

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL—

Thursday, October 14, 1965.

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

QUESTION**ANGLE VALE BRIDGE.**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: A short time ago the Minister of Roads was good enough to inform me, in reply to a question I asked, that the starting date for work on the Angle Vale bridge was about the middle of September and that it was expected that the work would be finished at the end of February or in March. I wish to make it perfectly clear that the Minister informed me of this in good faith. However, as far as I am aware, the work has not yet commenced; the contractors are at least a month overdue in starting. Will the Minister of Roads ascertain the cause of the delay and when it is likely that the work will commence?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The contract for this bridge has been let to Baulderstone Ltd. and provides for a commencing date and an expected completion date. As the honourable member has said that the work has not been commenced, I shall have inquiries made into the reasons, and I will inform the honourable member later.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REFERENDUM BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It seems to be rather customary in this Chamber this session to make personal explanations relating to press reports. I refer to a report appearing in this morning's newspaper. Last night I was in conversation with a reporter regarding the position relating to a lottery and the conference between the Houses and I am reported in this morning's press as having said outside the Chamber that the Council did not object to a lottery as such, but only to people being asked an abstract question.

It is obvious to any member of this Council that that is a ridiculous statement. Of course, there has only been an omission of one word, which can quite easily happen; I suppose it

could come about through something being missed in the reading of shorthand notes, but the word "referendum" was missing. The addition of that word would make the statement read sense and, at least if I cannot tell anybody else, the Council knows that the question of a lottery was never discussed. The only point that was raised in this Chamber was the manner of submission of the question to a referendum, and that was all that my statement related to. People outside do not completely understand the differences between the Houses. The press statement should have read "referendum on a lottery", not "a lottery".

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2089.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which is to give effect to the first Budget introduced by the present Government since it took office. It is the first Budget that we should perhaps look to for some fulfilment of the promise held out to the electors of this State that they would live better with Labor. Having that in mind, I fail to see anything in the Bill before us that in any way fulfils the promise of the Labor Party that the people of this State would live better with the Labor Government. In fact, I join with other speakers in saying that there is very real reason for honourable members to feel some disquiet at the situation, perhaps not exactly at the moment and perhaps not so much for this financial year but for future financial years, as the implications for the future are grave indeed having regard to what is in this Bill and various other matters promulgated from time to time as being the policy of the Government.

The Government's programme could be likened to the goods displayed in a shop window. This year's Estimates are the immediate goods in the front window. They set out the immediate policy that the Government is implementing but behind that front row of goods there is a second row, and those goods are matters which were set out originally in the policy speech and which have been amplified from time to time. Then perhaps in the rear

and somewhat out of sight are policies contained in the platform of the Labor Party, which we do not see much of and only hear about from time to time; nevertheless, they are there.

Earlier this session the Government naively suggested that, following the election, it had a mandate to do all sorts of things. In fact, I think it claimed a clear mandate to do everything in the Labor Party's platform. This Council will in future have to look carefully at every financial measure put before it and examine everything on its merits, not being swayed by any talk of a mandate that the Government claims it may have. Although this Council is a little hamstrung in financial measures, it must not hesitate to speak out against the implementation of purely doctrinaire policies.

This Budget gives some evidence of the way in which the Government is going about implementing some of its policies. I warn the Government that it should not in future push stubbornly ahead with fiscal plans without seeking the best possible advice. I do not know where precisely it is getting its advice at the moment but its ranks have been swollen by a certain honourable member from the university economics staff and I am wondering whether he has been recruited to advise the Government on economic matters. If that is so, it seems to me that the Government is starting on a road that can lead this State only to disaster.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He would be, very largely, a theorist?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes; that is so.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must address himself to the Chair.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: One thing that sticks out like a sore thumb in this Budget and in the Treasurer's explanation is that in this year £1,100,000 is to be spent as service pay. As all honourable members know, I had something to say about this on the Supplementary Estimates. I do not intend to repeat what I then said or reiterate any of the arguments I used then, but I believe that the Government has not yet begun to solve all the problems that have arisen from that arbitrary decision, which must have been taken either on its own initiative or on the advice of some persons within its ranks. Surely, that decision was not submitted to the advisers advising the previous Government?

It is a fact that, since it was decided to pay service pay to daily paid employees, an enormous number of problems have arisen. I

do not think the Government has yet begun to solve them and for some considerable time after the original announcement was made I have recollections of reading statements in the Public Service journal and elsewhere dealing with the number of anomalies created by the implementation of that decision. The Government has the problem of service pay on its hands. It has not yet solved it, and it will be a long time before it does. I am concerned that people propound these doctrinaire political policies, mere theoretical ideas, and overlook the fact that our wage structure is a complicated and delicate thing.

I suppose all honourable members have from time to time seen in magazines or in telecasts a model of an atomic structure displaying molecules and atoms arranged in a group and represented by small balls connected with rods to typify the structure of a particular element. Our wage structure is not unlike that; it is a complex series of decisions often originating in industrial tribunals. They are linked together and interference with one of the component parts has an enormous effect on the remaining parts. The Government should realize this. From time to time we have been told that this Budget is only just the beginning and that more expenditure will come. In the Labor policy speech there was a reference to the intention to introduce three months' long service leave after 10 years' service. We have heard nothing more about that, but it is a matter of extreme complexity. Under our State Act, persons may qualify for long service leave from 1950, but under industrial agreements 1937 is the commencing year. In providing for long service leave along the lines of present Government policy, what will be the commencing date? It sounds easy, but it is an extremely complex and important issue.

We have also heard from time to time that next year the Government intends (and here I sound a note of warning) to introduce a policy of equal pay for equal work. It is intended first to provide it for women employed as school teachers. I think it was mentioned in the reply to a question by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper that later it is intended to apply the policy throughout the Public Service. In other words, the Government seems keen to implement such a policy. I suggest that if it does so without considering carefully all the implications it will plunge into a jungle that will be ten times worse than the difficulties it will get into over the service pay question. The issue of equal pay for equal work sounds simple but, in fact, it is extremely complex.

and full of traps. We may be asked, "What is the principle?" I suppose it could be said that it is equal pay for work of equal value, but who is to determine what is work of equal value? Where this principle has been introduced it has been found necessary to impose restrictions regarding the non-dismissal of women and this would not be necessary if the work really was of equal value.

The second difficulty is that the basic wage for women is still 75 per cent of the male rate. Before the court adopted the "capacity of industry to pay" basis, women received 54 per cent of the male basic wage that was determined on the basis of the needs of a man, wife and two or three children. In those circumstances, women received equal margins, and when they received 75 per cent of the male basic wage they received that percentage of the margins. I am speaking of the State court, because at present the Commonwealth court has no particular policy in regard to women's margins. Those are only two of the difficulties involved in the implementation of such a policy. It is notable that, apparently, the Government intends to give some sort of lead in this matter, because it can apply its policy only to employees of the State Public Service.

Of course, it has announced that it intends to extend this to women teachers and other women employed in the service. There is no question that equal pay helps the single woman and her equivalent, the married woman who is working, and whose husband is also working, at the expense of the family man and the married woman who is not working. If increased taxation is to be applied (as it certainly will be) the inevitable result will be that married women who are not working and who are raising families must face increased costs of living. The question may be asked, "How do you work all that out?" I think it is fairly simple, because it is an economic fact of life that, if we are going to pay increased wages to any section of the community without there being increased productivity, we are going to inject into the community the extra wages paid and, unless that is compensated for by increased productivity, it must have some inflationary effect.

To take the case of teachers, I cannot see how the payment of extra wages in the Education Department is going to bring about any increased productivity in that department. In fact, if we look at the productivity for each teacher, we see that there is a constant endeavour to lower this productivity by lowering the number in the class.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you believe in equality of the sexes?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes. I am trying to sound a note of warning to the Government that if it rushes in without examining the matter carefully it will be heading for serious trouble. Because we have men and women employed in the Public Service it does not necessarily mean that there are wage disparities because of sex. If the Government looks at the position carefully, it will find that the whole matter bristles with difficulties. Many women in the Public Service are being paid a higher rate for what would be regarded normally as inferior work to that performed by males. A good example of that is the typist in the Public Service who holds the Intermediate certificate and who receives a wage greatly in excess of that received by a third-year apprentice, who would have a much higher educational standard, I would think, and who would achieve a much higher work productivity. Certainly, the apprentice is doing work of equal or higher value.

As far as I can see, there is nothing in this Budget (nor will there be in any Budget to follow) for the average family man, with the introduction of these policies, except increased taxes. All that the family man will receive as a result of this Budget is an increase in taxation in the form of increased water rates, increased land taxes to come, increased stamp duty on cheques and, ultimately, increased succession duties. I want to know how the average man is living better with Labor. Somebody asked this question in a letter to the editor of a newspaper some weeks ago. I have not the newspaper with me, but another person said in reply, "Of course we are living better with Labor. We are going to abolish capital and corporal punishment, and women teachers are to get equal pay with men."

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: We are better taxed!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, we are to have increased taxes on the family man. This Government will introduce policies that will result only in there being further increased taxes on the family man. There will be either direct disadvantages to him in extra taxation or indirect disadvantages because of an increased cost of living caused by inflationary pressures. Equal pay for women teachers in the Education Department—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They will live better!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Of course they will; the single woman, and the married woman who is working, will benefit. I estimate that it will cost well over £1,000,000 to apply this policy just to women teachers.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That money could well be spent on new schools.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Exactly, and this is only one department. I should like to know where the money will come from to apply this proposal to the Education Department and carry it right through the Public Service without there being increased taxes. If the Government can answer that, I shall be pleased.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You are opposed to equal pay for the sexes?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No, I am not, but I am saying that this is a tremendously complex problem and that before introducing equal pay the Government should consider all the implications and the effect it will have on all Government activities, because it will have an important effect and, once it is introduced, it will be impossible to turn back. It has not been suggested by any industrial tribunal that there should be equal pay for the sexes; this is something of a doctrinaire nature that the Government has introduced.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Have you heard of International Labour Organization Convention 500?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not know about that, but I do not think this has been recommended in this State or elsewhere by any industrial tribunal. In reply to a question I asked earlier this year the Minister of Labour and Industry told me that 1,502 married women teachers were employed in primary schools in this State and that only 676 of these had gained passes in the Leaving examination. In other words, equal pay is to be given to 826 women teachers despite the fact they have not even got the Leaving certificate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How many men have the Leaving certificate?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am concerned about women. This does not affect the men's pay; it is a matter of increasing the pay for women teachers to that paid to men.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But you say that those who have not got the Leaving certificate should not get it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I cannot follow the honourable member's argument. I am pointing out that this is a facet of an enormously difficult problem and that the Government would be well advised to consider

carefully if it moves to implement this policy without consulting the best possible advisers it has about the complexity of the situation, for it will have an explosive effect throughout the wage structure in the Public Service and outside. My main purpose today is not to oppose equal pay for equal work but to sound a warning that it should be examined carefully, as it will have a tremendous effect on future Budgets.

This year there is an increase of £234,000 in the allocation for the Police Department, and I wonder whether in this day and age the increase is a little small, as it seems to me that police administration, not only in this State but in all States and throughout the world, is experiencing some difficulty. I think the time is fast approaching when a thorough review is needed of the work police officers are called upon to do. We are calling on them to do a variety of tasks, and I think some investigations into curtailing some of their activities would be to their benefit and would bring about more successful work. The police work in so many fields now that I think some pruning of their activities would be a good thing. The increase in undetected crime is a worldwide problem. We can prove that in this State merely by looking at the figures in the reports of the Commissioner of Police. The report for the year 1956-57 showed that 70.3 per cent of offences against the person and 45.9 per cent of offences against property were cleared up. But if we turn to the 1962-63 report, which is the last one I looked at (I do not know whether the latest one is available yet), we see that only 59.4 per cent of offences against the person and only 31.2 per cent of offences against property were cleared up by the police. That is a dramatic reduction from 1956-57. I want to make it quite clear that I am not blaming the police for this, because the problem is world-wide, but one can probably be forgiven for asking: why is this happening? Why are offences increasing and why are criminals, as it were, getting away with it? Are the criminals getting any cleverer or is the Police Force getting any smaller? In 1956-57, when a high percentage of crime was cleared up, we had only 1,325 members of the Police Force, whereas in 1962-63 we had 1,929 members, so the force is not decreasing in numbers.

I suggest that perhaps one contributing factor why the police not only here but in all other countries are having less success with their work is the fact that they are engaged on many outside duties. It was mentioned

—earlier that the Attorney-General hoped to stop using the police as court orderlies. I welcome that as a good move. There is no need for the members of the Police Force to be engaged on that sort of duty. Further, many policemen are spending much time filling out accident reports. That work could well be done by ordinary trained clerical staff.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: By women police aides?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not know about that, but this is an aspect of police work that does not call for the attention of a trained and qualified policeman. Then, many policemen are engaged in testing people for driving licences. That again is an activity that could well be undertaken by a trained squad of private people well versed in the Road Traffic Act and the practical skills of driving.

There are many other activities engaging the time of police officers who, if they were released for normal duty, could help considerably to bridge this gap that seems to be ever increasing between crimes committed and crimes satisfactorily cleared up. This problem merits some attention from the Government at a suitable opportunity. I noticed, too, some interesting figures the other day bearing on the question of costs to the Government relating to offences under the Road Traffic Act and the great toll on our roads today. In the latest police report it is shown that 250,000 miles was travelled last year by the Highway Patrol, which detected 3,615 offenders under the Road Traffic Act, involving 5,341 offences. All in all, 51,554 traffic offences were detected by police officers. As the members of the Highway Patrol travelled 250,000 miles during the whole year and managed to detect only 10 per cent of offenders under the Road Traffic Act, this would seem to be a strange anomaly. There may be an explanation of it of which I am not aware, but this is another interesting aspect of police work that merits some investigation, because it is a costly item of expense for the department.

Earlier I sounded, I hope, a note of warning and trust that the Government, before it embarks in the future upon the implementation of policies similar to the policy that has already added over £1,000,000 to this Budget, will not lightly add another £1,000,000 or more to next year's Budget without fully examining all the implications of its policy in these respects. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I was interested in the opening remarks of my

colleague, the Hon. Mr. Potter, when he referred to the pledge of the present Government prior to the last election, "Live better with Labor." I well remember that nearly four years ago I had the privilege of doing a pre-campaign broadcast for my Party. I finished it with the phrase "Life is better with the Liberals." Slightly before the beginning of the campaign earlier this year, I used the same phrase, "Life is better with the Liberals", and shortly after that the Labor Party came out with this phrase, "Live better with Labor." Every day something happens to convince me that life was (and, unfortunately, the word is "was") better under the Liberal Party—most definitely so. Since we have had the doubtful privilege of being under the guidance of the Labor Party in Government, we have had a series of increased taxes, either implemented or foreshadowed, which have either brought or are about to bring about a drain upon the people, who will be compensated only in one or two distinct respects, such as equal pay to which the previous speaker referred.

We are informed in this Budget (and we already know it; many people have reason to know it) that action has already been taken to increase the charges for excess water and reduce correspondingly the amount of quota water available to a ratepayer without additional payment; so that ratepayers are being got at in two ways: the amount of water that they will get for normal payment is less and the amount of money that they will pay for excess water is more. Some £600,000 of additional water and sewer revenue will be secured this year. Further, we are told that it is proposed to bring down legislation to increase succession duties in many instances. The increase anticipated in the present year is £150,000 and I understand we are warned that next year a much greater increase can be anticipated.

Passing to the field of land tax, we were told that the Government is examining the provisions and intends to raise another £435,000 this year by means of land tax, and I believe that this is about a 15 per cent rise. The increase in land tax foreshadowed and even now before another place will be a great burden on many people at a time when it is most inopportune to bring down further imposts upon the public, particularly upon the primary producers.

A further increase is being made in stamp duties and I consider this an unreasonable one, being 100 per cent. Although we have, unfortunately, become used to increases of 10, 15 or

even 20 per cent in other instances and on occasions have been told, sometimes with good reason, that these are the logical outcome of the movement of the times and the values of money, when it comes to a 100 per cent increase in stamp duties it cannot be called anything but an unreasonable charge upon the public. I believe that this charge will fall on a far greater percentage of the public than the present Government realizes because many more people than in the past use the convenience of a cheque book. I understand this tax will bring in £150,000 this year and it is estimated to bring in £450,000 in a full year. It may be like road tax in that it may bring in more than that, because I think the Government does not correctly estimate the number of people, including many of its own supporters, who now use the businesslike method of a cheque book in paying their accounts.

Referring now to the Harbors Board, I note that action is proposed by the Minister of Marine to revise the charges levied by the board. The revised charges will operate from November next and will result in increased revenue of £300,000 for a part year and probably between £400,000 and £450,000 in a full year's operation. I am not complaining unduly about that as it is nine years since harbor charges were last increased, but I query the situation that this year a new bulk loading facility that was suggested at Giles Point at an estimated cost of £800,000 has been postponed whilst new offices are to be built for the Harbors Board at a cost estimated at somewhere near that amount. I ask the Government: which is the more necessary? Is it facilities for the removal of primary produce—and whether we like it or not it is a fact that that is the basis of our economy and our exports—or the erection of new offices for public servants employed in the Harbors Board? We are also informed that transport control will soon be with us again in no small measure and it is proposed to take measures to protect railway revenue by instituting transport control on competitive routes. The Government has stated that it does not intend to prohibit competitive operations but that it will require competitive services to make an appropriate payment for the privilege. The Hon. Mr. Rowe had something to say on that matter yesterday. Such thinking on transport is a little warped when talking about the privilege of being able to compete in a free country. I think transport charges at present are sufficiently high and this is another

instance of where we shall live not better, but dearer, with Labor.

I register my protest and disappointment at the general trend of this Budget. The Hon. Mr. Kemp yesterday referred to the situation in primary industries at the present time and I heard one honourable member say something about "getting out the handkerchiefs". In answer to that remark I said that if he did not cry yesterday I would do my best to make him cry today. In my opinion, the Hon. Mr. Kemp did not exaggerate the situation at all because as far as the State is concerned agriculturally, the present position is grave indeed.

A month ago I had the pleasure of visiting Blyth in company with the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and some other Parliamentarians. At that time we were at the cross roads as far as primary production was concerned. The season had been indifferent for the first half of the year but during the latter part of July, through August and up until the middle of September a lot of small rains had to some extent transformed the situation. By the middle of September the position was in a state of flux in that the season could have gone either way. Had we had bounteous rains in the last month no doubt we would be looking forward to a good season at present, but the situation has deteriorated drastically. Throughout the whole of the year we have not had a really good soaking rain, and there is no depth of subsoil moisture for fodder and crops to fall back upon in the event of continued dry weather. A month ago, on the way back from Blyth, I was encouraged, as was Sir Lyell McEwin, by the possibility of a reasonably good season, but since then we have had considerable hot weather, dry winds and a great recession in the prospects of primary industry.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: A persistent deterioration.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Exactly, and the deterioration has been marked from day to day. I have heard it said that while this weather continues the State is losing money at the rate of £3,000,000 a day. The Hon. Mr. Kemp highlighted the situation yesterday. At the moment the Government is bringing forward the following increases in charges, some of which I have mentioned before: water rates, land tax, succession duties, stamp duties, and rents and transport charges, most of which affect the country person. The rates he is paying are high enough at the present time but the Government, by these proposals, is going to

increase practically all these costs. The city people will not miss out completely, because they will have increased rents and tram and bus fares to meet.

All this is being done at what is in my view a most inopportune time and in a serious situation. I cannot but reveal my concern at this trend and I echo the warning given by the Hon. Mr. Potter. We have in South Australia only certain resources and only a certain capacity to pay. The more that is taken from the people in increased taxes, the less there will be for development and, therefore, the natural progression that we had under the Government of Sir Thomas Playford will be brought almost to a halt. I am not criticizing the Government for the sake of criticizing but am sounding a warning. If taxes are increased here and there and somewhere else, the brakes will be applied and there will not be that amount of development that normally would have resulted in increased revenue as time went on. I sincerely trust that the Government will watch the situation carefully.

Before I conclude, I want to say something about equal pay, a matter that may not be exactly in my backyard but something about which I am concerned. The Hon. Mr. Potter dealt with it and I think it was the Hon. Mr. Bevan who asked, by way of interjection, "Are you not in favour of equal pay?" If I were asked that question, I should say, provided we have the resources and in certain circumstances, I am in favour of equality of payment as between the sexes. Every honourable member would be in favour of equal opportunity for the sexes in so far as the structure of our community allows it. As much as we may talk about equality, the plain fact is that there is no equality between sexes when it comes to responsibility in meeting commitments. The man is the one who is expected to save enough money to enable him to marry, keep a wife and raise a family, and this situation should continue.

I recently attended a meeting of parents and friends of a particular country school and this meeting was also attended by a lady who, I understood, had come as the friend of a socialist member of Parliament. She was seeking money for a new school and during the evening she had something to say about equal pay. She was married but had been a schoolteacher previously and she said that she knew young women in the Education Department who had no responsibilities at all in relation to their future. They did not have to save for any particular

reason and were able to obtain leave to go abroad two or three times during their lifetime, and she cited a particular case. On the other hand, the men would receive equal pay and, as I said earlier, would have to save money to enable them to marry in due course and rear a family.

The attitude of this person was that there was only a certain amount that could be allocated to the Education Department and if women were to have equal pay, one of two things would happen. Either taxes would have to be increased or there would be a tendency for the men's increments of salary to decrease as time went on. In the latter case, there would probably be fewer men wanting to go school teaching and they would probably have less qualifications and ability. It is probable that we would not get the same quality of person under equal pay as we are getting at the present time. This could apply in other departments in the Public Service, and I suggest that the Government look at this matter.

It is very well in theory and it is nice to be idealistic and say, "We will give everybody equality." However, the sexes do not have the same equality of responsibility to the community. They have equally important responsibilities but the financial burden is not the same. Therefore, I suggest to the Government that, if it continues to implement this equal pay proposal while it is in office, it do so with a certain amount of restraint and that it heed the warning given by the Hon. Mr. Potter, which I endorse.

I have spoken with some reluctance in this strain. The Budget is for a record amount and I think we would have been able to take great courage from this fact if we could look forward to continuing the normal development of the State, because that would result in the normal increase in revenue that comes from an expanding economy. However, this Budget, the amount of which is about £122,000,000 as compared with about £112,000,000 last year, is based largely on increases in taxation that will tend to slow down development. The taxation that is to be collected would otherwise have gone into the provision of facilities and some businesses would have been able to take on additional employees, thereby keeping the economy buoyant. With those qualifications and the disappointment I have expressed, I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I consider that, in order to obtain a full appreciation of the effects of the Appropriation Bill

now before the Chamber, one should examine the conclusions reached by the Treasurer when he introduced his Budget on September 1. He said:

At the time of the Budget presentation in September it is normal for a State Treasurer to make some reference to seasonal conditions, which, as well as affecting the rural community, have their influence throughout the State and of course an effect on the Budget itself. The 1964-65 season was a very favourable one. The spring rains ensured good yields of cereals, high stock carrying capacity, and particularly good intakes into our reservoir system so that the cost of pumping from the River Murray was relatively low. The present season is in the balance. Intermittent rains have been sufficient to keep cereal crops and pastures growing, but over wide areas there is no reserve of subsoil moisture. Good spring rains would ensure an excellent season, but dry weather from now on would have serious effects on production. It is encouraging that the widespread rains of mid-August eased the situation in the drought-affected northern pastoral areas. However, rains to date have failed to give good intakes into the reservoirs, and holdings at the moment are well below those of 12 months ago. It is clear that the cost of pumping from the River Murray will be much greater than in 1964-65. I believe that the overall state of the South Australian economy is healthy and full of promise. Some observers see dangers in the Australian economy from a growing pressure on physical resources and on our international currency reserves, and all States will share to some extent in any problems if they should arise in this way. However, the people of South Australia have always shown themselves to be resourceful and responsible, and I have no doubt that they will remain so in helping to increase our productivity and to raise our standards of living.

Since the Treasurer delivered his Budget speech six weeks ago, seasonal conditions in this State and many other States have deteriorated considerably, and the Revenue Estimates will not be realized. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Kemp gave us a very clear picture of the acute position in agricultural areas. This position is getting more serious as each rainless day passes. South Australia is essentially a primary producing State, although in recent years under a Liberal and Country League Government it has developed considerable secondary industry. However, as it has a relatively small population compared with the Eastern States, it has had to export much of the secondary industry production to those States. Many parts of other States are experiencing drought, and no doubt this will have some influence on the availability of markets for our secondary industries.

It may be said that we should look at our export possibilities. Australia exports second-

ary industry products to the extent of £154,000,000 a year, but our exports of rural production total £1,075,000,000, so it will be seen that no matter how we look at this position we get back to the inevitable conclusion that this is a rural production State, and it is rural production that is in a serious plight now. This will have a serious effect on the secondary industry of this State and throughout Australia.

Over the years rural industries have learnt, with the assistance of technical officers from the Agriculture Department and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, to combat the forces of nature. We are indebted to the Hon. Mr. Geddes for mentioning in this debate yesterday the lack of extension officers to carry information developed in the research laboratories to the farming industry. To develop his argument a little further, it is interesting to read the comment made by Mr. J. V. Mertin, a prominent technical adviser in South Australia, in presenting his address as retiring President of the South Australian branch of the Institute of Agriculture. The following is a report of his address:

Mr. Mertin said that extension as a profession was relatively unrecognized in Australia. Opportunity for correcting this had presented itself at the Australian Agriculture Extension Conference in New South Wales during 1962. Unfortunately, except for a new diploma course in Queensland, the fostering and development of extension as a recognized profession was no further forward. "This situation in extension must surely rank as the greatest deficiency in our agricultural system today," Mr. Mertin said. "While it is important to study the inter-relationships of plant, soils and animals, it is equally vital that the puzzling reactions of man should also receive some fundamental attention. After all, he is the one who has to manipulate all these other inter-relationships for the progress of himself and the nation." Mr. Mertin proposed a three-point plan to remedy the present situation. This comprised: (a) inclusion of some extension training in the syllabus of the Agricultural Science Degree; (b) prompt establishment of a one-year diploma course in Agricultural Extension in Adelaide; and (c) holding of agricultural seminars to which commercial companies could send staff.

Different types of extension officer are required, but the men who carry extension work from the research laboratories to the farmer are those we are considering. In 1962 Dr. O. H. Frankel, who was a member of the Executive of the C.S.I.R.O., delivered the Farrer Memorial Oration, in which he said:

Agricultural science consists of three spheres of activity—basic research, regional research and extension. A search for the word

"extension" in the syllabus of each of the 40 subjects listed in our new Adelaide degree course produces a negative result. As a member of the profession and the institute, it is pertinent and not improper to ask why. From the remarks of these two noted gentlemen I think it can be realized that it is incumbent on the Government to consider the need to introduce a diploma course, possibly at the Adelaide University at a post-graduate level. Mr. Geddes suggested that graduates should perhaps go out to the farms and gain experience in that way, but I believe a more appropriate and possibly a better way is to establish a diploma course in farm management at the university.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Have you ever advocated this previously?

The Hon. L. R. HART: To obtain farm management consultants, we must import men from overseas, and there are relatively few of them. In fact, in a few years men will not be available overseas, and the longer we delay this matter the longer it will be before we are able to train men for this purpose.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Have you advocated it previously?

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I have never heard you advocate it in this Chamber.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Even if we have not advocated it here previously, I now support it. If the present Government believes this is the answer and is prepared to accept the suggestions, we can get on with the job straight away, because it is the primary industries in this State that export the products that will get this country out of trouble. If we delay disseminating scientific knowledge to the farming community we shall be delaying the recovery of this country from its present position. Also, while we are dealing with the extension, I should like to refer to the Rural Youth Movement, which in this State has developed considerably in recent years. Present figures indicate that over 5,000 members belong to clubs throughout the State. I cannot stress too highly the great value of the movement to this country. In it, we are training the leaders of tomorrow, those people who will play a leading part not only in rural industries but also in all phases of the State's development. However, this movement at present is being hampered because it is not getting sufficient officers to cope with the increasing influx of members. Suggestions have been made by the Rural Youth Council, a body of competent people specially selected for their knowledge of

the requirements of industry, not only primary but of other types. Its Acting Chairman is Mr. Marshall Irving, whom we all know. The members include Mr. A. A. West, Mr. D. A. Cram, Mr. Ken Esau and Mr. R. H. Sedsman (Director of the Royal Agricultural Society). There are other members well known to the community. These people recommend that six advisers would be none too many. At present we have four advisers and it is impossible for them to cope with the work in front of them. In addition to this, there is no office staff other than the typing pool available to the extension services. This is specialist work, and, as it is necessary to be able to cope properly with the office work for this movement, they suggest one female staff for their own purposes.

The similar movement in Western Australia is controlled by a separate Act and it has direct access to the Minister himself. I am not necessarily advocating that we go that far, but further consideration should be given to providing the Rural Youth Movement with the necessary staff. The reply that I received to a question I recently asked gives me some hope that this will come about. It stated:

The Rural Youth Council has made a recommendation to the Minister of Agriculture that additional officers be appointed to assist with the organization of this valuable movement.

However, we got the inevitable statement in the next sentence of that reply:

The possibility of meeting this request is being considered against the availability of funds for the current financial year.

No matter how urgent and necessary many projects are, we get back to this inevitable statement that it is being considered in relation to the availability of funds. Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Potter this afternoon mentioned several items in respect of which funds seem to be available. If an industry is sufficiently necessary to the State, surely funds should be made available for its particular needs.

I come now to the prolonged drought in the Far North of this State, which has lasted for not only one year or two years but in some areas up to 10 years. This continuous drought has meant that we have a rapidly deteriorating asset in this country, which is being eaten out and eroded. Soil erosion is taking place and what was once a great asset is now a dwindling asset. But in its place we could have another asset—tourism. If we are to allow this country to deteriorate to the extent that it becomes another dust bowl, obviously it will have to be closed to all kinds of stock.

I suggest that the Government consider creating an arid zone reserve. We hear much about the need for reserves, for recreation areas in our more populated parts of the State, and I am not saying that these are not necessary. I am prepared to accept that it is necessary that we have reserves and recreation areas, but I believe that an arid zone reserve or park (whatever name you like to give it) would have some appeal as a tourist attraction. Tourists tour the northern areas at present in great numbers and if we could provide a park in those areas we would establish an asset in country that probably at present is worth very little and can be used for no other purpose, because much of it is arid, carrying very little stock. From a tourist point of view, it would be valuable.

There are many reserves in other countries. Some are quite extensive. The biggest reserve in the world is the Wood Buffalo National Park in Canada, which consists of 17,300 square miles. In the United States there are the Yellowstone National Park, consisting of 2,213,207 acres; the Everglades National Park, of over 1,000,000 acres; and the Mount McKinley National Park, of nearly 2,000,000 acres. In South Africa there is the Kruger Park, of 8,000 square miles; and in the Belgian Congo there is the Parc National Albert (to give it its correct title), of 3,900 square miles. Then in Canada there are the Jasper National Park of 4,200 square miles, and the Banff National Park of 2,564 square miles. We are here referring to fairly big countries but England, which is a relatively small country, has national parks of considerable dimensions. For instance, there are the Lake District National Park of 866 square miles, and the Snowdonia National Park of 845 square miles. Other national parks are scattered throughout the world. So we should only be following the precedent set by other countries if we were to establish a national park in the centre of Australia. It would have considerable tourist possibilities. Many countries are making efforts to attract tourist trade these days. Australia should not be prepared to stand idly by and do nothing to make available these facilities wherein undoubtedly lies much income. Admittedly, all of the areas that would be most suitable for this type of park may not be in South Australia; some may be in the Northern Territory or even Western Australia, but this matter could be considered by the State Government at a Commonwealth level. It would be well rewarded if it did so.

I refer now to the practice of Asian students at the university (who are here, I take it, under the Colombo Plan) embarking on another course after completing their training in the particular course for which they came. I do not know whether this practice is occurring at our university, but it is something that has been occurring at universities in other States. I trust that every effort will be made by the Government to see that once these people, who have been brought here to train at our universities, have completed their courses they will go back to help their own countries with their acquired knowledge. That is why they were brought here. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I, too, support the Bill. Most other speakers have referred to the difficulties being faced at present in most of the rural areas of South Australia because of what is a doubtful season. Also, we are facing increased costs on public services and the certainty of increasing taxation. I do not wish to labour those points further, but I will speak briefly on the fact that South Australia during the past 20 years has made outstanding economic progress. I do not think any person who is prepared to take a dispassionate look at this question, and examine the statistical figures available, will deny that statement. If honourable members remember, I presented statistics to bear out that contention when I spoke in the Address in Reply debate earlier this session. The economy of the State has changed dramatically in that 20-year period from one relying almost exclusively upon rural industries to what may be termed a well-balanced economy between the industrial side and agricultural and pastoral side. The fact must always be borne in mind that our industrial growth has been due to the ability of the State to produce slightly more cheaply than other States to sell on a lucrative interstate market. I think that at present—and I quote from memory—80 per cent of our industrial production is exported to other States. We could claim that in the internal economy of Australia this State is an industrial exporting State. This could be carried to the national level, where we are an exporting nation as far as primary products are concerned. As soon as the stage is reached where the cost factor reaches parity with a neighbouring State, or somewhere near parity with a nation receiving our exports, there is great difficulty in maintaining a competitive position.

This State's economic development and growth during the 20-year period has been more dependent on this one factor than any other, in that we have had the ability to compete on more than even terms with the manufacturing industries in other States. However, in saying that I realize many factors are involved. If the stage is reached when our production cost is on a parity with the Eastern States then we can no longer expect this favourable trade position to continue. If our efficiency is no higher, our State's internal economy will be seriously affected. I think honourable members will agree that this is plain common sense.

That being so, I regard this Budget as a somewhat depressing document. The Government may well congratulate itself on presenting a Budget in which more money is to be spent, but it is obvious that increased expenditure will not achieve any increased economic growth in South Australia. Indeed, one may say at this stage that already there is some evidence of a slowing down in the State's economic growth. Further (and this has been dealt with by other speakers) it appears that increases in the taxes levied on the people are imminent. Any study one wishes to make of the Budget will show that during this session several Bills will be introduced to increase the tax burden on the people. This burden must in its turn inevitably affect the ability of the State to compete, which, added to the inevitable rise in the cost structure, does not lead us to believe that the Budget is designed to continue the dynamic growth that this State has enjoyed during the last 20 years.

This extra tax burden, because of the limited tax field in which the State can operate, must fall increasingly on certain sections of the community. If members look at the major fields from which State taxation is raised, such as land tax, succession duties, stamp duties and motor registration, it can be seen that my statement is correct. South Australia has been singularly well served by its primary producers who have, by comparison with primary producers in other States, done a remarkable job in the development of the State, despite the limited possibilities for intensive development. In the field of increasing State taxation, this will particularly affect that section of the community. By and large, the Budget does present a somewhat depressing outlook and the dynamic growth that has been taking place in the State over the last 20 years, both industrially and agriculturally,

must be affected. I do not wish to be over-critical but I draw the Government's attention to these matters in all good faith and in the hope that it will recognize, above all things, the need to maintain in South Australia a climate for continued growth and expansion, both in industry and in commerce.

As has been pointed out, particularly by the Hon. Colin Rowe, the tax burden in South Australia as a result of this Budget will rise by about £2,000,000, an increase of about 12 per cent, compared with the previous year. I have already dealt with the main sections of the State taxation field but I think we should look at the amount of the increases in those figures. It has been estimated that land tax this year will return an extra £405,000. The increase in relation to motor vehicles will be £323,000, and from stamp duties, £832,000. One may well wonder whether there is to be any alleviation of the stamp duty on the purchase of motor vehicles. Succession duties will return £448,000 more than was the case last year, and there will be an increase in Transport Control Board licence fees of £27,000.

In addition, there will be the increased receipts from certain public services, in particular, £436,000 in relation to harbours, £321,000 in relation to railways, and £1,000,000 by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. These figures lead us to the same conclusion, that a certain section of the community will be adversely affected, not only by the increased tax burden but also by the increased payments for certain public services. This will inevitably affect what has been the dynamic growth of the State. We notice that there is to be an increase of about £27,000 in the licence fees collected from road transport. Evidently, that increase will cover a small part of this financial year. There is also to be an increase of £321,000 in railway revenue. I think it is reasonable to assume that these two matters are linked.

We must realize the important part played by our road transport system. We rely for our economic development upon a rapid and efficient transport system, probably more than any other State does. Since the lifting of transport controls last year, we have seen, particularly in the district I represent, a marked improvement in the service given to the people by the South Australian Railways. I know that to be true because I myself have received better service. It is important in the field of transport, which affects the lives

of practically every person in the State, particularly those in country areas, that we maintain an active and competitive spirit. If we do away completely with the possibility of competition, we immediately reduce the efficiency of the service to the public.

One can get rid of this competitive factor in several ways. It can be done by physical control and it can be done by making it uneconomic for road transport to compete with the State railway system. Another matter of vital importance is that up to the present the people living in the city have not been very concerned about transport control, in my opinion at any rate. However, the matter has a bearing on the metropolitan area of Adelaide and on the areas adjoining the Victorian and New South Wales borders. At present there is a movement of business from Melbourne and New South Wales to Adelaide. When business associations are established with firms in New South Wales or Victoria, a pattern is established and that takes a long time to break. However, I have noticed in the electoral district of Southern, particularly in the Lower South-East, that there has been a marked move back to the city of Adelaide in business dealings. If stringent controls on transport are reintroduced, whether they be physical or economic, this return of business to Adelaide will cease and business will revert mainly to Melbourne, and Victoria generally. Therefore, the matter does not concern country people only; it concerns the commercial interests in the metropolitan area and the economics of the State.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Nobody has been able to give me figures to substantiate that this business is coming back.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think it would be impossible to give actual figures. The only way to obtain information would be to conduct a survey of every business in the Lower South-East of South Australia. However, I have checked with several of these business people and can cite one case where the movement of business back to Adelaide has been of the order of £2,500 a month. Of course, this business is not a large one but I think that anyone interested in the matter can find from inquiries that the trend is back to Adelaide so far as the business people of the South-East are concerned. The reason for this is simply the freedom of transport enjoyed by those people since the lifting of controls. I have endeavoured to point out the need to maintain a dynamic and developing economy in South Australia and have also tried to show that

the Budget is a depressing document in this regard.

I now desire to deal with the matter to which Sir Lyell McEwin has referred. I think it can be accepted that probably the most important field of development in this State at present is the discovery of an economic supply of natural gas. This is possibly far more important to our economy than an oil strike would be. A supply of natural gas is important not only as a source of energy but as a way to develop secondary industry around an economic supply of fuel. I believe that in America 30 years ago natural gas was one of the minor sources of energy but that today it is the major source. The allocation to the Mines Department for geological and geophysical research has been reduced by £50,000 this year. I think we all realize the part that has been played by the Mines Department in the economic development of this State. Whether one looks at past development at Leigh Creek and Radium Hill or the present development at Gidgealpa, one must say that the department has played a dynamic part in the industrial growth and the economy of South Australia.

The total expenditure in the Budget has increased by £8,000,000 or £9,000,000, but as far as I can see nothing more is being achieved from the additional expenditure. I believe that we must continue to maintain the dynamic and developing economy that has served us so well in the past 20 years. No matter how much money we spend or raise by taxation, the fundamental factors are the productivity of this State and the fact that we must continue with our dynamic and developing economy. I draw these conclusions not as a criticism but in the hope that the Government will realize that the continued economic health of this State depends on these matters.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I thank honourable members for their co-operation in pushing this Bill through, as it is important that it be passed so that the Budget proposals can be proceeded with. Although I do not know whether anything has been held up, it has been suggested that it is desirable to have the Bill passed today. Many honourable members have put their points of view very well indeed, but it is obvious that I cannot answer all matters raised. I was particularly interested to hear the comments made by the Hon. Mr. Potter on a subject that is dear not only to me but to every member of this Chamber; I refer to the Police Force. I have had talks with various members of the force, from the Commissioner of Police down, about what they are

doing, and I have not heard many complaints. We are all justly proud of our Police Force. However, there may be some substance in the matters raised by Mr. Potter, and I assure him that the attention of the Commissioner of Police will be drawn to his comments and that, if any action is needed to make our efficient force more efficient, something will be done. It has been suggested that certain duties—possibly not those mentioned by Mr. Potter—should be taken away from the police and done by someone else. However, when we have called for reports from the Commissioner, we have been left in no doubt that the police are the appropriate people to do this work. Perhaps the answer is to have more police officers.

I come now to Mr. Potter's reference to undetected offences. It must be obvious that, as the metropolitan area expands into the near country areas, the work of the force must be more difficult unless there are sufficient officers. That may be one of the reasons for the increase in undetected offences. However, I assure the honourable member that I shall be happy to draw the Commissioner's attention to his speech. I have obtained a reply to some queries raised by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin and another honourable member yesterday, the first of which relates to the group laundry. The reply is as follows:

In the second reading speech on the Appropriation Bill I referred to an increased provision of £200,000 for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Of this increase, £71,000 is required for salaries and wages. The figure of £129,000 to which I have referred is the increased provision for all contingency lines—that is to say, the increase for operation and maintenance of the hospital, including the charges for group laundry services. The main accounting and appropriation details for the group laundry are as follows:

The committee of management set up to control the operation of the group laundry was of the opinion that its finances should be conducted along lines comparable with those of a business undertaking, with appropriate charges being made for services, rather than as a part of a social service department (Hospitals Department). The committee requested that a working account similar to accounts conducted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and certain other departments be approved. After discussions between the committee, the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General, it was agreed that a working account similar to those already operated by other large departments would be appropriate. The Treasurer therefore approved the setting up of such an account, subject to the detailed accounting arrangements being acceptable to the Auditor-General, and the Loan Estimates included an appropriation of £230,000 for the

purchase of stocks and the provision of working capital.

Salaries and wages, the purchase of soaps and detergents, and other expenses will be met from the working account, and an appropriate charge per pound of clean linen will be made to the hospitals and institutions using the service. This charge, as met by the hospitals, will recoup the working account and thus keep it in funds to meet further expenditures. The appropriations to enable the various hospitals to meet the charge for laundry services are included in the Estimates of Expenditure as a part of expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance for Government hospitals, or as a part of the grant to non-Government hospitals. The provisions so included this year for Government hospitals are:

	£
Royal Adelaide Hospital	154,000
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	101,000
Mental Health Services	30,000
Other hospitals	6,000

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That is bulked into "Contingencies", is it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is a copy here of the statement I have just read if the Leader would like to see it. That is the main answer, I think, that the Leader was looking for. If other honourable members have other questions, I shall be happy to get the answers. If any honourable member has asked a question that has been missed either by myself or by my department in reading *Hansard*, if he will draw it to the attention of the appropriate Minister, we shall be happy to supply the answer. I should like to make it clear that I have read less of *Hansard* this year than ever before: I just do not get time to read it. Again, I thank honourable members for their attention to the Bill and their co-operation in getting it through.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the limit of cost of public works that are exempt from the principal Act from £100,000 to £150,000. The present limit was set in 1955 when the cost of building was substantially less than it is now:

indeed, it is estimated that the cost of buildings has increased by 10 per cent since that date. In view of the continuing rise in building costs and the need to fix a figure that could be retained for some years, it was considered that a more realistic figure would be £150,000. The adoption of this figure would save much of the committee's time, would be more in accordance with the limit fixed in 1955 and would enable the Public Buildings Department to proceed with work, particularly on a number of primary schools. Clauses 3 and 4 make the necessary amendments and I think I need refer specifically only to paragraph (c) of clause 3, which is designed to retain existing law in connection with public works already referred to and before the committee. I commend the Bill to honourable members for their consideration.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

To ensure a harmonious working relationship between the new Bedford Park Teachers College and the University of Adelaide and to ensure that the needs of teacher-training will be more closely related to the university Department of Education than hitherto, it is considered desirable that the person appointed to hold the office of Professor of Education, University of Adelaide, Bedford Park, should at the same time hold the position of Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College. In order to provide for this joint appointment, it is necessary to amend the Education Act, 1915-1963, to enable the Minister to make appropriate arrangements with the Council of the University of Adelaide for a suitable person to be appointed to hold both the office of Professor of Education and the position of Principal of Bedford Park. Clause 4(1) of this Bill so provides. By clause 4(2) it is made clear that if, as a result of this arrangement, the person appointed to be Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College ceases for some reason to be Professor of Education at the University of Adelaide, that person shall

thereupon cease to be Principal. By clause 4 (3) it is provided that Part III and Part IIB of the Education Act (which deal with Teachers Salaries Board, Teachers Appeals Board and appeals concerning special appointments) shall not apply to any person appointed to hold the position of Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College. I commend the Bill to honourable members for their consideration.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2096.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): This Bill is of a type that I have described previously as a sort of a rats and mice Bill; cottage pie type of thing; bits and pieces. Some matters in it have been well canvassed by previous speakers, and I do not intend to labour many of the points, but I do wish to pass some comments on the early part of the Bill.

In clause 3 the definition of "footpath" says "includes every footpath, lane or other place intended for the use of pedestrians and not for the use of vehicles". That was inserted to relate to a later clause, but I mentioned it in order to couple it with something I shall say later. I am not happy with clause 21, because, although I believe it proper that people should walk on footpaths where they are provided, in many areas both metropolitan and country footpaths exists in name only. When on inspections with the Public Works Committee I have seen footpaths that are badly eroded, and many not paved. In many instances it would be almost impossible to walk on them, and it would be especially difficult for women pushing prams and that kind of thing. If the amendment in its present form is carried, and legal action is taken against people who walk on the carriageway and are knocked down, it is going to be more difficult to sustain a case than it would have been previously. The Minister could well have a look at section 21 (1) (a) which says, "shall not walk along a carriageway of a road if there is a footpath on that road." It may be possible to find a suitable amendment, such as using the words "paved footpath" or, using my own words, "a footpath fit for people to walk on." Often in muddy weather it is not possible to walk on these so-called footpaths,

and there is nothing to say that a footpath shall be in good condition. I am not happy with that clause.

I favour clause 15, which deals with switching devices, but it could be confusing. The sting is where it always is—at the end, and I refer to the penalty of £50. I have no objection to the principle involved, but I think that a £50 maximum penalty in the hands of justices is too severe, as it is the same penalty as may be imposed for stealing a motor car. I do not agree with the penalty, although I know it is the maximum penalty. I have known of cases where the magistrate or justices have said "This offence is becoming far too prevalent and the next person who comes before the court will receive the maximum penalty", and they proceed to impose that penalty. Two of my friends were once sent to gaol because their cases were judged a month before the event. The magistrate had said, "The next two people who come before me for this offence will go to gaol." We should not have a provision with such a maximum penalty.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: But this is a case where they are either on the footpath or not.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. I wish to deal more specifically with clause 27, which amends section 146 of the principal Act dealing with maximum axle weight. In his explanation the Minister said:

Clause 27 amends section 146 of the principal Act. The limit has been suggested by the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee and has been adopted by all other States. The amendment will limit the load which may be carried on the front axle of a vehicle to 10,000 lb., approximately 4½ tons. Loads in excess of this amount would make the vehicle difficult to steer and could also cause damage to road pavements.

He explained paragraph (a) but not paragraph (b). The object of clause 27 (a) is to bring South Australia into line with other States. There is no uniformity whatever in other States on this matter of axle weight. The position varies considerably. The Minister said the limit had been suggested by the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee and that it had been adopted by all other States. That is not so. I have the 1965 edition, the latest issued, of the *Automotive Year Book*, which sets out clearly that the position varies considerably. In fact, this Bill does not do what the Standards Committee recommends. The figure given is 18,000 lb., equal to 8.035 tons, with the proviso that the weight may be reduced for specific roads or areas until such time as roads are brought to the standard required to enable the maximum load to be

carried. Dealing with the front axle there is a reference to a maximum single tyre load of 5,000 lb., the equivalent of 2.32 tons, for a tyre inflation up to 100 lb. a square inch.

In New South Wales, there is no express provision, but the following words have been written into the first section, in order to overcome the difficulty:

12,320 lb., equals 5½ tons, for single axle with single tyres, with inflation pressure not exceeding 75 lb. a square inch.

The weight in Victoria is 8 tons, and in Queensland it is 8 tons for an axle fitted with four or more pneumatic tyres, and more than 8 ft. from another axle. It is 4½ tons in Queensland for an axle fitted with two tyres. The South Australian figure is eight tons on the axle, with no express proviso for two wheels. In Western Australia, it is 18,000 lb., or 8.035 tons. It is 5,000 lb. on the front wheels, which equals 2.322 tons. The provision regarding the front wheels in Tasmania is the same as applies in Western Australia. We see that there is a wide variation. I do not believe in uniformity for uniformity's sake; there is no necessity for it. I do agree that, in a country like Australia, it is a good thing to get all the nuts and bolts the same, and to standardize commodities used all over the country—as long as sausages do not come into it! This Chamber at one time had to reject a whole set of regulations because an endeavour had been made to enforce upon us the Victorian recipe for sausages, and the Victorian sausages were not half as good as the South Australian ones.

If we look at the terrain and geographical features of our State, we see that there is a bit of a hump just outside the city, called the Mount Lofty Ranges, that we have the Flinders Ranges well up in our northern areas, and that we have a small rise in the South-East. That is the extent of our mountainous area; otherwise the country in this State is flat. We have these flat expanses on the West Coast for many hundreds of miles, and extending from Murray Bridge out through Bordertown and from Adelaide to Port Augusta, through the Mid-North and Upper North. From Truro to our other border on the River Murray the country is as flat as a billiard table. In view of that, why must we have a set of rules that may suit a mountainous State like Tasmania (as I understand they do), or New South Wales, with the high rising country of the Blue Mountains extending down to the Australian Alps?

In South Australia, we do not need to be exactly the same as the other States. The

other aspect of this that I do not like is that for the first time in our history we are getting down to a tyre basis. We have always dealt with this problem on an axle basis. Why must we suddenly swing around to tyres, just for uniformity's sake? The Minister said in his second reading explanation that this measure dealt with front tyres, but it goes further than that. It extends to all tyres of 5,000 lb. Many vehicles could not be used in South Australia if any degree of weight were placed on them, because the tare weight would be governed by this 5,000 lb. a tyre provision.

In the other States, each Act has been modelled on the same lines throughout, but we are trying to include only one matter in our legislation, and that will not work. Firstly, it will be extremely costly. An increase of at least 25 per cent in costs must occur as a result of this provision. We would need 25 per cent more vehicles to do the same work. For instance, metal, sand, and so on, are carted in the building industry and so, therefore, we would be adding to the cost of building. Similarly, farmers must have their wheat carted, and fruitgrowers must have their grapes carted. In fact, everybody who must have a commodity carted will be affected by increased costs, and yet nothing will be gained.

The forward controlled type of truck, which is specially designed and balanced for this type of loading, has been introduced, but, in my opinion, we will stifle technological advancement. How many trucks of this type are manufactured here? They are world-wide, universal. Why should we suddenly decide to go down to 4½ tons in relation to the front axle? Countries like Italy, Germany, the Alpine countries and France—in other words, the Common Market countries—do not have roads as good as those in South Australia, except on the autobahns, and places like that. The main roads in those countries are not nearly as good as ours, yet the authorities there permit a load of 6 tons over the front axle and 10 tons over the rear. Great Britain permits loads of 5 tons on the front axle and 9 tons over the rear to be carried on the same type of truck as we are using here; indeed the trucks are made by the same firm. Why should we inflict this imposition on the people and on the economy of the State? There is nothing in it except a wish to conform to some other State that may have the terrain that makes it necessary.

I speak with some authority on this matter in that Mr. Octoman and I, like some other members, have been approached by several

organizations. I have the authority of the Affiliated Associations of Country Carriers of South Australia, the Eyre Peninsula Road Transport Association, the Yorke Peninsula Carriers Association, the Pirie Area Road Transport Association, Mid-Northern Carriers, the Christies Beach and Noarlunga Sand Carters, and the Country Division of the South Australian Road Transport Association (Upper Murray and South-Eastern Divisions). These bodies wrote a letter setting out their complaints, so I think I can say that I speak with some authority. Also, I have received a letter from the President of the Chamber of Automotive Industries, who says very much the same as I have been saying. Although I have not received a letter from each of these organizations, I speak for many thousands of primary producers in the State who are upset, who cannot see the wisdom of this provision, and who will be extremely inconvenienced if this measure goes through in its present form. I shall now read a few lines from the submission of these transport bodies. The letter, which was signed by their President, will indicate to honourable members how these road operators feel. The letter states:

The damaging part of this amendment is that it generalizes too widely, by making no distinction whatsoever, between the light commercial vehicle and the heavy duty vehicle, where it states that no single tyre should carry a greater weight than 5,000 lb. So it would be fair to assume that a light commercial vehicle shod with 7.00 x 20 x 8-ply tyres, which is probably a 3-4 ton truck, in comparison with a heavy duty vehicle shod with 14.00 x 20 x 14-ply tyres, which at least is four times the strength, and all the vehicles of different sizes in between are lumped together under the one heading.

The tip truck business around the metropolitan area is big business. Last year one firm alone moved 3,000,000 tons of sand, gravel and soil, 75 per cent of which was taken by the Highways Department, councils, Engineering and Water Supply Department and Electricity Trust. The balance was used largely in the building industry. One does not have to reflect long to know that this provision will put up costs considerably to Government departments and semi-Government authorities; in fact, costs will rise by over 20 per cent, and perhaps even 25 per cent. I am trying hard to get this message over to the Minister, as I want to give him the benefit of the advice I have obtained. The cost of the 3,000,000 tons was £1 ls. a ton, 40 per cent of which was for cartage. In reducing the front axle limitation from eight tons to 4½ tons, there will be a

reduction of at least 20 per cent in the carrying capacity of these vehicles, so the industry will need 20 per cent more vehicles and drivers. This will all add up to further hinder the road traffic conditions in this already congested city. Most of the tip trucks used today are modern forward-controlled vehicles especially designed to carry a greater load over the front axle than is the normal-controlled vehicle. We are going to make it extremely difficult for straddle trucks used in the timber industry, as their carrying capacity will be cut by 50 per cent.

I do not intend to deal with grain cartage, as the Hon. Mr. Octoman is an expert on that and will deal with it later. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, log haulage is big business in the South-East, and it is also big business in the red gum areas in my district. The people in this business will be vitally affected. The restriction on log haulage vehicles would reduce their carrying capacity almost to half. It may be even worse than that; as I shall explain in Committee, the capacity may be reduced practically to nil under this provision. Total exemptions should be made on certain classes of vehicle. Every Tramways Trust bus should go off the road as being completely unsafe if we are to be consistent, as each of these buses has more than the front axle weight permitted by this measure. I have no doubt that they are already wider than any other vehicle is allowed to be under the Act. They have been licensed by the board: I do not doubt that they will be licensed again to conform to this provision. That is all right for the Municipal Tramways Trust, which can get a blanket exemption. It is all right, too, for the Highways Department and some other departments that have specialist equipment: they can get a blanket permit. But it is very difficult for a person who lives some hundreds of miles away from Adelaide to come over and plead a case to try to convince the board that he ought to be allowed to operate and get a permit. My experience, in common with that of many other honourable members, is that it was never the most co-operative place to work with before we removed transport controls, and I do not think it will be any easier for people to get a permit to operate these various types of vehicle in compliance with the provisions of this Bill. It is not at all easy to get a permit unless approved by the board. So we need a longer and closer look at the overall effect of this legislation.

I will not have a bar of this limit of 5,000 lb. on any single tyre. First, it is unrealistic; secondly, we have not imposed it

before. We ought to stick to the axle limits. We ought also to meet the Minister's wishes and the wishes of other people that we do not grossly overload our vehicles at the front. I am prepared to clamp down quite a bit on front axle loading, but not to $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons in one fell swoop. To come down from a load of 8 tons over the front axle to $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons is a terrific reduction. We have to consider the effect on people who have organized the whole economics of their businesses on the number of loads they can carry each day and the number of tons they can carry on their vehicles.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What is the reason for the big reduction from 8 to $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister did not explain this. He is giving me much attention at the moment and I hope he will explain it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I was going to refer the honourable member to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act to see what he would say about that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is no use referring me to that section when clause 27 is included in the Bill so as to amend section 146. I am taking the point that people have based their whole economy on the present law and we are going to whip $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons from the front axle load in one sweep like this. People who have vehicles on hire-purchase and have commitments to meet will be seriously affected in running their businesses. It is completely unrealistic. If the Minister had said, "We should reduce this by 1 ton, $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons or 2 tons", we might have thought, "Well, this is pretty good." I do not think any one of us wants to see our vehicles grossly overloaded, but in the industry of which I have some knowledge, the grape industry, where we move large tonnages of grapes from the river to the Barossa distilleries and from the distilleries to the south, the greatest difficulty will be experienced by the carriers if the front axle load is reduced to $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons.

At the moment we are allowed to carry 8 tons over one rear axle. If we put on two axles we can carry another 8 tons. We can carry 8 tons over our front axle. Those people who have travelled this road know well that, in coming from the river to the Barossa Valley via the Sturt Highway, the haul up Truro Hill and Accommodation Hill tends to push their load from the cabin towards the back of the vehicle. Also, all the juice runs to the back of the vehicle. Some attempts have been

made by the carriers to fork their loads forward before they get to the weighbridge, but this has been severely frowned upon by the inspectors, and some people have been warned about it. I see nothing wrong with it. If a load gradually slips back over two or three miles of roadway and a man attempts to re-adjust it, surely he should not be reprimanded for it. On reaching the weighbridge we often find that the juice that has moved to the back of the vehicle has not had time to run forward again, and the vehicle will be grossly overloaded on the rear axle. If we have the 8-ton limit as we have at present, we have a bit of leeway but, with a 4½-ton limit on the front axle, a man will have to have his load thrown much further back on the vehicle. It will be difficult to trim a load so that he does not run into difficulty with the inspectors.

This brings me to my final questions. First, is this provision designed to put people off the road? I ask the Minister that because, if the clause is to be left like this, it is the surest way of getting them off the road. It will make it uneconomic for them to continue in business and run trucks capable of carrying a big load; they will have to reduce the load, which will make it uneconomic for them even to operate on the road. Secondly, is it intended to make it almost impossible for them to conform to the law? The inspectors will continue to dog their footsteps every inch of the way. Thirdly, if we adopt this tyre basis, surely in carrying things like headers and agricultural machinery, which have weight on one particular part of the machine, at the rear, we shall find that we shall have more weight over one tyre than over the other, yet we are allowed only 5,000 lb. over any tyre on the vehicle?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No, you are wrong. Read the Bill again.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I am not wrong.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are wrong. It is not over every tyre.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister is probably trying to help me and I want to make sure whether he is. Clause 27 reads:

Section 146 of the principal Act is amended (a) by inserting at the end of subsection (2) thereof the following passage: “, and the weight on any single tyre must not exceed 5,000 lb. unless otherwise approved by the board”.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Right. What does subsection (2) say?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Subsection (2) says “by inserting after the word ‘two’ in subsection” —

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No; I mean subsection (2) of section 146.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Subsections (2) and (3) state:

If an axle of a vehicle is fitted with wheels having pneumatic tyres, the weight on that axle must not exceed 8 tons. The weight on any two axles of a vehicle must not exceed the sum of the maximum weights which could lawfully be carried on those axles under subsections (1) and (2) of this section.

Subsection (1) deals with the old type of solid tyre and bears a relationship to width. I think the Minister should have another look at this; I know he said in his second reading explanation that it would apply only to the front wheels. However, I think that is what he intends the amendment to do, but the way this Bill is worded means that it will apply to every wheel on the vehicle.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It says “front axle” in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but we have often been given magnificent explanations on the floor of this Chamber. We have just had a conference where it was clearly delineated what was meant when we left that conference. My point is that what matters is what is written in the Bill: it does not matter what any speech in *Hansard* says about the Bill. It is laid down that the weight on any single tyre must not exceed 5,000 lb. I will explain in the Committee stages of the Bill just how ridiculous this is. It will put people out of business and it will put trucks off the road. I do not wish to labour this subject further. I hope that I have given the Minister sufficient information and that I have indicated I do not like these provisions, that people in industry do not like them, and that it is bad for the economy of the State. I do not believe that the wording secures the results that the Minister desires. The only other point I wish to mention is that the Minister did not give any explanation of clause 27 (b), which reads:

By inserting after the word “two” in subsection (3) thereof the words “or more”.

I cannot work that out, and I would like the Minister to give me an explanation of what it means. If the words are added to section 146(3) it means that the weight on two or more axles of the vehicle must not exceed the sum of the maximum weight that can be

lawfully carried on those axles under sub-sections (1) and (2). They are just words as far as I am concerned, although I believe I have a solution. However, I want to be sure that my interpretation is the same as that of the Minister because, at the moment, I am having trouble in convincing the Minister on the matter of tyres. If I am wrong in my interpretation, I am sure that the Minister will correct me later, but at the moment I believe the provision

applies to all tyres on a vehicle. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.10 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 19, at 2.15 p.m.