause 86 of the Bill will extend the power of removal to any vehicles likely to obstruct traffic.

Duties at ferries.—Clauses 91 and 92 of the Bill contain two new provisions on this subject which are proposed on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Highways. Clause 91 requires a driver about to enter a ferry to obey any reasonable directions given by the person in charge of the ferry as to the order in which vehicles shall be driven on to or off

the ferry or as to the position to be occupied by vehicles on the ferry. Clause 92 provides that vehicles must stop at stop signs at or near a ramp or jetty leading to a ferry and must not drive on to the ramp or jetty until directed to do so by the person in charge of the ferry. The Highways Department proposes to erect stop signs at all ferries.

Miscellaneous road duties.—Clauses 93 to 105 re-enact the laws about a number of hazardous practices such as opening doors of vehicles so as to cause danger, riding on the roof or bonnet of a vehicle, various forms of dangerous conduct by cyclists, driving from an unsafe position, boarding and leaving vehicles in motion and leading animals. In this group there are two new matters to which I draw attention.

Driving abreast.—Section 147 of the present Road Traffic Act prohibits a person from driving his vehicle abreast of another vehicle, except for the purpose of passing that vehicle. This requirement is obviously too rigid for modern conditions. However, the traffic authorities in this State think that it is still desirable in the interests of safety to have a general rule that drivers must refrain from driving abreast whenever it is reasonably practicable to do so, and clause 97 has been inserted for this purpose. The restriction on driving abreast will not apply on a road marked with lanes, or where one vehicle is overtaking another, and will not prohibit pedal cyclists from riding two abreast.

Riding and leading animals.—Clause 104 provides that people are not to ride animals in municipalities and towns so that three or more animals are abreast. This rule at present applies only to roads within 12 miles of the G.P.O., Adelaide, but it is regarded as a desirable rule for town areas generally and the Bill proposes to extend it accordingly. A similar extension is also proposed to the rule which prohibits a person who is riding an animal or driving a vehicle from leading more than two animals.

Damage to roads.—Clauses 106 to 110 which deal with the protection of roads take the place of Part VII of the present Act. The experience of the officers of the Highways Department, who police these provisions, has shown that a number of them are now obsolete and it has been found possible to state the law more briefly and in more general terms. A small alteration is proposed in the existing rule which prohibits driving on the shoulders of a road. On many roads it is not at all clear where the shoulders begin and end, and

in these cases the present rule is of little use. Road authorities have advised that a general prohibition of driving on shoulders is not now practicable, but for the purpose of protecting roads it is desirable to retain the principle that traffic should as far as possible keep on the sealed portion of any road which has a sealed surface. Clause 110 provides for this and is a more reasonable way of dealing with the problem, than the present total prohibition against driving on shoulders.

Equipment, size, weight and safety.—Part IV of the Bill contains the rules relating to the equipment, size and weight of vehicles and safety provisions. The first topic dealt with is lights. The Bill sets out, in general terms, all the lamps which must be carried on vehicles. The details about the illuminating power of the lamps, their exact position, and other like matters, have been omitted from the Bill on the ground that they are more appropriate for regulations, particularly as changes are frequently made by manufacturers. With regard to lighting of lamps on vehicles, some changes are proposed. The first is that lighted lamps must be carried not only during the period between half an hour after sunset and half an hour before sunrise, but also during any period of low visibility. A period of low visibility is defined as a time when owing to insufficient daylight or unfavourable conditions, persons on a highway are not clearly visible at a distance of 200 yards. This rule has been found necessary in a number of other countries of the world, and from time to time conditions in South Australia show the need for a similar rule.

Another new provision of Part IV is in clause 123 which provides that every bicycle and every sidecar must have one red reflector on the rear, and every other vehicle must have two red reflectors. This was recommended by the State Traffic Committee, and by the Australian Vehicles Standards Committee. It appears that the present law as to portable reflectors and rear lights has not been sufficient to prevent serious accidents caused by driving vehicles into the rear of stationary vehicles, and that some additional and permanent illumination on the rear of vehicles is desirable. An alteration is proposed in the law relating to the dipping of headlamps. Under the present Act a driver must dip his lamps whenever his vehicle is within three hundred yards of an approaching vehicle, or whenever the driver of an approaching vehicle, however distant, has dipped his lamps while his vehicle is visible to the other driver.

The duty to dip headlamps at distances greater than three hundred yards is not a satisfactory enforceable rule, and it is suggested that it be omitted. If this is done, the law as to dipping will be reduced to one simple and effective rule, making dipping compulsory in all cases within three hundred yards of an approaching vehicle.

Brakes and equipment.—The next matter dealt with in Part IV is brakes. The clauses on this subject are based on the recommendations of the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee. The Government is informed that almost all modern vehicles comply with the proposed requirements. However, information has recently been received as to unusual brakes in a certain make of vehicle, and an amendment is being considered to provide that they shall be recognized by the Bill. Clauses 132 to 138 deal with other miscellaneous items of equipment such as warning devices, mechanical signals, windscreen wipers, reflecting mirrors and silencers. As regards reflecting mirrors, a new provision is inserted to the effect that the mirrors must be on the outside of the vehicle in cases where the vehicle is a passenger vehicle with seating accommodation for eight persons or more or where the mirror fixed on the inside of the vehicle would not give a satisfactory view to the rear.

Size of vehicles.—Clauses 139 to 143 deal with the size of vehicles. The normal maximum sizes prescribed are the same as in the present law. However, the Bill proposes an amendment affecting the maximum width. The question has frequently arisen whether a rear vision mirror or signalling device projecting on the side of a vehicle is to be taken into account in calculating the width of a vehicle. The proposal in this Bill is to allow an additional width of 4½ in. for a projecting mirror or signalling device. This means that if a vehicle has a mirror or signalling device on both sides it can be 8ft. 9in. wide, or if it has such equipment on one side only it can be 8ft. 4½ in. These principles are being enforced in Victoria, and the Victorian police report that they are satisfactory. Another amendment of the clauses dealing with the size of vehicles is that in future exemptions from any of these requirements will be granted by the Road Traffic Board.

Axle weights.—Clauses 144 to 156 take the place of the existing width of tyres legislation. This legislation contains complex provisions restricting the weight of axle-loads and vehicle-loads by reference to the width of tyres, and

was designed in the days when there were numerous horse-drawn vehicles with iron tyres, and motor vehicles with solid rubber tyres. These restrictions are not suitable for modern vehicles with pneumatic tyres and are repealed by the Bill. The new clauses contain three basic rules limiting the weight of vehicles, as follows:—

- (a) The axle load on an axle fitted with solid tyres of any kind must not exceed five tons, or seven hundred-weights for each inch of the width of the tyres, whichever is the less.
- (b) The weight on the axle of a vehicle fitted with pneumatic tyres must not exceed eight tons.
- (c) The total weight on all the axles of a vehicle other than the front axle must not exceed 32 tons. In applying this rule any combination of vehicles drawn by the same hauling unit is treated as one vehicle.

These provisions are based on recommendations made by the Commissioner of Highways having regard to the carrying capacity of South Australian roads. On specific roads lower maximum weights may be prescribed by regulations. The Bill empowers the Road Traffic Board to grant exemptions from the weight restrictions in cases of heavy machinery or merchandise which cannot be taken apart. Before granting an exemption the board must satisfy itself that the roads on which the exempt vehicle will be driven are capable of carrying the vehicle and its load without danger or damage.

Unloading excess loads.—An alteration has also been made in the law which enables members of the police force or inspectors to require overloaded vehicles to be unloaded so as to bring them within the law. At present the obligation to unload arises if there is an excess weight of 10cwt. on an axle of the vehicle, or if the excess of the total load is 10cwt. It is proposed to increase the tolerance in respect of the total load from 10cwt. to 30cwt. This has been done at the request of the South Australian Road Transport Association. The Government accepts the argument that if a tolerance of 10cwt. is permissible on one axle, the total tolerance for the whole vehicle should be a greater amount.

Compulsory mudguards and mudflaps.—The Government is aware of this problem, but it cannot be solved by a simple general rule that every vehicle must have mudguards and

mudflaps. Consideration will have to be given to the special requirements of various classes of vehicles and for this reason the Bill provides that the compulsory fitting of mudguards and mudflaps will be a matter for regulations. The details will have to be worked out after a full survey of the implications of this matter.

Towing.—Clauses 157 and 158 set out the requirements for towing vehicles, and restrictions on the number of trailers, and are the same in essence as the present law.

Safety provisions.—Clause 159 deals with the examination and certification of vehicles used for carrying passengers for hire. It is proposed that in future these examinations and the grant of certificates of safety will be under the control of the Commissioner of Police instead of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. The registrar has been in control of them in the past, but in practice much of the work has been done by police officers. It is provided in the Bill that every police officer in charge of a station more than 15 miles from the G.P.O. will be an authorized person for granting certificates of safety and also that the Commissioner of Police may appoint other authorized persons.

Defective vehicles.—Clause 160 is a new clause similar to a law of New South Wales dealing with defective vehicles. It empowers members of the police force to arrange for the examination of vehicles which they consider not to comply with the law, or to be unsafe. If after examination a vehicle is found not to comply with the law or to be unsafe a defect notice may be issued to the owner or person in charge. This notice will specify the repairs or adjustments which have to be made and will direct that until the work has been done the vehicle must not be driven on roads except as permitted in the notice. Clauses 162 and 163, which deal with securing of loads, and the duty to paint information on commercial vehicles, reproduce the present law.

Legal procedure, etc.—Part V of the Bill contains the legal provisions about offences and prosecutions, disqualification of drivers and the making of regulations. In connection with the disqualification of drivers, I draw attention to clause 169, which provides for the compulsory disqualification of drivers for second offences against certain provisions of the Act. Under the present law compulsory disqualification is prescribed for the offences of reckless and dangerous driving, exceeding the 35 m.p.h. speed limit in a municipality or town, and failing to give way at an



intersection or junction. It is proposed to extend the list of these offences by including failure to stop after an accident, exceeding the speed limit of 60 m.p.h., or the speed limit in a declared zone, and failure to give way at a give way sign.

Regulations.—Clause 173 empowers the Governor to make regulations. Regulations will be required for amplifying the requirements of the Bill as to lamps and equipment of vehicles. In addition it may be necessary as time goes on to make regulations for the management of traffic, prescribing rules to be observed by drivers and pedestrians in addition to those mentioned in the Act. The Bill provides that this can be done. A somewhat similar provision has always been in the law and has been used as occasion required.

Experimental traffic scheme.—A new provision, clause 176 (3), has been inserted empowering the Governor to make regulations for the carrying out of traffic experiments. Such regulations may suspend any of the general traffic rules set out in the Act or may lay down rules inconsistent with the Act, but any suspension or modification of the Act must be for a period not exceeding six months unless extended by further regulations. Similar provisions for the conduct of traffic experiments have been enacted in England and are included in this Bill at the request of the Commissioner of Police.

Penalties.—The Government has considered the question of penalties for traffic offences and does not propose any increases. In recent years almost all the penalties have been reviewed by Parliament, and, where thought necessary, increased. There is a general maximum penalty of £50 for all ordinary motoring offences, and specially heavy penalties for driving under the influence of liquor, joy-riding, dangerous driving, failing to stop after

an accident and so on. There is also a general discretionary power for the court to disqualify drivers for any motoring offence, and compulsory disqualification for certain offences. All these penalties are in the Bill. For some less serious offences, however, mainly those committed by pedestrians, and pedal cyclists, lower penalties are proposed, *e.g.*, fines of £25 or £10.

In conclusion I would like to say that this Bill goes as far in the way of altering traffic laws as is at present justified on the best advice now available to the Government. It is well known, however, that with the growth of the density of traffic, and developments in road construction, further changes in the law will be required. There will of necessity be other Bills, but it is submitted that this Bill will provide a much better basis to work from than we have had before.

I pay a tribute to Sir Edgar Bean, who not so long ago retired from the position of Parliamentary Draftsman. He offered to consolidate and add to the existing Road Traffic Act, and to do it gratis. The task has taken him the best part of three years, and I am certain that all members will join with me in saying that he has done a wonderful work, especially for a man who is now entitled to rest, following on his retirement. He did this for the benefit of the State. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members, who will realize that, in the main, this is a Committee Bill, and the Government will be keen to hear what is said on the various clauses.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 18, at 2.15 p.m.