

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 21, 1974

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

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. McANANEY presented a petition signed by 32 residents of South Australia, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mr. BOUNDY presented a similar petition signed by 80 residents of South Australia.

Mr. CRIMES presented a similar petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 57 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: LIVE HARE COURISING

Mr. JENNINGS presented a petition signed by 84 928 citizens of South Australia stating that live hare coursing was a cruel sport and that many hares were subjected to unnecessary pain and stress, and praying that the House of Assembly would pass legislation to ban live hare coursing.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. BOUNDY presented a petition signed by 255 residents of the District of Goyder, stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would reject any legislation that would be introduced to implement any recommendations of the Commission concerning the District Council of Minlaton.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SPENCER GULF

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: There have been suggestions in the House, and again in a newspaper report this morning, that a plan of action for a study of Spencer Gulf waters has not been acted on by the Government. It has been further suggested that recommendations of a subcommittee of the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Coordinating Committee have been ignored. This is not so. Members will recall that the co-ordinating committee was established to consider the report of the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution-Reconnaissance Survey. The full committee and the Government accept that urgent studies are required. The only question at issue was whether the method of implementation proposed by the subcommittee was the appropriate way to pursue this matter.

As a result, in October last year Cabinet approved recommendations from the full committee on proposals for priorities on issues referred to in the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution-Reconnaissance Survey. The requirements within this approval call for: (a) purchase of vessels and equipment; (b) physical oceanography studies; (c) marine geology studies; (d) water chemistry and quality assessment; and (e) marine biology and fisheries studies. As a

result of Cabinet approval on these priorities, it now has before it proposals for finance to be provided to undertake this work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This should make obvious that the report of the subcommittee was only a document to guide the full committee towards its total findings and was never intended as a public document.

Mr. Millhouse: You're playing on words.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I repeat that there is no argument between the view of the subcommittee and the Government on the urgent need for studies of the Spencer Gulf waters.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 8).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I took up this matter with the Australian Government's Minister for Transport, who has stated that the sealing of the main runway at Kingscote is a fairly expensive project that could be justified in the allocation of public funds only if there was a very strong economic benefit to the local community. However, it was suggested that local government take over the aerodrome and share future development and maintenance costs. I forwarded this information to the District Council of Kingscote, which decided against the local ownership plan. Copies of the relevant letters are available to the honourable member to read, if he so desires.

STEEL DISPUTE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, say what compensation is available to the owners of the steel which has been impounded on the wharves at Port Adelaide by the Transport Workers Union for the past 4½ months and much of which has now rusted beyond use? My question is aimed not merely at seeking financial reimbursement for manufacturers who have had to cut back production and who, as a result, have lost valuable orders for their products and general production efficiency. I am more particularly concerned over two other aspects involving considerable financial loss to manufacturers (and especially the building industry), who have been the victims of this purely inter-union dispute. In the first place, I am informed that much of the steel that has stood on the wharf for the period of time I have mentioned is now worthless; in fact, if it were to be used for manufacturing, the amount of treatment required would make it uneconomic to use. Secondly, during the period of this dispute the steel industry has involved itself in the changeover from Imperial measurement to metric measurement. Because of the lack of movement of steel of the old imperial sizes, South Australia has lost about 47 000 tonnes of steel to its industry (and the Premier has confirmed this). There has been a considerable increase in manufacturing costs associated with there being part imperial and part metric size material. With this in mind, and having regard to the real problems (basically financial) facing persons involved in the steel industry, I ask the Deputy Premier whether he can provide compensation for these people who have been victimized in precisely the same way as the Government provided union costs in a previous industrial dispute?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Government agreed to the Leader's request, I think it would be the first time in the history of not only this State but the nation as a whole that such a decision had been made. That is the first point I make, and I think the Leader would be aware of this without my explaining it to him. I am unaware of the legal position in this matter, and naturally would want to examine it. It is not a matter of favour to one and disfavour to the other. They are two entirely different situations, and the Leader is aware of this.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about compensation for loss of wages?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was about to refer to the compensation for loss of wages aspect. That is the opposite end of the scale, and the Leader chose to ignore that. Regarding the steel strike, the executive of the Trades and Labor Council, which met this morning, recommended to the two unions involved in this problem at No. 29 berth that they agree to abide by a decision of a person, acceptable to both unions, appointed to arbitrate on the matter. The executive also decided to make it known to both unions that the council had placed no ban on the handling of the steel at the berth.

REDCLIFF INDENTURE

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines indicate whether the Redcliff Indenture Bill contains a new clause? In this morning's *Advertiser* a report, under the heading "Ecology Clause for Redcliff", states:

The Redcliff Indenture Bill, with a new clause, is likely to go before a Parliamentary Select Committee.

The report continues:

The Minister of Development and Mines (Mr. Hopgood) told the Assembly this last night.

As I did not hear the Minister say any such thing, I believe it is in the public interest that the matter should be made clear.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I, too, saw (much earlier today) the report to which the honourable member refers and I was considerably bemused by it. I cannot imagine what is meant by a new clause because, as I pointed out last evening, there is still no final indenture in the sense that all the "i's" have been dotted and the "t's" crossed. The drafting of the agreement has taken many weeks. The point I made last evening was that I had been able to study very closely the indenture, including the environmental clause (which is a strong clause), and I believe that, when the contents of the indenture are made known to the House and to the South Australian public, people will see that there is no cause for concern whatever. The so-called "new clause" is no more a new clause than any of the other clauses in the indenture.

PETROL

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Premier, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry what is the present and likely future position regarding petrol and fuel oil supplies in South Australia. A refinery spokesman at Port Stanvac is reported as saying yesterday that fuel oil supplies ex Port Stanvac refinery could be exhausted within three days and that super grade petrol supplies, including Birkenhead supplies, could also be exhausted within a week. At the same time, one tanker is being loaded for Tasmania, whereas others are still under a ban. I understand that a section of the refinery work force is to hold a stopwork meeting later this week.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Deputy President Williams's report, which was handed to the parties yesterday, was

to be considered by the Full Bench of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in Melbourne this morning. No word has yet been received from Melbourne as to any decision that may have been reached. My information at this stage is that there is no extreme urgency regarding fuel supplies. I think that the *Mobil Australis* left yesterday afternoon for Tasmania with a load of crude oil for the Burnie pulp mill. That would enable the refinery to go back into production to fill the tank out of which that oil had come. Fuel is still being pumped through the pipe to Birkenhead. There may be problems with regard to certain elements used at the refinery in the production of certain fuel that has run short. Apparently, other ships are tied up and cannot be worked. It is hoped, however, that a favourable decision will be reached today in the Melbourne court. Failing that, there could be problems towards the middle of next week.

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General investigate the advertising and promotion methods used by Cox Foys and Harris Scarfe Limited in the sale of galvanized tool sheds manufactured by G. R. Fawkes Productions, Western Australia? An advertisement in the *News* of Thursday, August 5, states that the size of the mark 2 galvanized tool shed is 1.8 m by 1.8 m by 1.8 m at a cost of \$61. Upon erection, it is found that the measurement does not exceed 1.7 m by 1.7 m by 1.8 m. When people complain about the reduced size to resellers they are told that the measurements of the roof, which includes overlapping eaves, are 1.8 m by 1.8 m, and that therefore the shed conforms to the specifications of advertising. As this practice appears to be misleading and dishonest, will the Attorney-General take corrective action against the firms involved?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter examined.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to increase per capita grants to independent schools? A newspaper report published last week indicates the magnitude of some of the fee increases being implemented at independent schools for the third term this year. Increases of about \$50 being made by some schools represent a large percentage increase on the present fee. Some schools will charge over \$400 a term for day scholars, and a sum exceeding twice that amount for boarders. This situation does not apply only at one or two schools. The newspaper report states that Roman Catholic schools are also planning to increase fees next term, although the relevant figures are not given. Obviously, all independent schools are in considerable difficulty as a result of escalating costs and the effects of inflation. This situation is marked where education is really labour intensive, because teachers' salaries at independent schools must keep pace with salaries paid to teachers in State schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: During the 1973 election campaign, the Premier, on behalf of the Government, made clear that the policy of the Government towards independent schools would be to increase by 1976, on a student basis, the amount of assistance given, either by way of per capita grants or grants through the Cook committee or by way of books, to the level of 20 per cent of the cost of running a Government school. The decisions for this year, which are in line with that policy, were made some weeks ago. I think 17½ per cent of the cost of running a Government school will be the formula applied in 1975. The decisions have been taken and the actual amounts to be provided are set

out in the Budget that will be presented to Parliament next week. The per capita payments first introduced (\$10 primary and \$20 secondary) will be continued. The additional funds will be allocated through the Cook committee on the basis of the system accepted throughout the independent school system in recent years.

TUNA BOATS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Fisheries say whether he or his department has issued an instruction to the State Bank or any other lending institution concerning the provision of finance for the building of fishing craft? I have been approached by a fisherman who was making necessary arrangements for the building of a new fishing vessel. Verbal agreement had been reached on securing the necessary finance from the bank but, when it came to signing the contract, the bank changed its mind because, it was said, the Director of Fisheries had contacted the bank and advised it not to finance the building of tuna vessels.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which bank was it?

Mr. BLACKER: The State Bank. I raise this point to give the Minister of Fisheries the opportunity to explain the situation and, if necessary, to correct any misleading information that may have been given. Many fishermen have questioned these tactics as being a rather dubious means of management of the tuna industry.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know exactly what has occurred in this regard. Certainly, I have issued no instructions on the matter. If the honourable member will provide me with the details of the case to which he has referred, I shall have the matter investigated.

GAS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works investigate the supply of gas in South Australia and the possibility of a fall in supply? Many people in the Adelaide Hills who rely on gas supplies for heating and cooking are living in fear of their gas supplies being exhausted. They are worried because of the likely effects of the strike at Port Stanvac and of the transport workers' strike. Some families that have only a few days supply left are worried about getting more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and to let the honourable member know what is the situation as soon as possible. I know that a similar problem exists in the south-eastern part of the State where the gas comes from Victoria and the transport workers' strike in Victoria has delayed supplies for the South-East. I will ascertain what is the position in the honourable member's district and what is the situation generally, and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

CYCLING TRACKS

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the Cycle Tracks in Metropolitan Adelaide Report prepared by the Director-General of Transport? This report, published in March, makes certain recommendations for the establishment in Adelaide of experimental cycling tracks in inner metropolitan areas. Much interest has been expressed in the community about this and I have received representations from people wanting to know what progress has been made.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can only reply that I think the matter is currently in the hands of the various councils. It will be remembered that there were requirements about

such matters as road access and road closures. Some difficulties were encountered, but I will get a more complete report for the honourable member and let him have it.

COURT TRANSCRIPTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General say why a complete record of court proceedings is not made available when a party involved in a case makes a requisition for the record? I have been told that a charge of 30 cents a sheet of evidence is made for a record of proceedings in the Magistrates Court and a charge of 50 cents in respect of evidence in the Supreme Court. One of my constituents has complained that the report is only a partial one and, when a person wants to use the material on appeal, he finds that some matters cannot be referred to as having been recorded. It seems that the court does not make available to the party that requisitions it a full and complete record. Also, my constituent has pointed out that the court is now moving into the field of tape recording and that it employs a group known as Court Recording Services Proprietary Limited, of 327 King William Street, Adelaide. I take it that that is not a Government authority: it must be a private enterprise company that transcribes the evidence. When the evidence is made available to the parties concerned, a document provided with it states that the transcript belongs to the Crown and that, if it is reproduced, the person doing so will be prosecuted, or action will be taken. My constituent has made the point that the staff of the private enterprise company transcribing the material can take note of any evidence that has been given. I understand that recently this method of recording was used in a rape case in one of the courts. I ask the Attorney-General to give a report of the whole matter. Sometimes the material given is private and, on the one hand, it is recorded by a private enterprise venture that has persons employed, whereas on the other hand the Crown states that the transcript belongs to the Crown and that no reproduction of it can be made, otherwise action will be taken against the offender.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member has raised several matters and in some cases he has not given many particulars, so it is difficult for me to grasp precisely what is the point. Court reporting is carried on in several ways. In several courts, including the Magistrates Court, it is carried on in the conventional or traditional way for South Australian courts, namely, by a reporter using a typewriter to take down the evidence in narrative form. In other words, the reporter does not make a verbatim transcript of what is said but converts the question and answer into a sentence that reflects the substance of the evidence given, in a way similar to that in which any member here would take a note of what was said. In other words, in the court a question is asked, an answer given, and the evidence is put into narrative form. This is done because to take question and answer on a typewriter is extremely tedious, laborious, and so time consuming as to slow down proceedings very much. This is the way transcripts have been made in South Australia throughout my period in legal practice. Of course, it is not by any means the best method. It is far better to have a complete verbatim transcript, but that is an extremely expensive process. In the Magistrates Court, as proceedings often are short and the magistrate does not have to refer back to the evidence, because it is fresh in his memory, and as appeals in those courts are few, that still remains a satisfactory way to record evidence. In fact, it is the only way in which we can get transcripts taken, because we could not provide shorthand writers to record every case before every magistrate or justice of the peace in South Australia.

Another way of recording evidence is by the shorthand method, and this method is used widely, particularly in the Supreme Court and in the Local and District Criminal Court. Those courts use either the manual shorthand method or the shorthand machine operated by a reporter trained in use of the machine (and this method is widespread). However, because there is a dearth of experienced and qualified court reporters, it has been found necessary to consider other methods of recording court proceedings. The method referred to by the honourable member has been adopted in part and is in widespread use in other States, particularly New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. It is a tape recording system and, as is the case in those other States, it has been arranged by contract to a private organization skilled in making transcripts in this way.

No problem about confidentiality is involved here. The staff of those private organizations are as much bound regarding confidentiality as a public servant would be. Part of the terms of arrangement is that the matter be regarded as confidential, and it would be entirely wrong for any member of the staff to disclose outside any information obtained in that way. Of course, one must rely on the observance of confidentiality of that kind, and I have no reason to think that in South Australia there has ever been a breach. If the honourable member has any information to suggest that there may have been a breach, I should like to have it, because the matter would have to be followed up immediately. However, as far as I am aware there is no reason to think that the members of the staff of the organization concerned do not observe strictly their obligations as to confidentiality.

Regarding the other matter that the honourable member has raised about the unavailability of parts of the transcript, I do not know what the honourable member means.

Mr. Evans: I just meant it wasn't complete, and you've answered that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Because of the way the transcript is taken, that is inevitable. Where a verbatim transcript has been made, that would be provided on payment of the prescribed fee. However, where there is available only a report of evidence in narrative form, obviously that is all that can be provided.

CIGARETTE AND ALCOHOL ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to take action to control the advertising of cigarettes and alcoholic beverages in places of public entertainment? The matter of advertising cigarettes and tobacco products was raised in this House previously and an amendment in that regard was not proceeded with, for one reason or another. At that time operators of cinemas gave assurances that cigarette advertisements would not be shown to audiences that might be expected to comprise predominantly young people. Since then it has come to my attention that the number of advertisements for alcoholic liquor, shown in cinemas, has been increasing. In this regard I refer particularly to an advertisement for Bacardi and Coca-Cola, because it has come to my attention that this advertisement has been screened at day-time sessions that children have attended. For that reason I ask not that the advertising of these beverages be restricted or banned altogether but that at least consideration be given to controlling this advertising so that it is not exhibited to young people.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will certainly investigate this matter and confer with the Minister of Health about it. Great difficulties are involved in respect of this subject,

as the honourable member knows from the examination we all had to make of cigarette advertising when the honourable member's Bill was before the House. Naturally, there is a problem about restricting advertising in places of public entertainment, unless similar controls are imposed with regard to television and radio advertising, because they are viewed by people of all ages. I suppose it is somewhat futile to impose restrictions on cinema advertising, when in the child's home he sees similar advertisements on the television screen.

Frankly, I do not know how this problem can be tackled, but I sympathize with the honourable member's point. I think it most undesirable that children should be subjected to advertising that must have the effect, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, of acting as a persuader to the consumption of cigarettes and alcohol, particularly where the type of drink advertised is that to which the honourable member has referred and which obviously is directed towards the teenage market (one does not see many middle-age people drinking Bacardi and coke). This important matter must be taken seriously. Although I do not at present know what can be done about it, I will discuss it with the Minister of Health.

STERILIZATION FACILITY

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Development and Mines inquire into the feasibility of establishing a cobalt-60 sterilization facility when considering industrial development at the new city of Monarto? The sterilization effect of irradiation from the radio-active isotope cobalt-60 has been used for killing bacteria on materials such as fibres for carpets. I believe that the only place which does that now is located in Melbourne. However, the process has also proved valuable for sterilizing medical items and pharmaceuticals. Disposable items, such as syringes, needles, sutures and catheters are used in large numbers by the medical profession, and there are South Australian manufacturers of such products. I am given to understand that this offers advantages over the alternative ethylene-oxide method used (almost no residual toxicity and greater penetrating power).

SPF animals, free from pathogenic micro-organisms, have been used in increasing numbers by research laboratories throughout Australia. In order to prevent infection of these valuable animals from harmful bacteria in the feed (bacteria such as salmonella), it is desirable to produce disease-free feed. The most effective way to do this appears to be to use irradiation, and irradiation of animal feed has been used in the United Kingdom since 1962. The process may also be useful for certain human foods. The facility would add significantly to the technological expertise available in South Australia. However, the high cost of establishing this industry and the diversity of material that could be treated suggest that it might best be sponsored by the Government.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall be only too happy to investigate this proposition. From memory, I believe that the Development Division investigated a somewhat more restricted proposition along similar lines last year. However, I am aware of the effect of the spin-off on the agricultural sector, which was not investigated at the time, and this aspect would be worth looking into. We would have to look carefully at the capital cost of such a facility. On the other hand, however, it would fit in well with our general strategy for Monarto which provides first, that science-based industries be established at Monarto in association with the science centre to be

established, and secondly, that the Agriculture Department shall be located there. The department would be interested in having this piece of technology available to it.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he has made representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron) to ensure that South Australia receives its fair share of public works programmes in the areas hardest hit by unemployment? If he has made representations, what did the Commonwealth Minister suggest? A report in today's *News* refers to the Commonwealth Minister's proposing to make funds available for public works in those areas hardest hit by unemployment, which is increasing at an alarming rate. I hope that the South Australian Minister has already set guidelines and priorities to submit to his Commonwealth colleague, in order to obtain a share of these funds for this State.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Minister of Works, the Minister in charge of housing, and I have discussed with the Commonwealth Minister and the Prime Minister the labour situation in South Australia. No doubt the matters raised by the honourable member will be seriously dealt with in the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is true that correspondence courses for people who wish to qualify in the fields of public health, meat inspection, etc., through the Further Education Department, are likely to be phased out? It has come to my notice that people in the South-East generally are taking these courses to equip themselves with the necessary qualifications to advance in their jobs. I know that in many cases the qualification has been a distinct advantage to people, but the phasing out of these courses would inflict hardship on country people if the report I have received is true.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No report on this matter has been brought to my attention and no recommendation has been made. However, I will check this matter out for the honourable member as soon as possible.

TEXTBOOK

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Education investigate the contents of a poetry book currently being used by Matriculation English students with a view to banning its use in State schools? The book, entitled *Children of the Albion*, contains poems of the underground in Britain. The volume was listed and recommended by the Public Examinations Board last year for use by Matriculation English students. Following the purchase and use of the book by the Kingscote Area School, grave embarrassment has been caused to at least one girl student in the class and considerable concern has accordingly been expressed by many of the parents of other children at the school. I have received correspondence that confirms this concern and, if I may cite for the Minister's information the poems that have offended these children and the parents, they are on pages 51 and 54 of the 350-page volume.

Last Monday the Minister invited me to write to him on this matter. At that time, I did not have sufficient of the facts, nor was I willing to write my own personal views on the matter surrounding this incident. It is unreasonable to direct criticism to the school staff. As the contents of the book have proved to be offensive, it is considered that children should be protected from having

such material thrust on them, the same as adults are protected from having similar material thrust on them in the street.

I will not go into the detail of this incident, but it is serious. As a result of the book's proving to be offensive, I suggest that this matter be investigated, more particularly because it was not altogether the school's decision that the book be bought. It is appreciated that the staff has certain responsibilities to choose material, but the book was listed at the top of the recommendations for contemporary verse issued by the Public Examinations Board in 1973. I invite the comments and co-operation of the Minister in this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True, the honourable member telephoned me on Monday afternoon and I asked him to write me a letter so that I would have the details. At the time I could not copy the details he was giving me on the telephone, including the poem the honourable member was reading to me. Although I have asked for an investigation into the matter, I have not yet received a report. When I receive the report, I will tell the honourable member what action, if any, it is intended to take.

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say why the Government has not started work on the environmental assessment in Spencer Gulf, and why no funds were allocated in the recent Loan Estimates for capital works involved? I found the Ministerial statement today alarming because of the replies of the Minister to my questions last week in which he denied knowing of the existence of any report or recommendations from this committee. I understand that the report, recommendations, or statements (whatever the Minister likes to call it, it is the same) recommended that work should commence in January 1974, and that this recommendation was made in October or November last year. Obviously, however, from the Ministerial statement no work has yet been done. Also, I understand that the report recommended that the study should be undertaken over at least four years, so that sufficient data could be collected before work started at the plant or before major alterations were undertaken in the construction of the plant. The Government hoped to complete the plant and have it producing by 1978, if it proceeded, and obviously there would not be sufficient time for a four-year study. I understand that the report recommends capital expenditure of \$143 000 for the research involved, yet at this stage the Government has allocated no funds for that expenditure.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Once again, I think the honourable member shows his lack of knowledge of the duties of this committee. The honourable member will probably realize that, when the survey document was provided for the Minister of Works, the committee was reporting primarily on areas in which land discharge was polluting Spencer Gulf. It seemed at that time that the major recommendations that the committee would be advising on concerned a programme for the necessary action to reduce or prevent pollutants from the land from reaching the gulf. However, the subcommittee, after being formed (and this occurred when the Redcliff proposal was being considered), decided, quite rightly, that it should also turn its attention as one of the first priorities to aspects associated with the Redcliff proposals. However, the committee's total study recommendations to the Government on the gulf are not simply to determine the effects of the Redcliff operation on the gulf: they are also concerned with the future development of any industry in South Australia that may have an impact on the gulf.

I think the honourable member should realize that the committee's suggestion that the uranium enrichment plant in this State was likely to have a critical effect on the gulf was another reason to recommend that there should be a total study of the gulf. Although the committee was aware of studies being undertaken by the Fisheries Department and the Environment and Conservation Department directly in association with the Redcliff project, the proposal to which we are referring was not to undertake a study for the provision of any environmental knowledge that we needed on the Redcliff proposal. Accordingly, the problem that the honourable member passes over so easily in respect of implementing an environmental study at the beginning of this year is broadly the same argument as I would have with the subcommittee's recommendations, because one needs much effort to plan a programme either for one, two, three, four, or six years to set up the work necessary for a study of this kind.

In addition, it would be expected (and I am sure the honourable member would agree) that the sort of work being proposed on this study would be of considerable importance to the Australian Government, and discussions are being held to ascertain whether that Government will become involved financially in the work that should be undertaken here. If it became involved, our progress would be much more rapid. I assure the honourable member that finance would be provided, once we had worked out the appropriate scheme to implement it, for a study that would operate for two years or for six years, depending on what would be most satisfactory. The first aspect to be considered would be the purchase of the equipment required to undertake these studies. These things cannot be accomplished overnight: the Government is working on them and has allotted top priority to this matter.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister give an assurance that work will not commence on the Redcliff petro-chemical plant until after the initial environmental studies have been completed? The Minister would be aware that, after major construction work had taken place on the petro-chemical plant, any studies undertaken would be greatly hampered and the results of any investigation reported to the House would be affected.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I suggest that the honourable member confer with the Leader of the Liberal Party in the Upper House, as he has asked questions of this type, receiving from me a long list outlining the studies that have been completed and those that are about to be undertaken. These projects are directly related to the environmental aspects of establishing this industry at Red Cliff. I suggest that, if the honourable member is prompted again by the member for Davenport into asking a question on this matter, he do not make the same mistake the member for Davenport has made in the last two weeks by considering that the co-ordinating committee formed to look at the reconnaissance survey of the Engineering and Water Supply Department is undertaking a study related solely to the Redcliff project. That project is simply one of the matters for which that group is responsible. The Environment and Conservation Department is co-ordinating all aspects of the Redcliff project on the basis that the information will be required in working out the conditions to be included in the indenture.

HOUSING ADVISORY SERVICE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines consider establishing in South Australia an advisory service on housing finance? The Minister will be aware

that I raised this matter in the Address in Reply debate on July 31, as well as by a letter to him dated June 18. The need for such a service was fully outlined at that time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: For some time I have considered the possibility of this Government's implementing an advisory service not only in relation to finance for housing but also covering other matters associated with housing on which people require advice. Often people have difficulty in obtaining, from persons they can trust, proper advice that is soundly based in relation to many matters associated with house buying: for example, a simple evaluation of a house plan in which they need someone they can trust rather than the builder who has a vested interest in being able to obtain the contract to build the house.

For some time we have been compiling much information on these services available to the public in other parts of the world, particularly in the United Kingdom. In the process of compiling this information I have discussed the matter with the Australian Minister for Housing, who has indicated that he, too, is interested in implementing such a scheme. We have agreed jointly to place this matter on the agenda for the conference of Commonwealth and State Housing Ministers next month. If it were possible to obtain a commitment from the Australian Government, the State Government would not need to be involved other than in a supporting role. I thank the honourable member for this question about a scheme that is to be commended and, one way or another, I should like to see it introduced.

TORRENS RIVER FOUNTAIN

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Deputy Premier have a study made of the possibility of installing a record and flowers fountain in the Torrens River immediately in front of the festival theatre? While in Hamburg, West Germany, I recently saw one of the most beautiful fountains I have ever seen. The fountain, sited in a lake, consisted of many water jets coloured by changing lights, and the volume of water in the jets varied according to the type of music played. When soft music, such as that of a waltz, was played the water jets were subdued, but, when the music was speeded up, such as in a march, the jets became extremely active and the lights changed continuously. A translation of the German name for the fountain is "Record and Flowers Fountain" or "Water Light Play". Thousands of tourists pay an entrance fee each night to see this spectacle which runs for an hour. If such a fountain could be installed on the Torrens River in front of the festival theatre it would certainly prove to be an asset to that complex.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am interested in the idea, and I believe the Premier would be interested, too. However, I think the Adelaide City Council would have a vital interest in the matter because, as the honourable member knows, that part of the river is controlled by the City Council. Although I am not sure whether the City Council would be in a financial position at present to implement the honourable members suggestion, I will examine the matter to see whether or not we should make a submission to the City Council in regard to the suggestion, because I am sure that such a fountain would be an unusual, albeit attractive, feature.

SOMERTON BUS SERVICE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of extending farther south the Municipal Tramways Trust bus service that now operates

from the city to Somerton Park? The service now finishes in Whyte Street, Somerton. In 1970, I asked the Minister to extend the service but at that stage he said he could not do so because an independent bus service was operating in the area. I suggest that, as an extended service is still needed, the Government has the opportunity to extend the service now that it controls all road transport in that area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will ask my officers to investigate the honourable member's suggestion.

PORT PIRIE HARBOR

Mr. VENNING: In the light of the perilous situation facing the Redcliff petro-chemical project, will the Minister of Marine indicate the possibility of upgrading and deepening Port Pirie harbor? Some months ago, when the Public Works Committee was asked to investigate the possibility of upgrading and deepening the harbor, it recommended that the harbor deepening be not proceeded with. I believe the recommendation may have been linked with the possibility of work being done on the Redcliff petro-chemical project.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Redcliff project has never had any bearing on the deepening of the channel of the Port Pirie harbor. If the honourable member cares to read the committee's report he will see that the committee's decision was made purely on the economics of the matter. I need not go into the details of that report because it is available to the honourable member. Since the committee made its recommendation nothing has happened to change the situation. If the petro-chemical complex is established at Red Cliff Point it will be serviced by an entirely different port: Port Pirie has never been considered as an outlet for Red Cliff Point.

Dr. Eastick: You said "if".

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the petro-chemical complex is established it will not be serviced from Port Pirie. I suggest to the honourable member, if he wishes to refresh his memory, that he look at the report of the Public Works Committee to ascertain why the committee made the recommendation it did.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE PASSES

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Speaker, will you tell members what method has been adopted in issuing passes to members of the press wishing to enter Parliament House, and whether the present system will be extended to all members of the media? I understand that, because of the stringent security precautions at present operating in Parliament House, members of the press are issued with special press passes. I understand, too, that on several occasions some members of the media, including television news and current affairs crews, have experienced difficulty in obtaining access to members in Parliament House. In addition, I understand that some passes have been issued to members of all forms of the media so, in view of the many news teams that have to be maintained by television stations, I wonder whether consideration could be given to extending the method of issuing passes to cover all members of the media in order to avoid any embarrassment to them in trying to obtain access to members in this House.

The SPEAKER: At present it is not intended to extend the authorization of press passes to members of the press other than to those who have been issued with passes. I think the latter part of the honourable member's question answers itself, because the honourable member said that television personnel are experiencing difficulty in getting to members' quarters and to members themselves. One

of the reasons security was instituted in these premises was so that we could control our own building and the activities of members within it. A press pass is issued on the basis that a press member was domiciled within this building during the sittings of the House on three days of each week for six or seven months of the year. As these people, because of their profession, have to be here during the sittings of the House it was not possible to escort them to their place of work. Television people, in the main, come to Parliament House only on special occasions when there is something happening of a sensational nature. Television crews are controlled and do not have complete access to the building. It is not intended to extend the issue of press passes to give them the right to move around in this place whenever and wherever they want to go. As many honourable members have said that they believe there is too much trespassing in this building, the press pass has been introduced as one way of controlling that trespassing.

At 3.13 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the present system of estimating and charging water and sewerage rates is inequitable in that it is based on property values, and that the Government immediately should adopt a more equitable system of assessment.

Recently, the people of Burnside have appreciated how unfair, unjust and inequitable the present system of water and sewerage charging is. Within the last two months, these unfortunate people have had their water and sewerage accounts increased by about 50 per cent to 100 per cent, although in many individual cases the increase has been far greater than that. There are specific cases of increases up to 670 per cent. I am sure that the Minister of Works understands only too well the increases that have taken place. I understand that, on the Engineering and Water Supply Department's own assessment, the average increase has been about 70 per cent. Before discussing the system in detail, I wish to give some background information about how rates are currently estimated. Water and sewerage charges are based on the annual value, which is one-twentieth or 5 per cent of the improved value of the property. The water rate is $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the annual value, with the sewerage rate being $6\frac{3}{4}$ per cent of the annual value.

The main question is why the present system is unsuitable and inequitable. The principal reason is that the present system charges water and sewerage rates according to property values. Increases in property values need not necessarily bear any relationship whatever to increases in the cost of supplying water and sewerage services; in fact, the figures suggest that there is no relationship whatever. I hope the Minister of Works will listen to what I have to say. Unfortunately, he was overseas when this issue first arose. Since his return, other than making a rather bland Ministerial statement, he has completely ignored the matter, and it appears that today he is trying once again to ignore it. I have taken out figures, for the period between 1959-60 and 1974-75, of the increases in wages, the consumer price index, property values, and water and sewerage accounts. I have been able to take State averages for the first two cases, but I have had to base the other two cases on one or two specific instances, as I do not have access to all the departmental files.

In selecting my case I have taken a house concerning which no alteration has been made and in which the number of people living has remained constant, so there has been no alteration and therefore no reason for adjusting the actual system of assessment. The increase in wages during this period of 14 years has been 177 per cent, and the increase in the consumer price index has been 96 per cent—fairly large increases but small when compared to the increases in property values and water and sewerage rates. For this property, the increase in property values has been 385 per cent during the period, and for water and sewerage rates it has been 402 per cent. Clearly, the increase in water and sewerage rates has been about four times greater than the increase in the consumer price index. For this main reason, the whole system is unjust, especially in a period of inflation. Apparently the Minister is now starting to listen.

The second reason why the system is unjust is that the current assessments on which the people of Burnside are being rated are based on valuations made at the peak of a land and house price boom. We all appreciate that a boom has taken place in the last 18 months, although house and land values have begun to fall in the last six months as a result of the liquidity policies of the Commonwealth Government. Again, that is a good reason why the present system of assessing water and sewerage rates should be altered. The third reason is that the increases have been sudden and dramatic, placing an unfair burden on all families in the Burnside area, particularly on pensioners and people on fixed incomes. In the case of a widow with four children, the water and sewerage rates for her property were increased from \$38.11 a quarter to \$102.24. Yet the Minister and the Government are willing to support an unfair and unjust system that places such a burden on pensioners and people on fixed incomes in a period of sudden inflation. If the Minister had any feeling whatever for these people, he would most certainly alter the present system of assessment.

The fourth reason why the present system should be altered and why it particularly discriminates against people in the Burnside area is that people in this area pay far more for a unit of water used than people pay in any other area of Adelaide. I have taken as examples comparable houses in Burnside and other council areas with the same number of people living in them and the same approximate water usage, and it would appear that the people in Burnside pay 50 per cent to 100 per cent more for a unit of water used than is paid by people in the other suburbs. That is another excellent reason for the Government to alter immediately the present system of assessment.

Possibly the most important reason in relation to our own State is that South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent on earth and yet the present system of assessment supports a quota system. In a quota system each household is allocated a certain volume of water which it may use without paying excess. This encourages people to use the entire quota of water and that, if the quota is exceedingly large, will encourage people to waste water. To show how ridiculous the present system of water rating is, I quote the example of six home units built on a block on which there was originally one property. The water quota for each unit is now greater than was the water quota for the original property even though six units have been built in place of the one property.

Whereas the old property had a large extensive garden, the home units have very small gardens and, whereas the old property had a large family living in it, the new home units are each occupied by only one or two people. This shows how unjust the present system is. The fact that they are prepared to charge six home units the same amount for each unit that the old property was charged shows how unjust the present system is. Two weeks ago the member for Bragg asked the Minister what was the total storage capacity of the Adelaide water supply and what was the total estimate for the quotas of the Adelaide metropolitan area. The answer supplied by the Minister of Works was:

The total storage capacity of the Adelaide reservoirs is 158 000 megalitres: the total quotas of the Adelaide metropolitan area is 243 890 Ml.

That indicates clearly that the State could not possibly supply the total water quota for this State. It could make up part of the difference from the Murray River but in effect the State Government is selling a product to the people of South Australia that it does not really have: it is charging people for water quotas that it cannot meet if everyone uses his quota. This is another reason why the system should be altered as quickly as possible.

The quotas now allocated to the people in Burnside are quite unrealistic. At a public meeting attended by about 2 000 people recently, one gentleman pointed out that if he used the total quota on his block of land the water would be 4 metres deep by the time he had used that quota. I think that shows how ridiculous the quota system is. The Government is simply trying to use water and sewerage rates as a means of raising funds for the State, rather than using a just system of charging people for the service actually provided. I am surprised the Minister should look up in horror. He knows—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are not raising money. We cannot pay for what we provide. You know we are making a substantial loss on the operation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister knows full well that in the metropolitan area a substantial profit is made. One gentleman has supplied me with carefully documented figures indicating that his present quota is 1.3 Ml and over the last five years he has used about .6 Ml a year. He is therefore being charged for more than twice the amount of water that he can use. The case of this gentleman, who has a large garden and a lawn tennis court, is yet another reason for the present system being altered as quickly as possible. Perhaps the most outstanding thing is that the South Australian Government has been willing to charge people an increase of 70 per cent to 100 per cent when at the same time it is calling on private industry, other bodies and trade unions to observe price and wage restraints. That is the most blatant example of double standards that one could ever see.

The Premier has pleaded in this Chamber that doctors should not adopt their 30 per cent increase in fees, and he has come out and condemned trade unions for excessive wage demands. The Government has introduced legislation to ensure that the increase in land values cannot be more than 9½ per cent a year, and yet it can send out accounts for an increase of 70 per cent to 100 per cent in one year. It is an extreme case of double standards, and the Government knows it. I will cite one or two cases to point out the extreme hardship caused by the present ludicrous system. One gentleman living in Burnside has been paying \$28 a quarter and his new water and sewerage rate is \$128 a quarter. That is a savage

and almost unbelievable increase, especially when we see how ludicrous the system is. This gentleman, who is paying \$128 a quarter, has no water supply to his house; he uses rainwater tanks. Furthermore, he has no sewerage connected to his house, he has a septic tank system, and yet he is charged \$128 a quarter by the State Government. Of course the Minister knows it is simply a means of raising for this State revenue for extravagant programmes like Monarto—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We have told you already the operation loses money.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister well knows that in the metropolitan area it makes an excessive profit. A lady telephoned me this morning saying that she had a house and tennis court on a large block of land; her old water rate for the entire area used to be \$43 a quarter. She sold the house, kept the tennis court and built a house on it. Now living on just the tennis court area with a little extra land, she is paying \$57 a quarter compared to her original quarterly rate of \$43 for a house and a tennis court. Yet the Minister claims it is a fair and just system.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't say that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Of course you did! I will soon be quoting from the Ministerial statement in which the Minister said that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are being entirely irresponsible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, told the people of Burnside not to worry about the increase because they would not get another increase for five years, just as they had not had an increase during the previous five years. One gentleman has told me that in 1968-69 his water and sewerage rates were \$133. In subsequent years he has paid \$118, \$184, \$201, \$201, and \$276. His rate has therefore been changed three times within six years, and yet both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Works said the people should not worry because it was a quinquennial system of assessment and another increase would not take place for five years. That is baloney, and the Government is trying to prop up an unjust system which does nothing more than impose a wealth tax on the people of Burnside. About 2 000 people attended the recent public meeting held in the Burnside Town Hall. All of those people (and I saw many Labor supporters there) unanimously passed a motion that states:

This public meeting of residents of the city of Burnside strongly condemns the recent exorbitant increases in water and sewerage rates and the basis upon which these have been calculated and requests the Minister of Works immediately to rescind the current notices and issue new accounts calculated on a more equitable basis.

The people of Burnside unanimously reject the present system of assessment. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of July 16 states:

Burnside, in particular, has a high proportion of elderly and retired householders and age pensioners who simply haven't the means to cope with sudden rises in rates and taxes which in some cases will total well over \$200 a year . . . Unless the State Government is prepared or able to step in and mitigate the effect of the increases in some way, many elderly people may literally be forced to sell their homes, perhaps on a falling market . . . In Australia, the property services tax weapon is a two-forked instrument wielded at one level by the State Government and at another by local councils. But, as in Britain, it seems clear that the constant pressure for more and better public services has imposed costs which have risen much faster than the natural yield of the rating system. Some sort of subsidy, perhaps from the

Commonwealth, seems necessary. Certainly, a close and urgent Government investigation of what is happening would seem necessary.

Of course, that is exactly what we have at present in this State. The editorial concludes by stating:

It is surely not social justice to impose punitive tax increases on people of modest means with homes whose increase in capital value is an irrelevant book entry if they wish merely to live out the remainder of their lives in them.

Yet another opinion is given in an editorial in the *News*. It states:

The unhappy fact of life, in Burnside or anywhere else, is that costs are rising—costs in every sector of living. But ratepayers protest that they are slugged too much for water, and want a different system used. They are told they would be worse off if the system were based on usage. But there is one way to ease the burden. There is a powerful argument for the inevitable increases to be spread more evenly through the years, instead of hitting ratepayers in one gigantic slug.

Even Max Harris, of the *Sunday Mail*, that man of great justice and the people's judge, has condemned the present system of assessing water and sewerage rates. The increases have not come only through property values, and this is the other area in which the Government has been quite two-faced. It has claimed that the entire increase has been due to property values, but the Government has pulled one of the biggest swifties that one could ever imagine.

In converting from the imperial system to the metric system, the original charge of 40c for each 1 000 gall. of water was changed to a charge of 40c for 4 kilolitres, but 4 kl is the equivalent of only about 880gall., so the Government has gained 12 per cent in the conversion to metric units, yet it claims to be honest and a Government of the people. Of course, it is not. On top of that, on July 1 the Government imposed a further 10 per cent increase in the price of water, increasing the price from 40c for 4 kl to 44c for 4 kl, so the Government has imposed there a combined increase of about 20 per cent.

I shall refer now to statements made by the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, and by the Minister of Works. The Minister of Education, when this issue first blew up about four or five weeks ago, promised that a departmental inquiry would be held immediately, that its report would be forwarded to the Minister, and that the Minister would report to the House within three weeks. However, the only report that has come forward since then has been a rather glib Ministerial statement by the Minister of Works, and I will come to that soon.

The report of the inquiry promised by the Minister of Education and designed to take the heat off the entire situation has not come forward. One may ask what new system should be adopted, but it is not my task to submit a fair and equitable system: that is a role for the Government, with its technicians. I do not have the resources, and I have not the finance to travel overseas, nor have I the facts and figures regarding all the data available. Many inquiries have been held, and much more equitable systems are used overseas. I suggest that the Government should examine those and implement a fair and just system here.

The Minister of Education also made another interesting statement. He stated that, if the people of Burnside failed to pay their total rates immediately, he would restrict their water supply within seven or eight weeks. The facts suggest that the Minister has decided to discriminate against the

people of Burnside. I have exact details of a case in which a man did not pay any water rates, because he objected to the system, and his water supply was not restricted until eight months had passed. I understand that normally it is the general policy to wait for 12 months, yet because the people of Burnside have expressed their opposition and have taken a stand on this issue, as they will on other issues, the Minister has decided to intimidate them to try to force them to pay their entire water and sewerage rates. I am afraid, Mr. Minister, that they will not be intimidated. The Minister has made a rather bland Ministerial statement. He said that he had not stated that the present system was fair and just. I shall quote from the third paragraph of that Ministerial statement. The Minister is referring to the present system of assessment and states:

Even at this time it is probably the most equitable method in the long term.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read it all. Don't take that part out.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have not time to read it all.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of course you haven't, because it doesn't suit your argument.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will read the whole paragraph, if the Minister would like me to do that. It states:

This is not a unique system of charging for water supply and sewerage services: it has been used in many places here and overseas and has been a tried, proven and satisfactory method over past years. Even at this time it is probably the most equitable method in the long term. However, Australia, together with most other countries, is experiencing an exceptional inflationary situation and this is the fundamental cause of the rating problem we now face.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Right! There is a problem, and I have stated what the problem is.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has referred to inflation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: However, I am making the point that the cause is not only inflation at present. I have taken out figures for 14 years and they show that the increases in that time have been quite unfair. The matter is not related only to the present time: on the long-term basis the system has been quite unfair and unjust. Of course, the Minister devoted almost two pages of that Ministerial statement to a personal attack on me and he implied that I had said certain things. He implied that I had recommended a certain system of assessment. Of course, I had not, but he would not appreciate that, because he was overseas at the time.

The Minister also implied that, if my system of assessment was adopted, everyone would pay 26 per cent more for water. What a ridiculous statement to make, and the Minister knows it. Whatever system was used would depend entirely on the method of charging. Finally, I come to the attempts the committee (elected at the public meeting) made to see the Premier. A committee delegate (Mr. Andrew Warwick) wrote to the Premier and asked him for an interview. His letter was detailed, and he gave the Premier reasons why the committee wished to see him. A week later the committee received a letter of acknowledgment. Last Wednesday afternoon I went to see the Premier's staff. A staff member consulted with the Premier, came to me, and said "The Premier will see the committee. His secretary will telephone you in the morning with the exact time." No telephone call came on Thursday.

On Friday morning I telephoned the Premier's Department and again asked for the time and place of the meeting. I was again promised by the Premier's own

staff that I would be notified of the time and place of the meeting, but no communication has been received. Despite the Premier's glib promises that he would see the committee and listen to its case, he has constantly refused to come forward with a suitable time, or any time at all. The present system of assessment is quite unjust. It is time the Government appreciated that people no longer accept it, that it removed the hardship experienced by pensioners and people on fixed incomes, and began trying to conserve the State's water resources. The people will not give up the fight for a new system. Perhaps I should conclude with a quote from Lord Montgomery:

Here we will stand and fight. There will be no further retreat. I have ordered that all plans for retreat shall be burnt.

I hope the Minister fully appreciates that the people will stand and fight on this issue: they will fight for justice and for the right to stay in their homes instead of being taxed out of them by the Government. For these reasons, I have moved my motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): It is with pleasure that I second the motion and support the remarks made by the member for Davenport. Initially, I pay tribute to his tenacity in following through this most important subject on his constituents' behalf. From the time the first notices of water rating were issued to people in Burnside, the member for Davenport took every opportunity available to him to raise this subject in the House. I remind members of the questions he has asked and of that part of his Address in Reply speech, made on August 7, that dealt with the situation clearly and succinctly. I have tried to support him in his activities, because I believe that the present system of water rating as applied to the metropolitan area is unfair. It is unfair that it should be based on property valuations, and it is unfair that, because of this, the effects of high inflation of property values should be felt by the consumer. The recent increases have been threefold, as the member for Davenport has pointed out. The metric conversion activities of the Government (which said that it would not countenance at any time any profit on metrication) in respect of water have been phenomenal.

The member for Davenport pointed out clearly that we have seen a change from 40c a 1 000 gall. to 40c for each 880gall. We have also seen the second increase of 10 per cent; in other words, a 1c increase from 10c to 11c. The combined increase amounts to over a 19 per cent increase in water charges. What is most important is the impact of the valuation increases ranging from 100 per cent to 350 per cent; this is the severe hardship. This is the increase which has had the most impact on the average citizen not only in Burnside but throughout the metropolitan area, because people generally in the metropolitan area will be affected just as surely as the citizens of Burnside have been affected in the first instance.

Everyone in the State has become accustomed, as a matter of course (not that they accept it as a good thing), to inflationary increases in this country, involving about 20 per cent, but this increase of over 300 per cent, in many cases, is far in excess of what even they have become accustomed to. This is hitting at people on fixed incomes and pensioners. All right, as the Minister has said, pensioners receive a concession, but their total concessional rate of \$80 a year will not go anywhere near meeting their water charges. At least they are better off than people on fixed incomes who receive no concession. Their position is even worse, and it is aggravated further by the fact that the total allowable limit for the purposes

of an income tax deduction is \$300; the deduction must encompass water rates, land tax, council rates, and these, in themselves, are taxes.

The average sum being paid by residents, particularly under the new form of valuation, is well over \$300 a year. This means, in effect, that they are paying a double tax: they are taxed to provide certain services, and they have to pay income tax on the balance, which is not deductible. That standard of double taxation should not be countenanced at any stage. It has been said that, because valuations have increased, the total quantity of water that may be used has also increased. This leads to the ridiculous situation where people have calculated that, to use their total water entitlement, they would have 4 metres of water all over their front lawn and to the situation where the allowable quota for one unit in a block of six units is now the same as the total quota previously allowed for the whole area of the block. This quota could not be used in any case by all those people. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. JENNINGS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a very simple Bill which, if carried, will repeal section 7 of the principal Act. Section 7, as members can see, is that section which allows the hunting or coursing of hares to continue despite the other strictures of the Act. Many of us believe that nothing exists today to justify the continuation of a so-called sport that inflicts unnecessary pain or suffering on any animal merely for the gratification of society and, in this case, a very small minority of our society. However, I make quite clear that amongst those people who support this practice are many who are not by nature cruel or barbarous, but who perhaps have followed this so-called sport for many years or have even inherited an interest in it from their fathers. These are people who are, I believe, not truly aware of the pain they inflict on an innocent animal and are willing to cultivate something that they have just grown used to.

I believe that in time they will realize that legislation of this kind enriches our society as it ennobles it. Whenever legislation of this kind is discussed, it is amazing how many completely extraneous things are brought into the argument. I think of trapping rabbits and, from that, myxomatosis. Surely those people who say that we cannot pass this legislation because it would be inconsistent with what is permitted in other spheres are the people who are inconsistent themselves, inasmuch as they do not differentiate between vermin control and blood sport.

Certainly the world is cruel—nature is cruel—but we should always be able to make a distinction between what is necessary for our survival and what is merely pandering to our lower instincts for some purely ephemeral self-gratification. Our society improves as we the constituent members of it improve. What hope have we of stopping wars and hunger and greed if the animals that share this domain with us are used merely as our playthings, and regarded as bereft of feelings of their own and not worthy of our consideration in any way at all?

I quote from a report to the Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals from its staff inspector, following a coursing meeting at Murray Bridge held on June 22 last. The report states:

I used my own private conveyance and wore plain clothes. On arrival at about 10.45 a.m. I gained admittance to the grounds upon the payment of \$1. After parking my vehicle, I obtained a printed programme of events from Mr. Colin Viney, an official of the National Coursing Association, and at about 11 a.m. the first course was run. During the course of the day, I observed the running of each elimination heat of the two events listed on the programme, namely, the S.A. Oaks and No Flag Stake with the aid of binoculars. Each elimination heat was contested by two greyhounds chasing a live hare released into the coursing area. Points were awarded to the dog leading in the run to the hare and for turning it, etc., until the hare escaped under the fence at the end of the coursing arena or was killed by the dogs.

During the running of the S.A. Oaks, the dogs caught the hare in the fourth heat, the second round, and the final. During the running of the No Flag Stakes the hare was caught in the first heat, first round, second round, and final, making a total of seven catches for the day from a total of 36 heats. I observed the running of the heats from the mound near the bookmakers' stand, and each time the hare was caught during the elimination heats it seemed to have been killed within a matter of a few seconds after it had been caught. The dead hares had been carried from the coursing area and placed on the ground near a gate leading from the arena.

A few minutes before the running of the final heat of the S.A. Oaks, I decided to walk across to the gateway leading from the coursing area, through which the dogs were brought back and near where the dead hares had been placed, in order to examine the bodies of the hares. I was about a metre from the gateway when the final heat of the S.A. Oaks was run. The dogs quickly caught the hare during the final heat. I could hear the hare squealing as both dogs held it. The handlers of the dogs ran out on to the area and caught the dogs, and retrieved the hare from the dogs. One of the handlers carried the hare from the arena and placed it on the ground outside the gate, at the same time informing me that it was still alive.

The injured animal was breathing, and it was obviously conscious, although immobile. I drew my pistol and destroyed it immediately. I then made an inspection of the near vicinity, and found the bodies of four hares, making a total of five, including the one I had destroyed. The bodies of the dead hares did not seem to be severely mutilated. Whilst I was examining the dead bodies, I was approached by a spectator who told me that he had seen a hare, which had earlier been caught by the dogs, apparently recover sufficiently to get up and run off into open country. It would be impossible to assess this animal's injuries or chance of survival. As the meeting was then concluded I walked straight back to my car and left.

I had, at the start of the meeting, been approached by Mr. P. Alsop, President of the National Coursing Association, who welcomed me to the meeting, and treated me with the utmost courtesy. During the course of my conversation with him he naturally supported the sport of live hare coursing, asserting that the hares had a reasonably good chance of escaping the dogs, and, if by chance they were caught, were usually killed very quickly with a minimum of suffering. Because of the lack of evidence to the contrary, I had previously been inclined to agree with him, but, after witnessing at reasonably close quarters the last heat of the meeting at Murray Bridge, it would seem that not every hare is killed instantly by the dogs and that, on occasions, unnecessary pain and suffering is inflicted on the unfortunate quarry.

That leads me to a conversation I had some time ago with the gentleman associated with coursing in this State whom I know best and for whom I have a high personal regard. He told me that the hares really enjoyed the chase; that if they got ahead it was nothing for them to stop and wait for the hounds to catch up a bit, and that it was really a fun-and-games arrangement between the hare and the hounds. I must say that this was too much for me to accept, and our conversation terminated on that note.

However, I see the same argument was put to a reporter of the *National Times* of June 17 who begins his article, as follows:

Hares are funny creatures. They actually enjoy being chased through a paddock by two trained greyhounds intent on killing them. At least that is the claim of the men who organize the sport of live hare coursing, which flourishes legally in South Australia. They say that sometimes, when the hare looks like escaping it will slow down to give the dogs a sporting chance of catching it.

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day (Other Business) to be postponed until Notices of Motion (Other Business) are disposed of.

Motion carried.

Mr. JENNINGS: I greatly appreciate the action of the Attorney-General. I had hoped to rush this through, but could not quite make it. The article continues:

What is more, coursing fans say the sport actually helps preserve the hare species.

When they are not being killed by dogs the hares are carefully looked after and well fed by the people who run the coursing tracks. The article continues:

The R.S.P.C.A. takes a different view. They find it hard to believe that any creature can really enjoy running for its life.

The reporter of the *National Times* adds:

It is a paradox that South Australia, which has some claims to being the most civilized State in Australia, should be the only State to permit Australia's most barbaric sport.

The House will be aware that a petition has been presented, signed by about 87 000 citizens of the State asking that this legislation be introduced and passed. The August State council meeting of the Australian Labor Party overwhelmingly passed the following resolution:

That the State council requests the State A.L.P. to make live animal coursing illegal, with a substantial penalty written into legislation, and asks that the necessary legislative action have a high priority in the current session of Parliament.

A spokesman for the Hectorville sub-branch of the A.L.P. told the meeting he believed the council should not defend any act of cruelty to animals. Once again, the supporters of this so-called sport try to camouflage the matter. They say that the abolition would mean that dogs specially bred for the sport would have to be destroyed. Well, the sooner that is done the fewer dogs that will have to be destroyed. I understand that in the Committee stages of this Bill there might be an attempt made to render it less effective by suggestions that amendments such as the muzzling of dogs or matters of that nature be used as an alternative to my amending Bill. Let me make it perfectly clear that, whilst I do not wish to pre-judge the Committee stages of the Bill, any such amendments would be absolutely unacceptable. Indeed it would probably cause great cruelty to a dog if it were muzzled; it would not lessen the cruelty to the hare by the buffeting it would receive from the muzzled dog (apart from the fear it has of the dog), which is a great contribution to the psychological cruelty. After all we do not really know whether a hare is capable of knowing whether a dog chasing it is muzzled or not.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is talking about anticipated amendments. I understand we are here to receive the Bill in its original form and not to hear about how the honourable member expects the Bill to be amended later.

The SPEAKER: There are no amendments before the House and a discussion on amendments is not allowed during a second reading debate. The honourable member can speak to his motion relating to the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: This Bill is a simple amendment to the principal Act. There is scarcely any need for me to pursue the matter further. I believe in my right of reply I can answer any objections to it. I hope however that it will be carried overwhelmingly and that this odious feature of our treatment of animals will be removed by this one simple amendment. Let me remind the House that we are properly judged by our attitude to people less fortunate than ourselves and to helpless creatures. When this judgment is passed on us let us not be found wanting. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, and support most of the remarks made by the member for Ross Smith. The comments I wish to make on the Bill would be better left until next week because of the shortage of time today and I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PETRO-CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House express its grave concern that continued interference in the financial and other arrangements of the Redcliff petro-chemical project by the Australian Government will cause the loss of this vital industry to South Australia.

In addressing myself to the motion I recognize that the crunch day comes progressively closer. I therefore believe that, by seeking leave to continue my remarks next Wednesday, I shall be better able to give a more lucid dissertation on the problems of the Redcliff petro-chemical industry. I therefore seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 467.)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): At the outset I should like to say that the matter of the secret ballot has been raised on many occasions by people who honestly believe there is some merit in it. I do not believe that, in the principle of the secret ballot, there is anything outrageous or objectionable. After all, such a vote could be used to decide a union dispute or other matter associated with a union or other organization. However, in practice, as members opposite would be well aware, secret ballots have been used and found to be wanting. The member for Glenelg, in promoting this amendment, obviously believed he could make some political mileage out of it.

Mr. Gunn: That's not right.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I was not speaking to the member for Eyre, but referring to the opinion of the member for Glenelg. However, if the cap fits other members opposite who wish to interject, they may wear it. At this stage I draw the attention of members opposite to the matter of industrial unrest and strikes. When there is industrial unrest in South Australia, we find that members opposite are quick to get up—

Mr. Venning: We want to save this country!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —and attempt to condemn the workers. It is very convenient for them to overlook the extremely poor record of industrial peace in States

that do not have Labor Governments. To refresh the memories of members opposite, I will compare the number of industrial disputes in the States dominated by non-Labor Governments with the number of disputes here, my source for these figures being the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Last year, in Queensland (the home of that arch dictator of anti-workers, the Premier of Queensland), there were 378 disputes; in Victoria, there were 431 disputes; and in New South Wales, 1 299 disputes. South Australia had 159 disputes, and Tasmania 69. The member for Glenelg continually demonstrates in this House his lack of knowledge about unions and their policies. This Bill is like several other gimmicks that conservative people drag up in an attempt to hide the fact that industrial unrest stems from the alarm of workers at rising prices.

Mr. Venning: They've increased more since the advent of the Commonwealth Labor Government.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I want to tell the member for Rocky River—

Mr. Coumbe: Who wrote your speech?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —and the member for Torrens (who probably knows this) that legislation to provide for secret ballots was introduced in New South Wales back in, I think, 1912. Between that time and 1939 the system was tried twice, but then it was abolished because it was found to be completely ineffective. One of the problems with secret ballots (and I see the member for Torrens smiling, as he knows this to be true) is that the wide spread of workers throughout Australia creates communication difficulties.

Surely members opposite know that the Commonwealth Government has the power to order secret ballots. However, only three times since 1928 has it ordered them, and in that period the Liberals have been in power most of the time. The reason why they did not order secret ballots more often was that, when they did order them, they found that the ballots worked against them, bringing about strikes. If the present Bill were passed and workers decided at a secret ballot to hold a major strike, would the member for Glenelg and other members opposite support the striking workers?

Mr. Venning: There's nothing more democratic than a secret ballot.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If they were to support the workers, members opposite would certainly have to adopt a completely different attitude towards trade unions from the one they have demonstrated in this place. Can you imagine the member for Rocky River supporting a strike? I can imagine the shock of members opposite if a secret ballot resulted in a major strike.

Mr. Venning: Why?

Mr. Mathwin: What do you mean?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I hate to even think what might happen to the little fellow from Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: I can look after myself.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister may not refer to the honourable member for Glenelg as "the little fellow".

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Then I will call him the honourable little member for Glenelg. I should not even like to guess what might happen to him. If the Bill were passed and a secret ballot resulted in a strike, the members for Alexandra, Rocky River, and Eyre would tar and feather the little honourable member from the top of, or dandruff on, his balding head down to his ingrown toenails.

Mr. Mathwin: You sound like a Mau Mau terrorist.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member would have to live on Kangaroo Island for the rest of his life.

Mr. Gunn: I've never heard such nonsense.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As I have said before, the member for Glenelg knows little about unions, although he often claims to have been a good unionist back in old England.

Mr. Mathwin: I've forgotten more about unions than you'll ever know.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will try the honourable member out. Does he know that there was a British Royal Commission in 1968 into the merits of secret ballots?

Mr. Mathwin: I've got the book.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Then the honourable member should have referred to it before he gave his second reading explanation, but he cunningly avoided reference to the findings of that Commission.

Mr. Mathwin: The point about that was—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Glenelg that interjections are out of order. The honourable Minister must confine his remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Glenelg has the report of the British Donovan Royal Commission under his desk, but he cunningly concealed its contents because he well knew that the findings of that Commission were completely against the purpose of his Bill. The Commission found that secret ballots were more likely to approve strikes than reject them.

Mr. Venning: Why? There's nothing wrong with a secret ballot.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have said that, but secret ballots ordered on the workers can result in a strike.

Mr. Mathwin: I'd support it if it was a secret ballot.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Anyhow, the Commission found that secret ballots approved more strikes than they rejected. The same thing was proved in the United States of America and Canada. Let us consider a case where a strike was in progress and ballot forms were sent out to workers in relation to an offer by the employer, but in the meantime the offer was withdrawn. Has the honourable member anything in mind to cope with that situation?

Mr. Mathwin: It is entirely in the hands of the Industrial Court and Commission.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It has not even reached the court at that stage. They have had a secret ballot, and the members have been circularized and told of the offer from the employer. In the meantime negotiations have proceeded with the employer and the original offer has been rejected. They would then have to call another ballot to discuss the changed circumstances. Offers change a dozen times; members who know anything about unions know that offers can change from day to day. How many ballots would there be floating around the country to inform union members of changed circumstances? I am referring to what would happen if people working in similar industries throughout Australia had to be informed by mail when they were on strike.

Mr. Chapman: Do you believe that a strike is the only direct action that can be taken?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Liberal Party had the power in 1928 and it is still there. It has used it three times, and found it to be unsuccessful and completely

ineffective. That is what I am trying to explain to the honourable member. The problem of the widespread labour force and the lack of correspondence to members on changed offers and rejections could only prolong a strike further. It has been proved that the system has countless problems, including possible manipulation.

Mr. Chapman: You don't think that opportunity exists now?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Rocky River knows all about that. He asked for another count of his ballot after the last election, and he got it. It was then proved that it was Labor Party preferences that got him re-elected. He did not complain about manipulation then; he was quite happy about it. It is an unrealistic approach to the problems of industrial unrest. I have no objection whatsoever to unions holding secret ballots but, like the Donovan Royal Commission that was held in the United Kingdom in 1968, the report of which the member for Glenelg purposely and cunningly avoided during his speech—

Mr. Mathwin: What part of it?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: That was the crux of that finding. Even the member for Heysen is agreeing with me. It was found that a secret ballot was more likely to cause strikes than to prevent them: that is in the report. The honourable member does not even know whether that is in the document or not; he has not even read it properly. If a secret ballot is held, it should be at the request of the members of the union. If they want a secret ballot, I have no objections to it. As many unions already have the power to conduct secret ballots included in their rules, I think this Bill is completely unnecessary and completely unworkable.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill. The widespread public demand to improve industrial relations, to restore production at all levels, and to cultivate harmony and good relations between employers and employees is well known to us. I believe that the message has been loud and clear, particularly in recent months, when not only have we received the message but it is evident that the Commonwealth Government as well as our State Government has also received the message. The request has clearly come from the public, that we should be taking serious steps towards harmonizing the relationship between men at work and their employers.

While I commend the member for Glenelg for his contribution in this debate, I was disappointed by the Minister of Labour and Industry taking the attitude he has taken today in setting out to politically pollute this legislation. He has set out to destroy its original intention. He has set out to destroy those parts of the legislation necessary to bring harmony back into industry in Australia. The Minister has missed altogether the intention of the member for Glenelg, and he has missed altogether the basis of this legislation.

The Minister has taken political advantage of this situation. He has taken this opportunity of replacing the member for Florey, and has used this opportunity to try to cut the Opposition in what he describes as another political attempt. Before I heard the Minister's remarks I had no intention of citing the sensational aspects that usually accompany such legislative changes as those sought. However, I do not intend to let the opportunity go by without taking the Minister to task on some of his comments.

I suggest that the Minister has grossly contradicted some of his remarks. On rising in this debate, the Minister initially said that there was nothing objectionable

about secret ballots, that he agreed with secret ballots. He then told us, however, that secret ballots cannot work in practice. Let me remind the Minister that secret ballots conducted in industry have been a practice in this country for many years. The Minister should know that secret ballots are conducted on industrial sites in certain situations and that that practice is most satisfactory in achieving what they set out to do.

I do not have to go into great detail to remind the Minister of the type of secret ballot conducted within the shearing industry, where every member on the site has the right to exercise his own personal and private view by secret ballot in a situation where he is not encumbered, embarrassed or sidetracked. Before exercising his vote, a worker in this situation can consider all aspects of the job, all the repercussions that are likely to follow, and the results that could emerge from that vote.

A worker can take into account, if he so chooses, his possible loss of wages, and the effects on his family at home if he chooses not to proceed with his work. He can also take into account any other private matter that he may not wish to disclose even to his workmates, matters which are of a private nature and which should therefore be preserved as such. Secret balloting is practised in industry in South Australia and throughout Australia, and this has been the case for many years in many areas where it is considered desirable.

Secret balloting has been clearly demonstrated as being not only possible but also workable and effective in these areas of industry, and I see no reason why, in the protection of the workers in this State or throughout Australia, secret balloting should not be extended when stoppages or strike action is pending in respect of their jobs.

I wish now to refer to comments made by the Minister about the number of strikes that have recently occurred in South Australia, as compared with the number of strikes in other States. I do not dispute the figures that the Minister has taken from statistical records or from other sources. However, let us consider the number of man days lost, surely the most important effect of strike action. The most recent statistical survey shows that South Australia is once again the pacesetter: it is way out in front. Indeed, it has a bigger and better record than have Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, which were referred to by the Minister. In the period from January to April of this year, 153 000 working days were lost in South Australia, whilst in Queensland, that other ideal State to which the Minister referred, 132 000 working days were lost—20 000 fewer days than in South Australia. In Western Australia, which has a Liberal Government, 36 000 working days were lost.

Mr. Duncan: That is exactly what one would expect, because New South Wales and Victoria are the main industrialized States, and South Australia is the third such State.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not willing to reply to irresponsible interjections. If relevant matters are raised by members on the other side, I will deal with them. Government members are not willing to speak in this debate.

Mr. Duncan: Would you be pleased to hear from us?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes. Every member ought to participate in this debate, because it provides an opportunity for members to show positive action on behalf of the community, which is screaming for such action. I shall not cite a whole heap of letters to the editor and quotations from books, because we can feel the effects

of industrial unrest. There is nothing objectionable (the Minister's expression) about secret balloting; I am the first to agree with the Minister. It is a right of the individual worker. The workers themselves are calling for it. They are calling on their employers to support them in this matter. Further, they are calling on members of the Opposition for support and, if the Government was honest, it would admit that the workers are calling on the Government, too. Is it any wonder that public is demanding secret ballots? I am willing to protect the workers to the hilt in this respect. On the site of industry, where there is justification for improvements in conditions or salaries on the basis of relativity or on the basis of work done, I support the workers having the opportunity to negotiate with employers. This happens on the site of industry.

Mr. Harrison: Can you cite a union that does not have a provision for secret ballots in its constitution?

Mr. Mathwin: I mentioned three last week.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Let us take the situation where the employees have attempted to negotiate with employers and, for one reason or another, the negotiations break down. In those circumstances, it is reasonable for the employees to seek the assistance and support of their union. As a result of union representatives acting on behalf of the employees, we may find that in some cases the negotiations break down. There is a proper course of action to be followed from that point. The Industrial Court is willing to hear representatives of the two parties and to give a ruling on the case.

It is unfortunate that, even after that exercise, union representatives and workers are sometimes still not satisfied and they make further demands. The union representatives often say, "This is our only course of action: we must strike to get results." We only have to listen to "Do it or get done" Dunford to realize that. At that point, after negotiations with the employer by the workers, after negotiations by the union representatives, and after the employees or the members of the union executive are not satisfied with the court's judgment, strike action may be recommended.

We can cite all sorts of instance where this has occurred. The employees are assembled; I am aware of situations where the men have been assembled at the St. Clair youth centre. A recommendation is put to the men by a union representative and, by a show of hands, a decision is made on whether the men should go on strike. It is at that point that we are seeking the opportunity for a secret ballot, as directed by the court. It is reasonable that at that point a secret ballot should be available to the men.

We should not sit here in this place and say "It is fair for an employee to be required to go on strike, thereby harming the interests of his family, simply as a result of a vote taken by a show of hands." It is unreasonable to deny the workers the right to a secret ballot. I do not contemplate that employees, when called together for such a purpose, will enter into a secret ballot with employees of a common industry at some other place. The Bill provides that the secret ballots are designed to occur on the site of the industry. There is no reason why we should not uphold the principle of secret ballot, in lieu of the show-of-hands system. It is no use the Minister telling us that, on the one hand, he supports the principle of secret balloting and has no objections to it while, on the other hand, he says that it cannot work.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I said that I supported it only at the request of union members. I didn't say I agreed to the legislation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I know that financial members of unions have asked that secret ballots be conducted in such circumstances. On obtaining the information from those union members, I have agreed not to disclose their names here but, if it is necessary in future to disclose the names and if I can obtain their agreement, I will do so. I consider it extremely important that this Government get the message that its own people support the Opposition in our moves to have secret ballots on the site of industry. From early August this year to date the Minister and his colleagues may have cared to read some of the letters to the Editor of the *Advertiser*. The signatures on those letters can be checked easily with the records of union membership, and I consider that that, in itself, will establish to some extent the remark that I have just made.

Mr. Wells: What about the ones that aren't anti-union but are pro-union and are not published by the paper?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not have to go into detail to substantiate the comment I have made several times here about how we should treat those who can work but will not work. I have been reminded by members opposite many times of my remarks.

Mr. Wells: You'll never live that down.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Members opposite have said that my attitude towards some people is that, if those people will not work, we should starve them. Let me remind members opposite that other people have a similar attitude. In the past few days I have spoken to a citizen of this State who, whilst he was a member of a works union, was placed in a similar position.

In fact, that man told me that, in an effort to have all men on the site join the union, an organizer explained to him that, if he did not join the union, he would have to starve. At the time, the man did not understand what that meant. As a matter of fact, he had a fortnight's grace on this job, and as the men were camped in the outback and it was necessary to line up and eat at the mess, when the two weeks was up he got the message. When the men were too far away to have food at their own disposal or to get it conveniently otherwise, they were reliant on the mess, and two weeks after the job commenced the organizer stood at the door of the mess on one occasion and stated, "Unless you can produce a ticket, you go without food."

Mr. Duncan: Is this a fairy tale? Document the case with facts and figures, and tell us what happened.

Mr. Dean Brown: Members opposite don't like the truth.

Mr. Duncan: We want to hear all about it. Document it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I can give information about this matter. The employee has worked underground, and as a seaman and he is occupied in an air traffic business at this time, but during his travels around Australia he was employed under one of these unions, and the union to which I refer covered an industry involving works and housing in the Northern Territory.

Mr. Duncan: Which industry?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not think I need to go further, and certainly the member for Florey would know now to whom I have been referring. I have no intention of mentioning the man's name, but I have sufficient evidence to back up my remarks.

Mr. Duncan: Well, let's have it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Before the member for Florey speaks in this debate, I will give him any other detail he needs in that respect.

Mr. Wells: Do it quickly, because I'm the next speaker.

Mr. CHAPMAN: You will have difficulty, because I have a long way to go yet.

Mr. Duncan: You have 10 minutes more for this tripe. That's all you have.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On this occasion the Government has an opportunity to take a responsible stand, and uphold what it promised to do in many other areas of industry. In this place recently, the Premier has been trying desperately to convince members on this side that he has done everything possible and has pursued every avenue to get men back to work in certain industries. In fact, at one stage recently in the House he called on the Opposition to offer some alternative to the action being taken.

Mr. Wells: No; he challenged you to bring forward a solution, and you failed to do so.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The honourable member can say what he likes: the Premier invited us to give an alternative to assist to get men in this State back to work.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And you didn't have an alternative to put forward.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Premier could not get co-operation from union executive members in certain industries or from the union members themselves. Obviously, he cannot get total co-operation from his own Party, because of the distinct division between the right wing and the left wing.

Mr. Duncan: What rubbish!

Mr. CHAPMAN: After being in this place for only a short time, I can appreciate that the Premier is having much difficulty generally, and now, with the industrial unrest, it is obvious to me that the position is being aggravated as a result of this division within his own outfit. He did invite the Opposition to present some alternative, and in this instance the Opposition is offering what it believes is a system to bring confidence and incentive back into the work force of this State. We are trying to instil in the men confidence that they, as individuals, are being recognized and are not being dominated or dictated to by people who have been reported in the newspapers (they admit it and, in fact, boast of it) as being of the militant type and as saying that they have no alternative but to recommend strike action to their men, as it is the only weapon they have. The Opposition, to protect employees against that sort of militant, overpowering and dominating force, has introduced a Bill that recognizes what the men want.

Mr. Max Brown: That's a solution?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is not a solution to all industrial unrest. No-one has suggested that it is and I do not know to what extent it will help.

Mr. Max Brown: I do!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have seen what we propose operating in the field and I have seen it in practice, and I consider that it is a reasonable system for putting a man's view. It is the only democratic system there is on the site of industry, and I consider that it can be extended to other situations in industry. For those reasons, I support the Bill.

I would be extremely disappointed if the Minister's colleague continued to politically pollute this debate, introduce personal attitudes and background attitudes from their union involvement, and display in this place the sort of pressure we know they are under from the trade union

movement, in particular. There is no time in this place to consider sectional interests and sectional demands from people involved in those unions.

Mr. Wells: What in the hell are you here for if you're not here to look after sectional interests?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Bill before the House will greatly protect the interests of all people in the State, and that is why it should not be a political football. What we are trying to do, in response to the request of the Premier and of the people in the field, is to present to this Parliament a logical and reasonable recognition of people outside. I repeat that it will not solve all the industrial unrest, but to some extent it will have a settling effect among those involved in industry. I believe we should give it a try, because nothing done by the Government (either Commonwealth or State) in recent times has worked. Earlier this week the Premier admitted that the system he had used would not work and that he had failed. Further, he disclosed in the House that he was not willing to go on with the torts legislation that was to have come before Parliament in the current session.

Mr. Wells: What is the relevance of that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It has great relevance. In recognition of the demands of the trade union movement, the Government at one stage this year was willing to take that matter up. However, as a result of a rebuff from the trade union movement generally, the Government obviously is not willing to take it up, and the Premier has said so.

Mr. Wells: You are quite wrong.

Mr. CHAPMAN: You can tell me where I am wrong when you are on your feet!

Mr. Wells: We will take it up when we think the time is right.

Mr. CHAPMAN: When you think you have got the numbers! You know you have not got the numbers, in either the Commonwealth or the State sphere. The Labor Party in the Commonwealth sphere is more inadequate than ever it has been. The Commonwealth Government and this Government, because of their dogmatic attitudes, are the most unpopular they have ever been.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we will bring back a little sanity into the debate. We are discussing the Bill introduced by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate your remarks in that regard, Mr. Speaker. I believe some of the statements that have been floating in from the other side should have been stopped long ago. It is unfortunate that honourable members opposite have retained their dogmatic stand in these matters and have not acted responsibly when the opportunity has arisen. They have had the chance. They have had an offer from the Opposition to participate in this field of industry and to try to get a bit of common sense back into it. It is only a start. However, it is a method we believe should be tried. I commend the honourable member for Glenelg for introducing this Bill, and I am proud to support him in his efforts.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I want to put the record straight and to correct the statement by the member for Alexandra that the Minister superseded me when I had taken the adjournment of this debate. The Minister was not in the Chamber when the adjournment had to be taken. I took it, and I acknowledge that he is a senior member. Quite properly, he led the debate, very capably, for the Government side. I want to talk about some of the stupid things said by the member for Alexandra. I hate to be unkind

to anyone, but I find it awfully hard to contain myself when I hear such stupid statements. He knows very well that this Government is a firm, united, and consolidated body. He has implied that there are various factions within this Party, and I must throw that lie back in his teeth. Let us look at the other side. I did not want to introduce this matter, but I shall do so now. On the other side we see a fragmented Party struggling to maintain some form of unity. We see them fighting for positions in the front bench. We see—

The SPEAKER: Order! Although this Bill was introduced by a private member, it is still a Bill being considered by the House and as such, as I pointed out to the member who introduced the Bill, the debate must be confined to the subject matter of the Bill. The Bill deals with specific matters, and those matters must be the subject of the debate. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Yes, but I thought—

Mr. Dean Brown: You had better think again.

Mr. WELLS: You must not interject; it is rude. I thought, Mr. Speaker, you might have been lenient enough to allow me to expose some of the lies the member for Alexandra uttered. The member for Glenelg has often said in this House that, as he had been a member of a trade union, he could be expected to have had some experience in this regard. He has told us that, when he left England to honour us with his presence here in Australia, the members of his union stopped work for a day and went down to see him off.

Mr. Mathwin: They had two minutes silence.

Mr. WELLS: I have not been able to decide in my own mind whether they went to farewell him or to make sure that he went. Sometimes I think—

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is misrepresenting me. The people who saw me off said, "Here is a man who is going to Australia, and now we will have two minutes silence for him."

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had his say when he introduced the Bill, and it is out of order for him to speak again at this time. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Perhaps I should be more serious, because this vicious attack on the trade union movement is a very serious thing, although it is something we have become accustomed to in this House.

Dr. Tonkin: What are you afraid of?

Mr. WELLS: We are afraid that people of your ilk may attempt to take from trade unions the power they so rightly deserve. Here we have people telling the trade unionists what is best for the trade unions. The people who are telling us include business men, a doctor, a pansy grower, a shark, a shearer, and farmers and graziers. They have never done a day's work under a union boss in their lives.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: We have heard the screams of the member for Davenport, the pansy grower, on every subject brought before the House.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the pansies over there?

Mr. WELLS: If there are pansies over here they have callouses on their hands from hard work, but the honourable member will never have callouses. The introduction of this measure represents an insufferable insult to trade unionists and to the labour force generally in this State. Members opposite are saying that people in the labour force do not have the courage, the moral fibre, or the guts (to be more crude) to stand up and be counted when

a vote is taken, and the Opposition wants to provide an avenue of escape for some people who they say do not have this courage. Every trade unionist to my knowledge has the courage to stand up and be counted when the marbles are down. If he does not have enough courage or does not have the courage of his convictions to put his hand up to indicate that he is for or against a motion, he does not deserve the vote he has been given. A secret ballot is an insult to a man's courage, because it implies that he is afraid to express his own view. Possibly, we could extend the idea of secret ballots and implement it here. Often when the Leader of the Liberal Movement in this House opposes the Government and a division is called, we see Opposition members slinking across the Chamber like whipped dogs. As they do not have the courage to stand by their decisions, they want a secret ballot.

The member for Alexandra said that harmony should exist between employer and employee. That is all right, provided things are equal, but how can he talk about harmony? If this Bill is taken to its logical conclusion, I believe that some Opposition members will vote against it. Regarding secret ballots, we must take note of statements by people prominent in the community, in the trade union movement and in the industrial affairs of the nation. There is probably no more capable spokesman for the State's employers than Mr. Branson. An article in the *News* of August 17 states:

General Manager of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Mr. C. W. Branson) said the so-called union bosses were only servants of the rank-and-file union members. Trade union leaders are subject to election and must satisfy the majority. If union members felt strongly enough about not going on strike they would vote against it at a stop-work meeting.

That is precisely the situation. Those remarks were made by a man of high calibre, who is the leading representative of this State's employers. He said that secret ballots were worthless. If a man has enough faith in his elected leaders, he will follow them and vote against them if necessary.

Mr. Mathwin: I don't believe that.

Mr. WELLS: The member for Glenelg should ask Mr. Branson. I have more faith in Mr. Branson than I have in the member for Glenelg. The Opposition wants secret ballots. Most unions have a clause in their constitution that permits secret ballots but only rarely is it exercised, because members of the rank-and-file have complete faith and confidence in their elected leadership. If people were dissatisfied with their leaders, those leaders would, as Mr. Branson has said, be out quickly, and rightly so. The Opposition wants secret ballots (some Opposition members do not know much about them, because they are stupid and ignorant of trade union affairs), but it fails to realize that a trade union leader knows that a strike does not put butter on his members' bread, and they will strike only as a last resort. If the Opposition thinks a trade union leader and a couple of his organizers merely decide to have a stoppage for a month, that is a lot of tripe. The situation is examined in detail, a decision is made, and the rank and file is involved. Indeed, the executive's recommendations are not always accepted by the members. What the Opposition calls a strike may last only a day or two and take the form of a protest stoppage. Should we therefore have a court-controlled ballot or a secret ballot, or delay the situation until it is clarified by these means? The secret ballot sought by the Opposition will involve a voluntary vote to coincide with its policy in other areas. Let me read the following decision referring to a secret ballot:

This provision was applied in one case with disastrous results during a timber workers' strike in 1929. The strike was against an award of the court which increased hours of work in the industry and awarded lower wages. A number of members of the union applied to the court for a ballot to be taken of the members of the union in New South Wales and Victoria on the question whether members were prepared to resume work under the award. A ballot was directed, and voting sheets were posted by registered letter to voters. From a total of 15 000 possible voters, only 6 093 votes were received, with a majority of 4 500 for a continuance of the strike. The voters appeared to resent the fact that a small number of members of the union (requested by only 10 members out of a large union covering two States were required to precipitate a secret ballot) had called for a secret ballot in opposition to the wish of the union represented by its committee.

That is one result of a secret ballot held in this country. Some talk-back programmes and biased newspaper articles indicate that certain people want secret ballots. The member for Alexandra cited cases of unionists going to him for advice, but why on earth a trade union member would go to him for advice or protection, I do not know, because he has said that the workers should be starved into submission. With all due respect to the honourable member, I do not believe him. I know of two people who had letters inserted in newspapers which stated that they supported secret ballots. These two people went on radio talk-back programmes and supported the concept of secret ballots for unions. However, neither of them was a trade unionist, yet they wanted to tell the unions what to do. The Opposition also wants to tell the unions what to do, because it thinks there is some capital or mileage to be gained. The Opposition thinks this is a popular issue, but it is mistaken.

Mr. Venning: That's rubbish and untrue!

Mr. WELLS: If I have offended the susceptibilities of the member for Rocky River, I am sorry. If this Bill is passed, there will be immediate trouble within the trade union movement and we will have prolonged industrial unrest.

Mr. Chapman: Some union members should be protected against their leaders.

Mr. WELLS: If the trade union movement needs protection, it will not come from the member for Alexandra. The rank-and-file members resent intrusion into their personal affairs.

Mr. Chapman: Even though the Minister agrees in principle?

Mr. WELLS: The rank and file would revolt.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not right

Mr. WELLS: Do not tell me that that is not right; I know it is right! Only today I heard some expressions of opinion about this, but I will not name the people concerned. I do not think you, Mr. Speaker, would allow me to, because it might be considered libellous.

Mr. Chapman: You wanted me to mention names a few moments ago.

Mr. WELLS: Yes, but these are people of integrity. I do not think the member for Alexandra has any integrity at all.

Mr. Chapman: You object to people expressing their opinions about union leaders, and they were all union members—14 unionists, in fact.

Mr. WELLS: I have 13 minutes left in which to speak and I now have to say something I have avoided saying for a long time. The honourable member is talking of secret ballots and of a document that he produced recently in this House containing 14 names.

Mr. Chapman: No—85 names.

Mr. WELLS: Very well—85 names; a list of unionists on Kangaroo Island. He said that they stated that they did not agree with the Trades and Labor Council and were critical of its actions in a certain dispute that had occurred.

Mr. Chapman: But they wanted the opportunity to exercise their voice, which is very important.

Mr. WELLS: Let me talk my time out and I will listen to you later! Although I regret I have to do this (and I am sincere when I say that), I figured in the proceedings that took place on Kangaroo Island to which the honourable member was referring. With all due deference, I consider I played quite a part in bringing about a solution to that problem, but the honourable member was not a member of the committee. At that conference, we decided that nothing that transpired in that room would go outside. The people attending it could let their hair down and say what they liked and nothing would go outside. I have never heard a whisper of anything that transpired in that chamber. I did not break the bond given on that occasion that I would not repeat outside anything said in that chamber by those present, including farmers and graziers and our own union representatives. The honourable member was not there. He has a list of 85 unionists who were critical of the trade union movement.

I went to Kingscote, where waterside workers came to me and asked, "What is he doing here?" They said, "He is going around to the men on Kangaroo Island and insisting they sign this document and, if they do not do so, their names will be published in the newspaper on the island." You, Mr. Speaker, would not permit me to say in this House what my wharfies told me to do with Mr. Chapman's list. That is what happened. He was not a member of the committee, but he went from unionist to unionist getting signatures outside the conference that was being held to try to solve the dispute that threatened to disrupt works on the island, and those members would have their names published in the *Islander* if they did not sign the document; and the wharfies refused to sign. I am sorry to raise this matter; I did not want to.

Mr. Chapman: You don't have to apologize.

Mr. WELLS: I am not apologizing to you.

Mr. Chapman: You might be interested to know that some of these wharfies signed that petition.

Mr. WELLS: I say it is a lie.

Mr. Chapman: The document is available to you. What I am telling you—

Mr. WELLS: You are admitting now that you did this.

The SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately, there is creeping into debates in this House the use of certain words that are not permitted. The word "you" is being used by many members, but under Standing Orders members should refer to other members by their districts or by using the term "honourable member". The word "you" is not permitted, and I will pull members up if they persist in using that word.

Mr. WELLS: I apologize for my transgression. I did use the word "you", but I could have used a much stronger term. I know you would not have permitted that, anyway. I see this measure before the House as a cheap, despicable, unspeakable move to try to cause divisions and bitterness within the trade unions and to capitalize on misled and misguided people outside who know nothing at all about trade unions and their activities. I believe this Bill was introduced because the member who introduced it felt that, with Steele Hall and his crowd breathing down his neck, it would be the right thing to do.

Mr. Chapman: It would be interesting to hear something on this from the right wing Ministers.

Mr. WELLS: Are you saying I am a left winger?

Mr. Chapman: You have been saying that all through the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: That is the situation as I see it. I may have transgressed but I was provoked at times into it. I leave members opposite with the knowledge of Mr. Branson's statement. He may not always be right, but he has my respect and he certainly retains the respect of the employer organizations or he would not be holding his present position. He has said categorically that there is no benefit in secret ballots. He recognizes the fact that, a leader of a trade union once having been elected, the members of that union will be loyal to him and vote with him unless he transgresses to the point where they see he is not acting for the benefit of that union, in which case they will immediately replace him. Mr. Branson recognizes this fact. I shall be interested to see whether or not some members opposite support Mr. Branson's viewpoint or whether they think he is there but should not be there and he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Chapman: We support the Minister, who agrees that there should be secret ballots.

Mr. WELLS: I support the Minister's remarks, which were that he would support a secret ballot if the members of a union wanted a secret ballot. That is what he said. Do not take it out of context.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: You are trying to foist secret ballots on to us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are trying to conduct the affairs of the State by discussing a Bill dealing with secret ballots. The member for Florey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! During debate I will allow interjections because I believe interjections are part of Parliamentary debate, but I will not allow interjections as second reading speeches during a debate. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: It is obvious, not only from the contributions that have been made on the other side of the Chamber but also from the interjections, that my earlier remarks about the incompetence and the inability of members opposite to assess a trade union situation, to determine whether secret balloting would or would not be of value to the trade union movement, have been very much reinforced. Members opposite know nothing about trade unions. One has only to look at them—

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: With all due respect, I am not indulging in personalities; I am referring to their vocations and their jobs as doctors, veterinary surgeons, business men, school-teachers, farmers, graziers, and pansy growers.

Mr. Chapman: What about giving this a try for 12 months: if it does not work then throw it out?

Mr. WELLS: The member for Alexandra, to maintain his lying in this House, says "Put people out of work and starve them for six months, and then they won't want to go on strike at all." I oppose the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It was interesting to listen to the member for Florey in his usual rather vituperative and vicious manner. I wanted to find out whether he was using his soap box.

Mr. Crimes: Many good men have stood on soap boxes.

Mr. COUMBE: I have stood on them myself.

Mr. Keneally: That is not what Ernie said.

Mr. COUMBE: Perhaps the honourable member may include it in the *Herald* next week. Both the Minister and the member for Florey, while trying to rebut the comments of the member for Glenelg and supporters of this Bill, touched on the essence of it almost immediately. I think it was the Minister who said that he had no objection to it and supported the idea of a secret ballot in unions if they wanted it. The whole point of this Bill is that unions "may" have a secret ballot. Nowhere is the word "shall" used, because the essence of the Bill is that the ballot shall be voluntary, a principle of my Party. The Minister agreed with the principle, and his sentiments were echoed by the member for Florey. They both agreed with this idea, which is why the Bill was introduced. I congratulate the member for Glenelg on the manner in which he introduced the Bill, and commend him for the enormous amount of research that he must have used to prepare it. The member for Florey referred to the Donovan report, and the member for Glenelg used his copy of it to quote a pertinent paragraph.

It has been made abundantly clear that many members of the public are today demanding that secret ballots be introduced into trade unions, and I have received letters (and no doubt other members have received them) requesting that this action be taken. Members of the public have complimented the Opposition for having the guts to introduce such a measure. Although Government members seem to be hell-bent on defeating this measure, what has the Government to fear if this Bill becomes law?

Mr. Crimes: We don't want court interference in union affairs.

Mr. Gunn: How would you like to work under the Companies Act?

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Spence has come in on cue: if he reads the Bill he will realize that decisions are left to the discretion of the court, and that is the whole essence of this legislation. The honourable member wants to uphold the law and is so righteous in many ways, but he does not want the Industrial Court to have any jurisdiction in this matter. No penal clauses are included in the Bill and one penalty only has been provided where a person obstructs the conduct of the court. I think it was the member for Florey who referred to difficulties of conducting ballots because of the different make-up of unions: members may be widespread in one union but concentrated in others. The word "section" is included in the Bill to cope with these problems. Another point that has been made is that secret ballots may provoke industrial action, but a ballot is a democratic right, and I am the first to support the result of the ballot, whatever it may be. If a ballot is held, the result is either in favour of a certain action or against it and, if most union members agree to strike, then that is the action they want. Having democratically expressed their opinions, these members are entitled to strike.

This Bill provides for them to make the decision one way or the other, unfettered and voluntary, and provides a perfectly democratic way of handling such a matter. This Bill will back up (and I use the term advisedly) the democratically elected union leader. Regrettably, all members have seen the trouble that has been caused recently—

Mr. Duncan: What about—

Mr. COUMBE: This applies particularly to the district of the member for Elizabeth. Action has been taken by

shop stewards against the advice and wishes of the democratically elected union secretary. I deplore this action, as it places the secretary in an invidious position. Sometimes, the action is taken without the secretary's having been consulted. Most workers resent what I would call "wildcat strikes". They merely want to get on with the job and receive their wages at the end of the week without having to lose money because of strikes over which they have no control and in which they do not want to indulge. I am sure the wives and families of such workmen are just as resentful if the breadwinners' wages are docked because of a strike that has been called against their wishes. More and more wives in our community are expressing this valid point of view, which may react in the opposite way in relation to women workers and their spouses. I believe this point of view was expressed in Whyalla: those concerned resent the irresponsible actions of a few against the wish of the majority.

Apart from the aspect of the union secretary and shop steward to which I have referred, I believe this Bill will help the Minister of Labour and Industry who has at present so many problems on his plate. I believed the Government would welcome this legislation. The public, the average decent, responsible workmen, and especially their wives, would also welcome it. Members of the public, including workmen's wives, are becoming more and more vocal and are calling more strongly for the secret ballot system in the operation of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

Many people in the community are indeed concerned about this State's industrial position. The number of disputes is increasing to an alarming extent. I am sure no Government member welcomes such an increase. Only recently in another debate, I cited the figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics in this respect. However, the situation has deteriorated even further since then, although the Minister has tried to play down the position with other figures. In the first four months of this year the number of man hours lost as a result of industrial disputes exceeded the figure for the whole of 1973. That is not a bad record during the term of office of a Labor Government in this State, and the term of office, for the time being anyway, of a Labor Government in Canberra.

Mr. Becker: The present Prime Minister said a Labor Government would reduce the number of strikes.

Mr. COUMBE: That is so. He said, "Return the Labor Government and we will get over the labour problems; there will be fewer strikes." However, let us look at the realities of the situation not only in South Australia but also over the whole country. I have cited the number of man hours lost because of industrial disputes in the first four months of this year, and we shall be going to beat that. The rank-and-file union member should have the final say on whether strike action should be taken.

Mr. Wright: No-one denies that.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Florey imputed certain motives to members of my Party, but I point out that we on this side strongly support the principle of trade unions with responsible and democratically elected leaders. Indeed, we will always support that principle. I go even further and state that the rank-and-file trade union member should have the final say regarding what happens in his union.

Mr. Wright: You're saying that he should not be controlled by an outside influence.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the member for that interjection, as that is part of my thesis. Unfortunately, there is in the trade union movement an irresponsible minority

which can and does take certain action that is detrimental to the average worker. This is a regrettable state of affairs. Because of the way in which it has been drawn, the Bill does not interfere with the rights of workers: the word "may" is permissive and not mandatory, and the discretion in certain matters is left in the hands of the court.

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: It is interesting to hear Government members talk about voting. I remember speaking about voluntary voting in a debate during the past 12 months and I was howled down by Government members who said that the only sort of vote should be a compulsory one. This Bill will give workers the right to express their views in a democratic manner. What more democratic method could we have?

Mr. Keneally: Why do you say the right isn't there now?

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member knows that, although some unions have a method of balloting for the election of officers, not all unions adopt the procedures included in the Bill. That is one of the main points in my argument. When we talk of industrial disputes, I believe we must realize that strike action is the last resort.

Mr. Wright: Do you think there should be secret ballots elsewhere?

Mr. COUMBE: In this Parliament, the election of the Speaker is by secret ballot as, indeed, is the election of members to this House. As I have said many times in this House, diplomacy and tact are needed in negotiations in an industrial dispute; you must get the parties talking. Conciliation should be the order of the day and, if that fails, arbitration can be sought. However, strike action must be the last resort. Under the Bill, individual workers will have a greater say in the running of their unions on a democratic basis. What has the Government to fear by passing this Bill?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It doesn't work.

Mr. COUMBE: I listened carefully to the remarks of the Minister and the loud comments of the member for Florey. Behind those speeches was something that neither member could quite spell out; they are frightened of something. Do they fear the democratic voice of individual unionists? If the Government has nothing to fear, it will pass the Bill. I heard the Minister interject that the system in the Bill would not work, but I say that it can work; it is definitely worth a try. I strongly and sincerely support the member for Glenelg in introducing this legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

OMBUDSMAN'S RECOMMENDATION

Consideration of the following resolution received from the Legislative Council:

That in the opinion of this Council, the Engineering and Water Supply Department should give effect to the recommendation of the Ombudsman that a 41-acre water licence in respect of section 290, hundred of Paringa, be granted to Mr. B. T. Kennedy of the Clovercrest Cattle Company.

The SPEAKER: In connection with this matter, which is Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 4 on the Notice Paper, I have to inform the House that there is another Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 9 on the Notice Paper in the name of the honourable member for Mitcham that covers the subject matter of the resolution received by message from the Legislative Council, seeking the concurrence of this House thereto. There is nothing irregular in having more than one motion dealing with the same subject on the Notice Paper at the same time.

It is for the House to decide with which motion it will proceed. The motion of the honourable member for Mitcham was placed on the Notice Paper before the resolution contained in Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 4 was received from the Legislative Council, and the proper procedure will be to postpone Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 4 from time to time and proceed with Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 9. If and when, a decision is reached on that motion, it will be held to apply to the resolution contained in Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 4.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Motion carried.

LITTER CONTROL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 468.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I draw to the attention of the member for Eyre, who introduced this Bill, the following remarks of His Excellency the Governor, in his Opening Speech:

In addition to the measures already referred to, my Government intends to lay before you a substantial legislative programme for the forthcoming session, and included in this programme will be Bills relating to . . .

The Governor then referred to several matters, including the control of litter. If the Bill introduced by the member for Eyre had achieved the Government's objectives in this matter, I assure him that we should have been pleased to use private members' time in which to pass legislation that was part of the Government's policy. However, as the Bill unfortunately lacks several features, I cannot support it. I do not oppose the principle behind it, as I agree that we require additional control over the indiscriminate dumping of litter. Although the existing provisions need revision, I do not think that simply increasing from \$200 to \$500 the penalty for dumping litter will automatically solve the problem. However, an increased penalty would help.

The Government is considering several points connected with this matter. First, I believe that the control of litter must be principally in the hands of local government. I see it as a function of local government, and I think the member for Eyre sees it in that way, too, but it worries me considerably that a Bill for a new Act is being introduced, rather than including improved provisions in the Local Government Act itself. It is far better to confine this matter to the Local Government Act. In saying that, I am not suggesting that the provisions currently in that Act are adequate for present-day needs, but I do not think the introduction of a Bill for a new Act will resolve the matter. Actually, the matter, would be resolved more satisfactorily if the existing provisions in the Local Government Act were updated. In 1971 or 1972 the existing penalty in the Local Government Act was increased to \$200, and for the first time a minimum penalty was introduced.

The weakness at present is that councils are loath to act under the legislation because of the cost involved and because there is no guarantee and little chance of that cost being recouped. So, on that score there is great value in the suggestion of the member for Eyre that expiation fees could be introduced. However, I do not support on-the-spot fines, because they can lead to corruption. Expiation is a different matter, and provision could be made for councils to be compensated for policing the laws. Amendments to the Local Government

Act could provide for councils to be compensated for the cost involved in discharging their responsibilities, particularly in connection with litter removal. The Local Government Act is the place for this, but we must go much further than the simple points that the honourable member brought forward, commendable though they may be.

The problem of litter must be tackled from the viewpoint of the cause, rather than the end result. We must start to think seriously and provide for additional garbage disposal facilities, particularly in the metropolitan area. We have passed the time when a weekly garbage collection service was sufficient. Some councils have shown initiative by providing trailers for hard rubbish collections. In the area where I live the council has provided this service for about 15 years. Yet, whenever one sees a trailer, one finds that it is overflowing with rubbish; this proves the need for the service. I commend the council to which I have referred; it has recently launched a scheme whereby each week people can put out a plastic bag full of lawn clippings, in addition to the garbage can; that is a real contribution to the problems of litter and pollution, which go hand in hand. If we keep within the confines of local government and tackle the cause of the problem, we will be on the right track.

We must find out why people dump rubbish and why they do not get rid of it in the proper way. If it is found that facilities are not in the right place, we should require that the facilities be provided there. The Government will be introducing legislation to give effect to this service. I am sure that the legislation will deal with many aspects of the problem. I commend the member for Eyre for bringing this matter forward and, without absolutely committing the Government, I think the honourable member can rest assured that the new legislation will provide for expiation of minor offences. Whilst the honourable member is no doubt disappointed that his Bill is not acceptable in its present form, I think he will later be able to consider a much wider piece of legislation that will meet the major requirements that are in this Bill.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 504.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill. It is a vicious, ill-conceived, and short-sighted approach to the State's financial problems. It is not a form of economic management of this State that the Opposition can accept, particularly as the Bill is the direct result of the financial incompetence of the Commonwealth Government and the failure of that Government to meet its promises.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What was that? Vicious, ill-conceived, and what?

Dr. EASTICK: I will repeat that statement. The words should be made to sink in, because they are important.

The Bill is vicious, ill-conceived, and short-sighted. The economic policies of this Government are a mirror reflection of the primary school (I use that term advisedly, because the word "pre-school" is out of vogue and is not an "in" word any longer, as a result of broken promises by the Commonwealth Government) economics that have been displayed in Canberra by the Commonwealth counterparts of this Government. In the same way as all Australia is pleading for help as it sinks into the financial quicksand of inept Commonwealth Government management, so too are the people of South Australia demanding a loosening of the noose that the Dunstan Government is applying. However, the Government seems to be either deaf to or, worse still, ignorant of the economic consequence of these increases.

If the increases were isolated, they would be bad enough, but, as members recognize, they are not being made in isolation from many other actions which the Government is taking and which will increase costs for the South Australian public. These increases are no more appreciated by the long-suffering South Australian people than are the other increases that have been foisted on them because of Commonwealth Government incompetence. I suggest that the increases will fan the fires of inflation that have already been whipped up as a result of many measures introduced by the Government, and more particularly by the lack of responsible management, which is an essential ingredient in any contract if the people that we seek to represent and support are to benefit.

We have only to consider the increases in the cost of living, with South Australia right at the pinnacle on the Australian scene. We have only to consider housing costs, which members on this side have referred to more than once and which members opposite have adverted to almost with shaded eye. We have only to consider taxation, which the present State Government has increased from \$58 000 000 when it came into office in 1970 to a position where, allowing for the increases already made and allowing for an increase in pay-roll tax, the amount received in 1974-75 will be in excess—

The SPEAKER: I call the attention of the honourable Leader of the Opposition to the Bill under discussion, the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill. I realize that the Bill is a revenue-raising measure, but at the same time it is not a Budget, and the honourable Leader's remarks must be linked with the Bill under consideration.

Dr. EASTICK: I shall be pleased to do that, because, as you have so correctly stated, Mr. Speaker, it is a money-raising Bill, and I am only chronicling the massive increases by way of revenue-raising activities imposed on the South Australian people over a period. Not the least of the money-raising issues relates to motor vehicles. Along with the motor vehicle fee increases, we have had those that relate to electricity, water, sewerage, and council rates, the last mentioned being a direct reflection of the Government's inability to make available to councils funds that are their due.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow the honourable Leader to make this a Budget speech, because once he got away from the terms of the Bill, every other honourable member would want the same concession to be granted to him. The Bill deals with increased charges under the Motor Vehicles Act relating to motor vehicles; the House is now debating that Bill. It is not a Budget Bill, and the Leader's remarks must be confined to the Bill under discussion.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I make that point that members are being asked to vote on a measure that will increase seriously the costs associated with owning and running a motor vehicle, and that cost will have a marked influence on the other services provided to a community that relies on motor vehicle transportation. These costs, when considered with all the other increased costs to which I have been referring, have played a significant part in the inflation rate of 17 per cent that we have at present, and the increases provided for in this measure will further increase the costs to the community of the services provided to it.

That increase is quite apart from the costs that will be involved for people enjoying themselves in the family car, whether to transport themselves to work or to go out for pleasure at the weekend. It is important to recognize that the effect on the wage-earner will be dramatic, and these increases are only part of the many increases to which I have referred. It is extremely important to consider those costs in relation to the detail that the Minister has given in explaining the Bill.

The explanation refers to the failure of the Commonwealth Government to make available to this State funds in the way in which they have been made available in the past to allow for road works and associated activities to proceed. Indeed, the Minister has spoken of the activities of the Commonwealth Government and the decisions made in relation to the measure. Last week he gave figures showing that the total amount of money available to the State from the Commonwealth Government was \$31 000 000, the same amount as was available previously.

Quite apart from that, greater matching grants than have been provided in the past will be required. These matching grants are the reason for the increases we are now considering. We have been told that the failure of legislation to pass in another jurisdiction is why it is necessary to raise this money as soon as possible and why local government bodies cannot be given an indication of the work they may undertake. The matter first came into the Senate on Tuesday evening last, a week ago yesterday. It appeared on the Notice Paper for the first time on Wednesday last, yet we are told that the failure of the Senate to accept the measures involved has resulted in confusion in the distribution of funds for roadworks. The Minister stated:

I thank the member for Gouger for last evening drawing my attention and that of the House to the letter which apparently has been forwarded to the Mayors and Chairmen of all local government areas by the Australian Minister for Urban and Regional Development and the Australian Minister for Transport. It appears that the Australian Ministers forgot to send me a copy or even notify me that the letters were being sent.

This is just another instance of the centralist Government working behind the backs of State Ministers. We have seen it in this field as well as in action taken by Mr. Connor in relation to minerals. It has been evident in relation to funds being made available by Mr. Uren.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to interrupt the honourable Leader continually, but the Bill does not deal with the matters he is trying to introduce into the debate. It is a Bill dealing with certain increases in relation to motor vehicles. The debate will not be permitted to get out of hand; members will not be permitted to speak about anything under the sun, because the Bill does not allow for that.

Dr. EASTICK: I am referring to points made by the Minister, and expanding on them slightly to stress that the problem that arose last week for the Minister of Transport

in not being informed of the activities of his Commonwealth colleagues is not an isolated case. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

Whilst the Australian Ministers labour the point that interim finance had been made available to several States, including South Australia (and that is true, it has), what they conveniently forget to tell local government is that the Prime Minister has advised the Premier of this State (and, I presume, the Premiers of other States) that, unless the legislation currently before the Senate is passed in the current session, he will immediately withdraw the interim financing arrangement into which he entered. Having regard to that statement we find that, while we are dealing with a programme of roadworks as mentioned by the Minister, the funds to be raised by this measure will be matching funds (or part of the matching funds) for those coming from the Commonwealth sphere. No attempt was made by members of the Senate to deny funds to the States.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is completely untrue, and you know it.

Dr. EASTICK: I know it is not untrue. If the Minister will contain himself for a short time I shall tell him what took place. He would probably be aware, if he wished to be, that the Ministers of four States of the Commonwealth informed the Opposition in the Senate that they were completely in accord with the Bill before the Senate being held up and amended so that money in the hands of the recipient Governments could be applied as those Governments would themselves determine. They would not accept a situation where every pot-hole and every piece of road to which the funds would be applied would need the sanction of Canberra before the work could be undertaken.

Mr. Coumbe: Big Brother!

Dr. EASTICK: Big Brother, the real centralist policy, the problem we have been seeing from this side for a long time as descending on the Australian community! Members opposite, aided and abetted by their Commonwealth colleague (Mr. Cameron), are suddenly facing this problem. The Bills to which the Minister referred came into the Senate for the first time on Wednesday last. The major one is a Bill for an Act to grant financial assistance to the States in relation to roads other than national roads. The action in the Senate was taken with the endorsement of four other State Parliaments. The amendments have a considerable influence on the ability to use funds supplied for roadworks in South Australia. The first of the amendments refers to clause 3—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought we were dealing with a Bill before the State Parliament, not three Bills before the Commonwealth Parliament, passed by the Senate in an amended form and now being considered by the House of Representatives. Would you, Sir, please rule on what we are debating? I should be delighted to debate them with the Leader, but if that is to be the debate I should be grateful to have your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I have brought to the notice of the honourable Leader on several occasions that we are dealing with a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1973. That is the Bill under discussion, and any reference to extraneous matters must be linked to its subject matter. I will not continually interrupt members to tell them that this is not a Budget; it is a Bill authorizing certain increases in expenditure under the Motor Vehicles Act. I therefore uphold the point of order. Further discussion will be along the lines of the Bill under consideration.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refer specifically to the second reading explanation given by the Minister, who said:

I hope that, in the light of the explanation I have given, members will realize that the course of action I took was unavoidable. However, subject to, first, the level of financial assistance from the Australian Government to the State being as proposed in the legislation currently before the Australian Parliament; secondly, the conditions attached to the expenditure of Australian Government, State and local government authorities permitting the allocation of grants to councils in accordance with needs as assessed by the Highways Department; and, thirdly, increased revenue being made available to the Highways Fund through higher registration and licence fees.

I link up my statements by saying that these three points are linked. One of them relates to the increased fees provided for in this Bill; another is an agreement between the Commonwealth, State, and local government bodies on how those moneys will be apportioned; and the first of those three points clearly states that the level of financial assistance will be determined and as required by the passage of the legislation currently before the Australian Parliament. The Minister's having linked the passage of the legislation before the Australian Parliament to the subject matter we are dealing with in this Bill, I have not strayed from what I believe to be my right on behalf of the Opposition to expose a fallacy in a number of points made by the Minister in his second reading explanation. I was proceeding to point out to the Minister and other members interested enough to listen that the statement made by the Minister on that matter has a real significance in respect of the amendments to legislation before another Parliament last Friday.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I point out that there may be a reason in the introduction of this Bill, but that does not give latitude to debate something that has taken place elsewhere. The Bill under discussion is a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1973. It does not open up an avenue for a complete financial discussion on matters over which this Parliament has no control or jurisdiction, because we are dealing with this specific Bill, and that is the Bill under discussion. That does not open up the way for a full discussion of the activities of another Parliament.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may be excused if I believe that the latitude and privilege given to the Minister are exactly those that I claim on behalf of the Opposition in referring to matters before the House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are now reflecting on the Speaker.

Dr. EASTICK: I am not doing that; I am reflecting on the Minister's having introduced into this debate the very matter I am currently canvassing.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you address the Chair?

Dr. EASTICK: I do that frequently and do not need the member for Ross Smith to advise me. The funds that will be provided by this Bill will be insufficient to fulfil the purpose for which they are to be levied against the people of South Australia. Those matters to which the Minister has adverted may be proceeded with at a time when the Commonwealth Minister recognizes that he must come to grips with reality and must accept that those people in another place will not bow down before a situation that prevents the State Ministers from being able to take positive action in respect of the distribution of the funds that they will supply from their own revenue, revenue that will be obtained from a measure of this type plus the supplementary revenue that is to be made available from the Commonwealth.

I have said previously that the increases in costs associated with this measure will have a serious and drastic effect on the people of South Australia. In the past few months, together with the taxing measures of the South Australian Government, the increases in registration fees are only one of a long series of increases imposed on the people. Compulsory third party insurance is an integral part of the road transport system, as is the registration fee that we are now dealing with. Compulsory third party insurance has risen by 40 per cent. From June 1, comprehensive insurance rose—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable Leader that in the discussion of a Bill the second reading speech is not a discussion or debate on its own: it is an introduction for the purpose of a Bill being considered by the House. There is nothing in this Bill connected with matters to which the honourable Leader is now referring. Therefore, it would open up the way for further discussion by other members, which I cannot permit. We are dealing with the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill; that is the subject of discussion that I will permit.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The persons who own motor vehicles, caravans and trailers find that the cost of running them has increased dramatically recently. The Minister, in bringing this matter to the attention of the House, has flown a kite which was picked up by the media, which suggested that the increase in cost would be 20 per cent.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Come on!

Dr. EASTICK: But, when the matter came before the House, it was revealed, as outlined in the media on the following day, that car registration fees would rise by 25 per cent in South Australia under the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So what! Who is responsible for the 20 per cent—you? Did you give the media that information?

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister of Education would take his eyes off the book that he happens to find pleasing to him and would listen to the whole debate instead of picking out one or two words here and there he would not be delaying the work of this House and we could all get home a little earlier. I said that the kite that was flown—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By whom?

Dr. EASTICK: By the media—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did you fly it?

Dr. EASTICK: —and by the Minister's department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition in desperation is intending by innuendo to suggest that I have flown a kite or that my department has flown a kite in relation to these increases. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule, as you have about six times already, that this has nothing to do with the Bill, and ask the Leader to confine his remarks to the Bill and not enter fantasy land in the way he has done.

Mr. Coumbe: Come off it!

The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of honourable members I quote the authority for what I have said many times, as follows:

The member who has charge of a Bill (or any other member acting on his behalf) moves "that the Bill be now read a second time"; and takes this opportunity of explaining its objects. Debate on the stages of the Bill should be confined to the Bill, and should not be extended to a criticism of administration.

The ruling I have given several times is that we are dealing with a Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill whereby certain charges are increased. I repeat that it is not a

debate on any particular matter dealing with finances; we are dealing collectively with the clauses contained in the Bill.

Mr. Venning: But why shouldn't—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Rocky River that, if he wants to disregard the ruling of the Chair, next time he will suffer the consequences. The honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: I was referring to details contained in the Bill that were explained in the media on the day following the Bill's introduction to the House. I make the point, because this information has not been challenged by the Minister or his department (it has not been referred to in the media) that there has been a 25 per cent increase in registration fees in this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's factual. That was stated in the House last Thursday.

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Minister. The increase in the fee for a driver's licence is another matter in which there has been an acceptance that the details provided are factual. The fee for a learner's permit will increase also, and funds from that source will be applied, with funds appropriated from other sources, to a highways programme, which, according to the Minister's second reading explanation, is in jeopardy because of the failure of his Commonwealth colleagues to make funds available. Some increases are substantial, in some cases more than 100 per cent. For a vehicle that does not exceed 10 p.w. the \$9 fee is an increase of 28 per cent. This Bill splits categories of trailers into two, and the increase for the smaller one is 25 per cent and for the larger one 166 per cent, and that is above the single factor contained in the 1973 amendment for trailers up to 1020 kilograms. The third category has risen by 125 per cent, the fourth by 100 per cent, and the fifth by 83 per cent. Also, there is an increase of 66 per cent in a driver's licence fee and 200 per cent in the fee for a learner's permit.

When presenting the Bill the Minister said that he was sorry (as the Premier has said several times) for the South Australian public, because increases have been necessary. The reasons for these increases are clear: obviously the Government cannot obtain funds it requires from other sources. It has been let down (like the Australian public has been let down) by its cobbles in another place. Is it any wonder that Opposition members cannot support this Bill, because it has been produced not because there has been a reduction in the overall amount of funding that the South Australian public has made available to this Government but because massive sums that have been made available by the South Australian public to the Commonwealth Government are not being returned to this State to allow the works programme associated with the motor vehicle industry (and that is what this measure is about) to be undertaken. We are being bled more than we have been bled in the past. This measure has an important significance to the community, because these increases will have an effect on family life, particularly because direct flow from these measures will affect freight charges. An article in the *News* of August 16, as a follow-up to the statement in this House the previous day, under the heading "Road freight rise bid", states:

Rises in truck freight rates will probably be sought soon. Announcing this today, the Director of the Road Transport Association of South Australia, Mr. A. M. Dewhurst, said the "vicious" 25 per cent increase in vehicle registration costs would have to be recouped. An application for rises would probably be put before the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, Mr. L. H. Baker, next

month. The size of the demand had not been decided. Mr. Dewhirst said the cost of registering a seven to eight ton truck—an average vehicle in the industry—was about \$180 a year for the metropolitan area. The registration increase, to operate from October 1, would add about another \$1 a week on trucking costs. He added, "Cartage operators have been faced with rising costs like all other sections of industry. This latest rise is another in the line and comes as quite a blow."

These increases will have a significant influence on all sectors of the community and on services provided for the community, and they will be an added cost against the family budget, so there will be a positive effect on the cost of living in future. Opposition members must protest at measures taken by the Government in an attempt to overcome or under-play a disastrous situation that has been forced on the people of this State by the Government's Commonwealth colleagues. A report appearing in a recognized political column in today's *News*, headed "Our State Budget may not be a gloomy one", which stated that the Budget, to be brought down by the State Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have continually warned the honourable Leader that the House is not discussing the Budget. Indeed, the Budget has not yet been introduced in this House. We are at present dealing with the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, and I ask the honourable the Leader, the same as I would ask any other honourable member, to speak to that Bill. He has no right continually to wander off the subject of the Bill that the House is now debating.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not trying to transgress the rulings that you have given so many times this evening. One of the important ingredients in the South Australian Budget is the availability of funds from a variety of sources. The source with which we are now dealing is the revenue that will be raised by an impost on the motoring public. As these increases have now been introduced, and other increases have been imposed in other areas in recent weeks, the prediction that the State Budget may not be a gloomy one may prove to be correct, solely because the Government has already announced many of its revenue-raising measures. I make one final pertinent point regarding this Bill. Opposition members are aware of the State's financial position as it relates to roadworks, and they must consider the ability of motor vehicle drivers, about whom we are speaking, to pay these increased charges.

Opposition members will be addressing themselves to this measure, as these increases are related to the subject matter which was introduced by the Minister last Thursday and which the Opposition has been unable to discuss as effectively as it would have liked this evening. I make the point that the Opposition cannot accept, even if the Minister accepts, that this State should be tied up into a small parcel and be directed by Ministers in another place. Whether the Minister introduces legislation in his capacity as Minister of Transport or as Minister of Local Government, the Opposition cannot accept that the action taken by members of the Senate in Canberra will be other than to the ultimate benefit of this State and of the Minister's Administration.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You won't accept it?

Dr. EASTICK: We will not accept the Bill as it has been introduced by the Minister's colleague in another place. However, we will accept it in an amended form.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is once more wandering off the subject and, if he continues to do so, I shall have to invoke the Standing Order that will bring him back to the Bill being debated. I will not continually interrupt honourable members. This is a

debate not on the Budget but on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, and the honourable Leader and all other honourable members must confine their remarks to that Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I trust that the measures contained in the Bill which do not have my support will prove to be effective in the carrying out of a road programme which will be directed by the authorities in this State and which will not be forced on them by way of strictures applied from Canberra.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are opposed to all the increases, are you?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Bill is the result of a complete abdication of responsibility by the Commonwealth Government in not adhering to the recommendations made by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads. I think the Minister will agree that this is the main reason why the Bill has been introduced. In not implementing those recommendations, the Commonwealth Government has reduced this State's allocation from the \$36 000 000 recommended by the bureau to \$31 000 000, a reduction of 14 per cent or \$5 000 000. Although the Minister readily accepts that we are faced with a 15 per cent inflation rate, the Commonwealth Minister seems unwilling to recognize this. The Minister of Transport said that, to maintain the present road construction programme in this State, motor vehicle registration and licence fees must be increased to the extent provided for in the Bill. In other words, instead of taking up this challenge with the Commonwealth Government, the Minister is happy to load this additional burden on to the South Australian public. What is more, he does not seem at all concerned about doing so.

The minimum increase provided for in the Bill is 25 per cent. Such an increase in registration fees might be well and good for a person travelling about 80 000 kilometres a year, as many members do. Had the Commonwealth Government met its responsibility, the average family man would not have to pay this increase of 25 per cent. Had the 15 per cent inflation rate been carried through in the legislation at present before the Commonwealth Parliament, all that would have been required in this State would be a small increase in motor vehicle registration fees, certainly not an increase of the magnitude included in the Bill.

As the Leader has said, in most cases the increase in registration fees will be 25 per cent. However, in the case of trailers of a weight exceeding 260 kilogrammes but not exceeding 1 020 kg the increase will be 166 per cent, not a bad increase by anyone's standards. It is incredible that such a large increase should be foisted on certain people. In several cases there are increases of 125 per cent, 100 per cent, and 83 per cent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: On a one-tonne trailer the increase is from \$8 to \$18.

Mr. ARNOLD: In the case of a trailer whose weight exceeds 260 kg but does not exceed 1 020 kg the increase is from \$6 to \$16, or an increase of 166 per cent. In the case of a trailer whose weight exceeds 1 020 kg but does not exceed 1 520 kg the increase is from \$8 to \$18, an increase of 125 per cent. Members on this side recognize the need for the roads programme to continue and for councils to have adequate finance with which to carry out road-building programmes in their areas. However, it is remarkable that the Minister, without putting up any fight whatever, should have allowed the Commonwealth

Government to put it over this Government to the degree it has. The Minister has said that additional funds of \$7 930 000 must be provided if we are to maintain the present road-building programme. By the measures in the Bill, the Minister will raise from the people of South Australia \$4 700 000. The fact is that, in the contribution they make in this State, the people of South Australia will have to pay for the effects of inflation, as well as paying for those effects at the Commonwealth level. Therefore, they must meet the inflationary increase in both cases. On this basis, we oppose the legislation.

The recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads not being accepted by the Commonwealth Government, this Bill has been introduced. The sums included in the present Commonwealth legislation are markedly less than the sums recommended by the bureau. Matching quotas recommended by the bureau have also been reduced, and the life of the current legislation will be for three years, whereas the bureau recommended that it should be for five years, as was the case in previous legislation. This all adds up to the fact that the people of South Australia will have to carry the burden in order to maintain the current road-building programme. The Commonwealth Government has not come to the party at all. The Opposition does not agree that the Government should have accepted this situation, immediately introducing a Bill to make up the gap in finance in order to keep employment in the road-building programme at its present level. For 1974-75, the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads recommended for South Australia a payment of \$36 000 000, whereas the present Commonwealth legislation includes \$31 000 000, a reduction of 14 per cent; for 1975-76, the recommendation was \$39 000 000, and the sum included in the legislation is \$33 000 000, a reduction of 15.3 per cent; and for 1976-77, the sum recommended was \$41 000 000, and the allocation in the legislation is \$36 000 000, a reduction of 12.2 per cent.

As it is totally unacceptable to the Opposition that the people of South Australia should have to pay for inflation at both the State and Commonwealth level, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Without doubt, the Bill imposes yet another slug on South Australian motorists and on the many industries that use motor vehicles. Because industries are affected, the cost of the distribution of goods will increase, so that the Bill is another directly inflationary measure. No-one can deny that the provisions of the Bill will generate inflation. Once again, throughout Australia (this is not the only State affected) the long-suffering public will get it in the neck. The main features of the Bill are the increase in the registration fee by 25 per cent, and the increase from \$3 to \$5 in the driver's licence fee. Let us consider the schedule, and let us remember that these are not small items; considerable sums are involved. A 25 per cent increase, which is a pretty sizeable increase at any time, is the smallest of the increases. There are also increases of 83 per cent, 100 per cent, 125 per cent, 166 per cent, and 200 per cent. This is the scale of increases that the Minister is asking, in all seriousness, this House to accept without the slightest protest, but my Party protests most vehemently.

Why has the Minister been provoked to introduce this Bill at all? I believe that I am within Standing Orders, Mr. Speaker, in canvassing this question, because the Minister canvassed it at considerable length. Therefore, any member should be able to canvass it within the

limitations that you, Sir, laid down. Instead of introducing legislation like this, the Minister should have persuaded his Commonwealth colleague, his great buddy buddy, to accept the recommendation of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads. We are now faced with these grossly increased costs, perhaps as a result of the row that occurred at the Darwin conference; I cannot be sure about this, because I was not there, but the row was almost heard down here. I did not go to Darwin and I have not seen the minutes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have been supplied with the minutes.

Mr. COUMBE: I have not seen them.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've seen the verbatim report.

Mr. COUMBE: No.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know you have.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister is not denying that he had a row.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am not saying anything about that question. With the consent of the Commonwealth Minister I will table the report in this House. I do not think the Commonwealth Minister would say that he would get the police, as a former Minister said.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I am not suggesting for a moment that the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Jones) sent a wrong docket to the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, as one of his colleagues did the other day.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you think that the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, was very discreet?

Mr. COUMBE: I know that there have been many red faces in the Commonwealth Administration in this connection. The Minister and his Commonwealth colleague should have come to an amicable agreement on the recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, which on other occasions the Minister has been keen to promote as an authoritative body. The Minister has often said that the recommendations of that authority should be followed. As the member for Chaffey said, the bureau made recommendations in this regard, and the Minister was forced to admit that he and his fellow Ministers from the other States violently disagreed with the action of the Commonwealth Minister; that is one of the reasons why we are considering this Bill tonight. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the report and recommendations of the expert committee were not accepted. Why? The Minister said that he violently disagreed, and so he should. What he should have done was get the bureau's recommendations adopted.

When questions were asked of the Minister prior to the introduction of this Bill, he was uneasy about some of these matters. The sum of \$31 000 000 is being provided, exactly the same amount as was provided last year, no provision being made for expansion or for inflation. I know the Minister is not at all happy, although he is laughing his head off at present, thereby showing a complete disregard for the present situation in this State. So, it seems as though friends have fallen out. It is significant that none of the broken promises was mentioned before May 18, the date of the last Commonwealth election. This Bill provides for an extra impost on the people of South Australia, first, because the Commonwealth Minister has disagreed with the findings of the expert committee and, secondly, because the Commonwealth Minister himself has not supported a greater contribution to the States. There

is to be an increase in the matching grant to be made by South Australia; the member for Chaffey rightly pointed this out.

Mr. Arnold: What would the Minister have said in 1968-70 if we had introduced a Bill like this?

Mr. COUMBE: He would have gone right through the roof like a rocket to the moon. The higher he went, the farther he would fall. Now he is reaping some of the fruits of his once great friendship with the Minister in Canberra. The Minister of Transport, in referring to roads and funds, told the people that, if they voted for Labor in the Commonwealth Parliament and in the State Parliament, they would get all the money they wanted. However, now there is a complete repudiation and the piper must play the tune. This is not a legitimate Bill, as the Minister knows. Whether he fathered it is another matter, but I think that it has doubtful parentage. The Minister has stated that one reason for imposing these taxes was his Commonwealth colleague's decision to reduce the amount given to South Australia.

The explanation states that the South Australian entitlement has been reduced from \$36 000 000 to \$31 000 000, which is the same amount as we received previously. Inflation is running at 15 per cent, and we are taking one step forward and two steps back. Later the Minister refers to the allocation of money raised by this measure, and states that the Highways Department will spend amounts from the Highways Fund and that certain amounts will be allocated to councils. We are dealing with an inflation rate of 15 per cent for 1974-75, and I do not know what the rate will be next year or the year after.

The Minister has stated that the Commonwealth Minister departed from the recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads on three matters. The amounts recommended by the bureau have been reduced markedly by the Australian Government, the amount of the matching quotas recommended by the bureau has been reduced, and the term has been reduced from five years to three years. I ask the Minister whether—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is not Question Time.

Mr. COUMBE: I ask the Minister whether this three-year period is hard and fast, or whether it can be varied.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a matter for legislation.

Mr. COUMBE: That is what I wanted to know. We are considering a Bill to provide money to overcome an estimated inflation rate of 15 per cent for 1974-75.

Mr. Venning: What would you have to do in your business in this regard?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He'd increase his prices. That's what he has done. Ask him how many times he hasn't done it.

Mr. COUMBE: Many businesses are packing up because of the inflation that the present Commonwealth Government is not doing anything to stop. The micro-Budget only accelerated inflation. I do not know what the inflation rate will be next year or the year after, but it will be more than 15 per cent, and I ask how the Minister will meet his obligations. The Minister, if he has a conscience (and I believe he has), will be embarrassed. He was uneasy last week when I asked him a question, and he is not pleased about the whole shemozzle.

Another part of the Minister's explanation deals with control of these funds. Some of the \$31 000 000 will be allocated from Canberra, and strings will be attached to the money. Canberra will decide whether and where every little road and by-pass can be constructed, and if

we do not ask Canberra for the money we will not get it. That is what is happening under this centralist Government. The Premier has stated that stamp duties will be increased. In the past, motor vehicle transactions have been subject to stamp duty increases, and I ask what will happen next year. I repeat that commercial and industrial vehicles often are overlooked, but without them the community cannot live, regardless of whether a vehicle is operated by a milkman, a baker, or a man delivering steel from Port Adelaide to the factories.

I return to the gravamen of the argument: instead of having to impose this Bill on us tonight the Minister should have been able to persuade his colleague in Canberra to agree to the recommendations of the expert committee. In that case, it would not have been necessary to impose charges of this magnitude, just as the Ministers in the other States have had to do—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Except that they have got more.

Mr. COUMBE: That is so. The Premier spoke yesterday afternoon of the position in the other States. Ministers in all States are in the same position; the Commonwealth Minister has let down all the States. To me and to the Opposition, this is an obnoxious Bill and we protest most vehemently about it. There will be a tremendous backlash against the Minister from the motor-ing public of South Australia as a result of its provisions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This Bill has been forced on the Minister as a result of the skulduggery and totalitarian dictatorship of the Australian Government, as it likes to call itself.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you in favour of the Bill?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are opposing the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't want local government to get the money.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The background to the Bill goes back to the recent Premiers' Conference. We all know the reaction of the Premier to the proposals outlined by the Prime Minister at that time: they were no longer friends. The *News* of June 7 contained a report, headed "frate South Australian Premier warns: State tax certain to go up", stating:

The Premier said that in all his dealings with Prime Ministers at Premiers' Conferences he had never known such a shabby deal as this one.

In relation to the road programme, he said:

This will make absolute chaos of our road proposals. That is the background to the introduction of this savage piece of legislation seeking to make massive increases in all charges in connection with the registration of motor vehicles, trucks, commercial vehicles, trailers, and so on. Commonwealth skulduggery, Commonwealth parsimony, and Commonwealth dishonesty have forced the Minister to introduce it. The Minister then could hardly expect the Opposition to be enthusiastic about the Bill. The financial implications are quite obvious. The Commonwealth, by such measures, is forcing South Australia to raise higher revenue to match grants that the Commonwealth itself is not willing to increase, and it has dictated to a greater extent than ever before exactly where and how we will spend our own money. If the Minister does not publicly acknowledge (and indeed he has) that this is a shonky deal, we cannot expect much from this Government..

Last year we received about \$31 000 000 from the Commonwealth, and South Australia's contribution was about \$21 000 000. The Commonwealth Government insists that

we must increase the State contribution to road funds. It is not willing to budge, yet we are told how to spend the money down to the smallest back road normally under the control of a council. The Commonwealth Government has commissioned many reports, and it has seen fit to accept some of them totally. One of its election planks was the education policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! Discussions along those lines are not related to the Bill and are out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am about to refer to the recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, mentioned by the Minister. I am speaking of the sort of advice the Commonwealth Government received, pointing out that it has seen fit to accept the advice of some expert committees, commissions, and boards, but that, in its lack of wisdom, it has not seen fit to accept the recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads. Some of the recommendations of the bureau were obviously obnoxious, but the Minister was prepared to agree with some of them. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

The recommendations of the bureau have been substantially followed by the Australian Government in the legislation which has been introduced into and passed by the House of Representatives and which is currently before the Senate.

The legislation has passed the Senate with amendments. What the Senate has done is precisely what the Minister in this State wishes to be done.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is untrue. It is a lie. It is a complete lie, and you know it.

Mr. Gunn: Take a point of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not take a point of order, but what I am saying is not a lie. At a local government meeting I attended recently it was obvious from the tenor of the Minister's remarks and those of the Commissioner of Highways that the Minister was most unhappy with the provisions of the legislation dictating how South Australians would spend their own money.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a different matter again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I heard some of the debate in the Senate last Friday on the radio. It is true that some of the amendments moved in the Senate sought to make the changes obviously desired by the Minister. The Bill, which has been returned to the House of Representatives in an improved form, returns some degree of autonomy to the State of South Australia and to local government bodies, and ensures that we have some control over our own funds. The Australian Government did not adopt the recommendations of the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads. The first area in which the Commonwealth Government did not accept the bureau's recommendations is:

The sums recommended by the bureau to the States have been markedly reduced by the Australian Government.

That is a disgraceful state of affairs. Here is the Commonwealth Government, getting this report after a great deal of consultation by the bureau, and saying it will axe the programme. The second area is as follows:

The amounts of the matching quotas recommended by the bureau have also been reduced.

The third area in the short term is not quite so serious: It merely states that the life of the current legislation is three years instead of five years. That could be argued, of course, but the other two areas are the immediate and pressing implications of the activities of the Commonwealth Government, which is purported to be the friend of this Labor Government in South Australia. This is a shonky sort of deal, one that the Minister is publicly trying to support. He has a difficult task; he has to wear two hats. He is

trying to protect his colleagues in Canberra and, at the same time, he is trying to make a go of the road programme in South Australia, but the two are incompatible. We do not forget the abuse and vilification, hurled by the Labor Government when the Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government was in office, on far fewer grounds for criticism than have obtained since the present Government took office. The ground for criticism is obvious in this obnoxious legislation forced upon the people of the State by this Government.

There are alternatives the Minister refers to that became patently obvious to him. He refers to the alternatives which were open to him, as Minister, to recommend to Cabinet. The first was:

not to increase State revenue and thereby forgo Commonwealth finance that would otherwise be available, and at the same time drastically reduce the road-building programme;

That is untenable. That is what local government feared would be the position, because that was the first option open to the Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The one you are supporting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How else can we protest against this shonky deal foisted upon us from Canberra? Are we to go along with it? It is on the shoulders of the Minister to go and tell his so-called colleagues in Canberra just what the score is. We cannot go along with this sort of dealing. That is why we protest against this legislation. The Minister is certainly in the hot seat.

The second alternative to which he alludes is that the State Government could increase State revenue only to the extent required by the Commonwealth legislation. That implies cutting our road programmes, because that would simply match the grants the Government requires and make no allowance for inflation, which is rapidly escalating. The third alternative is the one on to which the Minister has latched—that is, to try to maintain the *status quo*. One would confidently have expected from the utterances of this Government and of its colleagues in Canberra that the fourth alternative outlined by the Minister would be the one that, on the assumption of office in Canberra by the Labor Party, we could have expected the State Government to adopt—an expansion of our road programme. However, that is the fourth alternative to which the Minister refers. He has decided to try to hold the line and, to do that, he has to increase motor taxes savagely. We would normally have expected to have the fourth alternative, on the assumption of office by a Labor Government. The Premier was at the Commonwealth Government's doorstep with big plans for this State and for an expansion of its road system. As a result of these savage taxes, there will be an overall increase in finance to maintain our present road programme. The Minister rightfully refers to the dire effect on local government of the provisions, and he refers further on to the activities of the Commonwealth.

His anger was quite apparent to members on this side when he learned that his Commonwealth counterpart had had the gross discourtesy to deal directly with local government. Canberra sent a letter to local government discussing the matter of its legislation without even having the courtesy to let our Minister know what was going on, and assuring local government that bridging finance would be available. We were led to infer that this finance was not available, but the Commonwealth Minister saw fit to write directly to local government about the level of the grants likely to be supplied. The Minister was a little angered by this lack of courtesy. He mentions that fact in his second

reading explanation and he also refers to the sort of blackmail threat (that is the only way to describe it) that was made. Let me quote to the Minister a portion of his second reading explanation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where is "blackmail" mentioned in it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister refers to the fact that the Prime Minister had made it abundantly clear that, if the Bills did not pass through the Australian Parliament, funds would not be available. The Minister's words are—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where did I refer to "blackmail"?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: "Blackmail" is my word, but "blackmail" is the only word that can describe the situation as outlined by the Minister. These are his closing words:

I emphasize that these assurances (indeed, the whole road-building programme of the State) are completely dependent on the passage of the three Bills dealing with finance for roads that are currently before the Australian Senate.

The blackmail threat put to the Senate was that no amendment, however minor, would be accepted by the Australian Government. If that is not the action of a completely dictatorial, totalitarian and centralized Government, I do not know what is. Under those terms, we have no option but to oppose this Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I thought the Minister eased himself into this Bill gently and, when we consider the core of it, we realize that the Minister was very quiet when he said:

This Bill, which increases motor vehicle registration fees, driver's licence, permit and testing fees, is necessary for two principal reasons.

The Minister, in a detailed and learned lead-up, finally got down to the crux of the matter, that this Government, as the member for Kavel has pointed out, is under great pressure from the Australian Government. It is a far cry from the euphoria that followed the celebrations at Cabramatta just before Christmas in 1972 when the McMahon Government was relieved of office. We have not seen a follow-on from that. Members on this side warned that the happy days that the Government was looking for might not come to pass and, indeed, they have not come to pass. The important part of this Bill is mentioned at page 502 of *Hansard*, when the Minister made three points. The first was:

The sums recommended by the bureau to the States have been markedly reduced by the Australian Government. That is a significant and typical attitude from Canberra, in this day and age of marked reductions. The decision to reduce the amounts to the States means that the South Australian entitlement for the three-year period has been reduced from \$36 000 000, \$39 000 000, and \$41 000 000 to \$31 000 000, \$33 000 000, and \$36 000 000 respectively. As has been pointed out, the matching grants have to be increased, so that the Minister finds himself with a shortfall of more than \$2 000 000 this year. This Bill will mean increased contributions, but the Minister gives no indication how he obtained these figures. According to my mathematics, there will be an increase of \$5 000 000 this year and an increase of \$7 000 000 from the State in the next financial year, with \$8 000 000 in the last year of this triennium. I wonder whether the Government has thought about the law of diminishing returns, because it must come to the party.

Under the interpretation section "caravan" means a trailer that is constructed or adapted so as to provide sleeping accommodation for one or more persons. Efforts

have been made to provide good accommodation and roads for the tourists, and many families now own caravans, so that any increase in registration fees for a trailer, coming within the ambit of the interpretation definition, will have a heavy impact on the family man and on those people the Government claims to represent. The increase in this instance will be more than 100 per cent. On page 503 of *Hansard* there are very strong words in the Minister's second reading explanation: a quotation of a press statement by Mr. C. K. Jones (Commonwealth Minister for Transport), as follows:

I repeat the statement I made last week: Funds for the State and local government roads programmes will dry up if the Government's roads grants Bills are rejected by the Senate.

I think Mr. Jones will have to come to terms with himself, because he has a Senate that is hostile.

The SPEAKER: Order! Persistently and consistently I have pointed out that we are dealing with the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1973, which is Bill No. 25 on members' files. That is the subject of discussion, before the House, and extraneous matters are not contained in that Bill. Therefore, discussion must be along the lines that I have pointed out, otherwise the honourable member will be out of order.

Mr. RODDA: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the Minister used this rather historic chapter or verse in setting out his reasons for doing what is contained in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member might not have been in the Chamber earlier and, in that case, I will quote again the ruling that has applied for many years when dealing with Bills such as the one we are now discussing. It is as follows:

The member who has charge of the Bill (or any other member acting on his behalf) moves, "that the Bill be now read a second time"; and takes this opportunity of explaining its objects. Debate on the stages of a Bill should be confined to the Bill, and should not be extended to a criticism of administration.

They are the terms that have applied in this House.

Mr. RODDA: May I, Mr. Speaker, seek your interpretation? We have had an explanation from the Minister in which he (and I thought ably in the circumstances in which he was placed) pointed out his reasons for introducing the legislation, and in doing so he quoted what the Australian Government representative in charge of transport had said. I do not wish to offend under your ruling, and what I am saying is not in any way intended to transgress that ruling. However, I appreciate that you are charged with the duty of ensuring that Standing Orders are obeyed so that, because of what happened last evening and at this late stage of proceedings, I will not persist. However, I place on record my statement that I am not happy about not being able to develop my argument that would end up right in the centre of the Bill.

I have referred to the interpretation by which caravans come within the ambit of this Bill, and if we consider each clause we find that these increases in charges have probably been the result of the statement made by the Commonwealth Minister to which you have called my attention by your ruling. Therefore, I am somewhat inhibited in my approach. Although I did not hear all of the contributions made by my Leader and Deputy Leader, I am sure that they covered most of the details of this Bill and, as I cannot relate the Minister's second reading explanation to the contents of the Bill, there is little point in my continuing. We may have to discuss these matters in Committee.

Clause 15 seems to be the sting in the Bill, providing for a fee of \$3 for a practical driving test. After the new driver has passed that stage he then has to pay \$5 for his licence. The present fee is \$3, and this difference underlines the increases in revenue that the Minister will obtain as a result of the provisions of this Bill. I believe that the revenue received from the effects of this legislation will be much more than the \$5 000 000, \$7 000 000, and \$8 000 000 to which I referred earlier. The Bill does not endear itself to the people of this State and, for the reasons I have stated and for the reasons I cannot state, I oppose it.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am disappointed at the ruling you gave when my Leader—

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member shall not comment on rulings from the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: There is nothing wrong with the Chair.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: In speaking to this legislation, I think my Leader was treated most unfairly, because all the speakers who have followed him were allowed to cover a wide area in supporting their arguments in this debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is discussing my rulings he is out of order. He should be discussing the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Bill is incorrectly named: instead of being called "a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act", it should have been called "a Bill to rob the motorist of South Australia". I do not intend to canvass the way the Bill will increase the State's finances, as that aspect has already been covered. However, the Government must examine its administration of the State's finances, particularly in relation to roadworks, because it cannot continually impose increased charges on the motorist. Perhaps private enterprise can do some of the work on our roads more cheaply than can the Highways Department, but this aspect is not being investigated. True, the Government is having difficulties with its Commonwealth colleagues in relation to grants, and this has resulted in the imposition of these increased charges. However, this will not be the end of the matter, as I believe that next year there will be another poultice to meet the increased cost of road construction in South Australia.

One needs only to travel around the State to see how the season has been detrimental to our roads. Indeed, roads that have already been sealed are in a poor condition because of the season, and much money will be needed to put them in order. Private enterprise is used to seal roads, as it is able to do the work more cheaply than can the Highways Department. The Government should therefore thoroughly examine this aspect. I am concerned about the increased costs being imposed on motorists, because we have not yet seen the end of this matter and, as a committee is examining road maintenance charges, those charges will undoubtedly increase, and this will be yet another slug on the State's motorists.

I have referred to some of the niggers in the wood pile about which we do not seem to know much at present. The increased registration fees will tend to force trucks off the road and make people use the railways, which is what the Minister seems to want. Already rail charges in this State have been increased by between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. When one examines this whole matter, one can see that

primary producers do not have much reason to appreciate what the Government has done. The time will soon come when the people will have had enough of the Government, and at election time it will be defeated. That will be the only answer to this problem: the Government must be defeated before the situation can improve. Irrespective of the problems the Government is experiencing with its Commonwealth colleagues, I believe the situation is not a temporary one but one that will remain with us while the present Government remains in office. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, oppose the Bill. In leading the Opposition in the debate, the Leader said that this was a vicious, ill-conceived and short-sighted Bill. I agreed that it is vicious, as it is hitting road users with an increase of more than 25 per cent in registration fees. It is also ill-conceived. If it is the Minister's intention to raise money, he certainly is doing that satisfactorily, but whether that money is being raised in an effective and equitable way is another matter. Whether the Bill is short-sighted is subject to debate. However, this is a problem that the Government has and this is the way in which it has seen fit to get around it.

I raise my objection primarily because of the Bill's inequalities. Also, it is sectional and hits hardest that section of the community which, through no fault of its own, is forced to use the road network more than is any other section of the community. In some cases, a blanket increase can be regarded as being equitable. However, that is not so regarding this Bill. If all road users had a similar number of similar motor vehicles and a similar usage of our roads, a blanket increase could be regarded as equitable. However, it is necessary for some sections of the community to use the roads more than other sections do.

In discussing this Bill, one realizes that certain variables affect the requirements of road usage and the first of these concerns location. An urban dweller does not need to use the roads to the same extent as a country dweller. One's vocation also is relevant, as an office worker does not use the roads as much as, say, a travelling salesman does. One can also refer to the necessity for various industries to use the roads. Of course, this aspect depends on the industry involved. For example, the manufacturing industry might be involved in only a few hundred tonne-miles to transport its processed goods to the shipping ports, whereas the rural industries might be involved in many thousands of tonne-miles to deliver their goods from farms to ports. A set of variables is therefore involved.

In spite of all this, the length of road is constant: a given length of road is available for all motorists. Unfortunately, however, we are saddled with varying expenses, depending on the vocation of the road user. Members were told during the debate on the Loan Estimates that expenditure on roads would be concentrated in the metropolitan area. However, the main impact of this Bill is directed at those who, because of their vocation, have little option but to own a number of motor vehicles all of which must be registered.

Four classes of motor vehicle use are involved. First, there is the ordinary motorist with his car for personal transport. Secondly, there is the commercial transport operator, who has a heavy vehicle and usually, in addition, a smaller car for personal transport. Thirdly, there are motor vehicles which are used on privately-owned farms but which have to be registered because of their limited use on public roads. In many cases, primary producers must register four or five vehicles that, for 90 per cent

of the time, are used on private land. Fourthly, there are luxury vehicles such as caravans, boat trailers, horse floats, and so on. I cannot say much about protecting these luxury items, as they are not concerned with the necessities of life. Probably extra tax in those cases would be tolerated by all concerned.

An average motorist living in the metropolitan area probably owns a small car. Under the Bill, he will be required to pay \$5.10 extra a year. If he is a little more adventurous and has a caravan or boat trailer, or both, his increased fees for those items could make his total increase for a year \$9.10. That is what he must pay from his single income. A transport operator, who must own a heavier vehicle (a truck) in order to earn his living, will pay an increased fee of \$84.90. In addition, he will face an increase of \$5.10 for his personal transport, making a total of \$90. If he owns luxury items, such as a caravan and boat trailer, his total increase will be \$94.

A farm operator comes into a different category altogether, for in many cases he must register at least six vehicles. Most farmers have a motor cycle, on which the extra fee will be \$1, representing a 25 per cent increase. Most farms have a car trailer, the increase in the fee being 25 per cent in that case. In addition, there is a trailer used primarily for farm use. Because a farmer may have to take such a trailer on the road on the odd occasion, he has to pay an additional \$10 for that fee. A necessary vehicle on a farm is a utility, the increase in that case being from \$48 to \$60. All mixed farms, at least, have to have a truck. In the case of a medium-size truck required to cart farm produce to market (both grain and livestock), the increase will be from \$153.40 to \$192.30. A farmer also has to have a car, on which the increased fee is 25 per cent. Therefore, in the case of a farmer, the total increase on all these items amounts to \$73, or a 28 per cent increase overall, and not a 20 per cent increase as stated in the newspaper.

The figures I have quoted in relation to this section of the community are conservative, as most farming properties would have many more items on which they would have to pay an increased fee. If they did not have more items, the vehicles would be larger, so that the fees would be higher. As I have said, most of this equipment is used on private property 90 per cent of the time, so that this represents considerably increased overhead for these people. The way the Bill affects different sections of the community in varying degrees indicates the Government's lack of knowledge of the various sectors of the community. If one takes this Bill as an example, it is evident that the Government is oblivious of the incomes of other sections of the community. What evidence is there to suggest that one section of the community can afford an increase of \$5-10 a year, whereas another section can afford an increase of \$90? Such increases are completely disproportionate when the earning capacities of various vocations are considered.

Other aspects of the Bill will no doubt be discussed in Committee. I agree with the increase provided in the case of vehicles with semi-pneumatic tyres, solid rubber tyres, and steel wheels. Such vehicles should be taxed more highly, as they damage the road surface. We should try in every way to see that vehicles that use the public roads are constructed in such a way that they do the least possible damage. As the Bill affects various sections of the community disproportionately, I oppose it.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I object to the increases contained in the Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that there would be a short-fall of

\$6 320 000 in the sums available for the roads programme this financial year. As has been said, the short-fall is due entirely to inflation. Unless steps are taken to overcome or reduce the short-fall, clearly the roads programme will have to be reduced drastically. As the Government is unwilling to take that step, I take it that the money to be raised by increasing registration and licence fees will be used for road purposes, replacing money that would otherwise have come from Commonwealth sources.

The report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas states that Commonwealth roads money should be used mainly on two highways and other main roads, and that the sums previously made available for district roads should not be spent in that way. I wonder whether that is why this Bill has been introduced. Perhaps the reason for the Bill is not only that money has not been made available but also that there has been a change of policy. Instead of Commonwealth funds being used in the future as they have been in the past, perhaps more money will be bled from motorists in this State to be used on district roads. Not only the Opposition but also the Royal Automobile Association is opposing these steep increases on behalf of the many thousands of motorists in this State. An article, headed "Stamp duty rates to rise: R.A.A. staggered", in this morning's *Advertiser* refers mainly to new stamp duties.

The SPEAKER: Order! Stamp duties are not included in the Bill, and therefore discussion along that line is out of order.

Mr. RUSSACK: The article states:

The R.A.A. General Manager (Mr. R. H. Waters) said: "The R.A.A. is staggered at this latest revenue-earning exercise by the State Government at the expense of the already grossly overtaxed motorist."

"The Government has hardly allowed the ink to dry on the announcement of increases of drivers' licences, learners' permits and vehicle registration fees."

He said the registration fee rises announced five days ago were the result of the Federal Government road grants policy to the States.

"This increase is partly bearable as the money raised is spent on South Australian roads," he said.

I hope the money is used for the proper purpose. The article continues:

"However, this never-ending cannon fire by the State and Federal Governments eventually will have very disastrous effects on the vehicle building industry."

An article in the *News* of August 15, 1974, referring to the General Manager of the R.A.A., states:

Mr. Waters said the increase in vehicle registration fees could now be prevented if the States had received an equitable share of the fuel tax.

Mr. Waters said the R.A.A. was critical of the \$2 increase in driver's licence fees and learner permits.

"Although the State Government, commendably, will spend 50c of this on road safety projects, an increase of \$1.50 for simply processing licence renewals and permit applications is hardly justified," he said.

Part of the licence fee is used to operate the State Government's road safety instruction program.

At present there are about 600 000 drivers' licences held in South Australia and about 575 000 vehicles are registered. While criticizing the Government for the steep increases, I must commend it in one respect: I wish to echo the sentiments of the General Manager of the R.A.A. by saying that it is pleasing that an additional 50c of the increase in fees for drivers' licences and learner permits will be set aside for road safety. I oppose the steep increases, which have been necessitated by the inconsiderate attitude of the Commonwealth Government in the provision of road funds.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I object to this Bill, which slugs the people hard and often in their pockets. This Bill, which will affect the ordinary man, is another measure that

will result in the people's dollars being transferred to the pocket of the Government. It is further proof of the Government's Socialist policy, which always involves high taxation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The increases went further in New South Wales.

Mr. MATHWIN: That has yet to be proved.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It has been proved.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister's cry of inflation means little when one realizes what is the crux of the whole matter: the Minister has been let down by his Commonwealth colleague, and I do not blame the Minister for objecting to that. It is wrong for the centralists in Canberra to say what should be done in connection with the road system in this State. I will have to be careful in referring to the Minister's second reading explanation, because two-thirds of it relates to the Commonwealth Government. In his explanation the Minister sets out the following four alternatives:

(1) not to increase State revenue and thereby forgo Commonwealth finance that would otherwise be available, and at the same time drastically reduce the road-building programme;

(2) to increase State revenue only to the extent required of us by the Commonwealth legislation and to reduce the road-building programme proportionately to the amount of finance available;

(3) to increase State revenue not only to meet the demand of the Australian Government legislation but also to ensure that our own programmes are not drastically cut; or

(4) to increase State revenue to the extent necessary to ensure an expansion in our road programme.

In his wisdom the Minister has suggested that we adopt the third alternative and, as a result, the public is faced with a slug. Fees for drivers' licences will be increased from \$3 to \$5, and there will be a \$10 increase in the registration fee for trailers—a 25 per cent increase. University students and young workers will also be affected. They will be hit by an increase of 25 per cent in the registration fee on motor cycles. The registration fee for a solo motor cycle weighing more than 50 kilograms is being increased from \$6 to \$7.50, and on a motor cycle and sidecar from \$8 to \$10.

The registration fee on a trailer caravan weighing not more than 1 020 kg is being increased by 25 per cent, and trailers other than caravans weighing 260 kg but not more than 1 020 kg will attract a 166 per cent increase in fee. That is nearly as bad as all the profit the Government made on land sales this year. The fee for registration of trailers other than caravans is being increased by 125 per cent where the weight exceeds 1 020 kg but does not exceed 1 520 kg, and by 100 per cent where the weight exceeds 1 520 kg but does not exceed 2 030 kg. Such trailers weighing more than 2 030 kg will attract an increase of 83 per cent.

This is a heavy slug on people with trailers and trailer caravans. The registration fee for motor cars will increase along the line by 25 per cent. The Minister has said that he understands that the Western Australian Government increase motor taxes by 50 per cent, so again the increase in we are increasing the charges by up to 166 per cent, so the Minister has nothing to boast about there. He has also said that the Hamer Liberal Government hopes to increase motor taxes by 50 per cent, so again the increase in Victoria will be lower than that here. Further, the Minister has said that the Askin Government in New South Wales is considering substantial increases, and heaven forbid that the people of New South Wales will have to face

increases of 80 per cent, 100 per cent, 125 per cent, and 166 per cent. Our Minister certainly is setting himself a fair record.

The explanation states that clause 3 inserts in section 5 a definition of "caravan", and the Minister commends the definition to honourable members' attention. Apparently, a caravan will be defined as a trailer that is constructed or adapted so as to provide sleeping accommodation for one or more persons. If that is news to the Minister, it is not news to me: I should imagine that everyone would know that a caravan was a vehicle in which people slept. The Minister also states that clause 5 amends section 38a of the principal Act, which provides for concessional registration of a motor vehicle owned by certain pensioners. The concessional reduction has been increased from 15 per cent to 30 per cent.

Apparently, this relates to motor vehicles and car registration, and I wonder whether the Minister also intends to apply it to a pensioner's trailer that may be used for collecting wood for the fire, moving garden rubbish, going fishing, and so on. If a pensioner is fortunate enough to own a small caravan similar to the one we have on Parliament House steps, but without the washing and Royal bunting, will he be allowed a concession in the registration fee? I have difficulty understanding what the Minister intends, and I should like him to explain that when he closes the debate. Although a caravan may be regarded as a luxury, many elderly people and pensioners have caravans and travel around the countryside to visit children or grandchildren, or perhaps to have a holiday. These people should be entitled to a concession. I have seen pensioners riding motor cycles that have sidecars, and I am wondering how far the Minister has gone regarding concessions for pensioners.

About one-third of the explanation relates to the Commonwealth Government and the reasons (which we all know) for the introduction of the Bill. The Minister's Commonwealth colleagues have let him down, so he must raise this money from the people of South Australia. It is a slug that hits the ordinary person in the pocket and it is typical of legislation that Socialist Governments introduce to impose high taxes to pay for rash promises that they do not keep.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This Bill represents a degree of highway robbery that has not been equalled in this House for a long time.

Mr. Nankivell: It's Starlight robbery, isn't it?

Dr. TONKIN: Not even Captain Starlight would have considered getting such a rake-off from the activities of his highwaymen against road users. I congratulate my colleagues on the way in which they have summarized various objectionable aspects of the Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's a mutual admiration society!

Dr. TONKIN: That is more than I can say for the Minister of Education. I agree that only one course of action was open to the Minister of Transport when he was considering the various alternatives. The third alternative (of increasing State revenue not only to meet the demand of the Australian Government legislation but also to ensure that our own programmes are not drastically cut) is about the only decision that could be made. I do not believe it was accidental that the Minister dealt first with the Commonwealth Government's actions. Above all, he has sought to obscure the Commonwealth Government's parsimonious attitude towards the States; I believe it is a wilfully parsimonious attitude. I have some sympathy for the Minister; I am sorry he is not here,

because it is not often that I feel sympathy for him. However, he should not have been forced into the position of having to make this decision. The Commonwealth Government should have given back to the State a fair share of its income from revenue from its tax-raising powers. The reasons for the introduction of this Bill go back to the Commonwealth Government, showing quite clearly that that Government does not recognize that there is any inflation. It could not possibly recognize that under the present terms, because, if it recognized that inflation was running at more than the 15 per cent quoted by the Minister, it would undoubtedly have given bigger sums to the State. If it had awarded bigger sums of money to the State, without strings, we would have found no need, or less need, to introduce this legislation.

In addition to the Commonwealth Government's lack of recognition that inflation is a problem (and we have known that in other spheres, although I shall not transgress by canvassing them at present), this situation shows quite clearly the degree of control exercised by the Commonwealth over the activities of the States, especially in relation to highways, and its control over State activities and local government activities simply by controlling the funds available to those bodies. By developing needs, handing out special grants and special loans, with special conditions and strings attached—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with this Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, I have done so, Sir. I am saying that, by handing out special grants and special loans, with special conditions attached, the Commonwealth Government has created a climate in which any small deviation from what has become accepted as the normal puts this State and other States at a tremendous economic disadvantage. We would not be considering such steep rises in motor vehicle charges if the Commonwealth Government did not exercise such control by means of its fiscal policy. Some increases may have been necessary, and no-one is pretending that they were not. Obviously, just to maintain our programme of road building, roadworks, and highway maintenance we must have additional money to allow for the degree of inflation that has occurred. One can see the difficulty confronting the State Government, but why should we allow for inflation by raising additional revenue when the Commonwealth Government is determined not to allow for inflation, certainly in relation to the money it is willing to give us? I do not believe that inflation is solely to blame for the present situation, nor do I believe that inflation is the sole reason for the introduction of this legislation. The blame lies fairly and squarely on the Commonwealth for not recognizing that inflationary influences are coming to bear. The Commonwealth Government is quite clearly willing to allow the load to fall on the motorist; he is left to pick up the short-fall.

I believe the Commonwealth Government is deliberately ignoring the effects of inflation and is deliberately making variations in its roads legislation; by so doing it knows perfectly well that it will require South Australia to provide additional funds for matching requirements. Why it should leave inflationary allowance to us I do not know, nor can I see why roads should be maintained on a per capita basis rather than a usage basis. I know the member for Heysen has views on that, and no doubt we will hear them presently. I was referring to a base rate and perhaps an increased share of the fuel tax. Once again, we are most dependent on the Commonwealth Government. It is no good trying to keep the Commonwealth Government out of the debate

in this context. It is holding the State to ransom and, if ever we needed any proof that this was its intention, we see it in the introduction of this Bill. Members on this side have, for a considerable time, been saying that this is the case, and we have seen examples of it in other legislation. We have warned consistently that this State and its finances are in a precarious position, and that they depend for their viability on the goodwill of the Commonwealth Government. We have not been listened to; I believe that many people in this State do not think this is really the situation. They say, "It cannot happen to us," crediting the Commonwealth Government with far more honesty, integrity, and feeling for the goodwill of the States than it has ever had. As a result, I do not think people know exactly where they are heading. This legislation provides one more irrefutable item of proof of the Commonwealth Government's intention. It does intend to take over the States. This legislation, introduced by this State Government, has been brought about by the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policy and its policy of taking over the States no matter what the cost to any Australian individual.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill to the extent that I believe the Minister was forced into a situation where something had to be done if the South Australian road programme was not to deteriorate further than it has already deteriorated under the present Government. The raising of further revenue from registrations is alien to what I consider fair and just to the people who use the roads. Some people drive 160 000 kilometres a year, while some drive only 8 000 km. These fees are an injustice to the people who do not use their cars as much as others. When the Commonwealth Government accepts that the millions of dollars taken from road users in petrol tax should be refunded and roads paid for according to the extent to which they are used, we will have some sense of justice. The same principle applies to rates. The necessity for all this has been brought about by the Commonwealth Government. The Minister said that this had to be done because of inflation. Only one body in Australia has caused inflation, and that is the Commonwealth Government, because of its last Budget. The Minister explained why these taxes had to be increased. The Commonwealth Government by its deliberate action a year ago increased the demand for goods beyond our capacity to produce them—

The SPEAKER: Order! The debate is on the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I am merely linking it up with what the Minister said.

Mr. Simmons: What about inflation in Japan?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about inflation.

Mr. McANANEY: Then I will move on to something that I can really link the Bill to—railways and public transport. Grants to the State, instead of being spent on roads, have gone in allocations to public transport. That is something that every fair-minded person would strongly object to. Those who want to use public transport should pay for it; if we want to use the roads, we must pay for them. That is a fundamental truth. That is why we are getting into such a mess in Australia. These academics, Labor people and, regrettably, some Liberals in Canberra think we can run an artificial economy and provide free services. I agree that they should be provided free for the sick and the aged, but how can someone in Canberra assess our State needs and tell us how to spend our money in South Australia? That is going beyond the bounds of

reason. That is why, instead of there being the prosperity that there should be in Australia, people are becoming unhappy, because they are being sluggish for something that someone else is using. We are getting away from the basis of a good living. For the last 10 years I have been telling the House what to do; I do not claim to be a genius—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member come back to the Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: The mess that the Australian Government is in now could have been prevented 12 months ago. The Commonwealth Government has decided to make smaller road grants from Commonwealth funds. Before the last road grants were assessed, the grants were based on population, car registrations, and area. Under that scheme, South Australia received much more than it should have received based on numbers of population. Then, under the last roads agreement, South Australia's grants were reduced to a certain extent, but the State was still getting far more money than its population warranted. However, on the basis of the amount of petrol used in South Australia, which is greater per capita than the amount used in any other State because of the greater distances South Australians have to travel, we are entitled logically and honestly to receive a greater percentage of the road grants than our population warrants, because we have these larger distances to travel. After all, the money is collected from South Australia but our weak-kneed Minister, despite what he said over the telephone to his Commonwealth colleagues, was weak in his attitude and must have accepted this situation like a lamb. If he had not, we should not be in our present predicament.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member return to the Bill under consideration?

Mr. McANANEY: Surely, when we are discussing revenue that is to be spent on roads (and the Minister has given us three pages of explanation on roads and on what the Commonwealth Government would do about roads) I can continue to talk about roads. The Minister suggested there were three ways in which revenue could be increased. He dealt with the best way to do it in the unfortunate circumstances in which he found himself.

I support this Bill only because we need the money to spend on our roads. The Commonwealth Government has put us in this unfortunate position. The Minister has not made a good effort to get what South Australia should get. I do not agree that the way in which the money raised by this legislation is to be spent should be directed by Canberra. I feel strongly about that, because no-one in Canberra can assess the true position or needs of the South Australian roads, except for the national highways: I think the Commonwealth Government is warranted in saying that some proportion of the money should go to the national highways.

How can someone in Canberra determine how the minor roads, in which local government has so much say, should have money spent on them? How can someone in Canberra assess where the money should go? What moral right has Canberra to direct how money raised by the South Australian Government should be spent? We need a stronger Government rather than the complacent State Government in South Australia today. The Ministers are getting tired. The Minister of Education is getting teasy; he definitely needs an inquiry into the Education Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about education. The Bill deals with the Motor Vehicles Act.

Mr. McANANEY: The money must be got from somewhere, but it should come from another source.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the remarks of my Leader and colleagues in expressing their concern about and dissatisfaction with the Bill. The Minister has referred to inflation, which has affected the Highways Department, and the money we are now compelled to raise to match grants that we may or may not receive from the Commonwealth Government. At this stage we are not sure what we will receive, because legislation has not passed the Commonwealth Parliament. Although threats have been made by the Commonwealth Minister about Senate action, I think the money will eventually be forthcoming. This is the first of the new imposts that South Australian taxpayers will experience, and it affects most of the population. We in South Australia are motor-car orientated and support the motor vehicle industry, so obviously this is an area from which the Government can raise extra finance. In the financial year ended June 30, 1974, motor vehicle registration and licence fees contributed \$22 367 000 to the State's Revenue Account.

Whatever imposts are levied, motorists in South Australia must be affected. In New South Wales a driver's licence will cost \$10 and, although our fees may seem to be low compared to other States, this situation does not give this Government a licence to increase fees, which should be kept to a minimum. I am disappointed that the Commonwealth Government is insisting on our providing matching grants in order that we may undertake urgent roadworks in this State and continue our programme of road safety, because it means that motorists will be penalized. The Minister's reference in his second reading explanation to the imperial measurement of 5 cwt should have been rounded off and made 250 kilograms or $\frac{1}{4}$ tonne. This legislation taxes the working man and the people who put the present Government into office, because they are the people who depend on motor vehicles. These taxes will not help the average man in the present economic crisis. Although this is the first tax slug for our citizens, I hope that any future increases because of inflation caused by the Government's actions will not be as severe.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): This Bill is a result of highway robbery by Ned Kelly Whitlam, who crushes State Governments with his Commonwealth octopus, while at the same time he uses that same monster with its ever-grasping, clutching, power-grabbing, and soul-destroying tentacles to embrace local government. As John Citizen is again to be unfairly fleeced, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I, too, oppose the Bill. In the Governor's Speech we were assured that any effects on South Australia caused by the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policies would be closely scrutinized by the State Government. My interpretation of that comment was that the Government would protect South Australians who suffered hardship. Can we assume from the contents of this Bill that this is the Government's interpretation of the Governor's comment? If that is the case, heaven help us from now on.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): From the comment made by the member for Fisher in describing the Right Honourable Prime Minister of Australia (which I will not repeat because it was extremely rude), it is obvious that Opposition members have short memories. The member for Fisher was in this House in 1969; I know that the member for Bragg was not; I do not think the Leader of the Opposition was; I do not think the member for Kavel was; and the member for Alexandra certainly was not.

When Opposition members refer to the bad deal that South Australia received from the Commonwealth Government in the allocation of funds, almost all of them condemn the Australian Government and me for not getting something better.

Dr. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chapman: Will you get back to the Bill?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The heading in the *Advertiser* of March 14 states, "South Australian road grants a disgrace".

Mr. VENNING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is not speaking to the Bill but is referring to something that happened many years ago. This Bill was introduced only last week, and I ask that the Minister be directed to confine his remarks to it.

The SPEAKER: I will not uphold the point of order, as the rules of debate are that the second reading explanation of a Bill shall be given. Thereafter, the Bill shall be debated and, in closing the debate, the mover has an opportunity to reply to any statements that are made during the second reading debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. Opposition members were constantly stopped from referring to certain points, on which the Minister is now trying to transgress. How can the Minister be replying to those matters when Opposition members were not permitted to refer to them?

The SPEAKER: The mover can reply to any statements that were permitted to be made during the course of the debate and, like every other honourable member, the honourable Minister will be confined to referring to the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to reply to some of the criticisms made by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. I remind Opposition members that the then Premier, Mr. Hall (under whom the member for Davenport did not serve, although the Leader of the Opposition did as a back-bencher), said that he could not imagine more disgraceful action by the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see (and I am sure you cannot either, Sir) what relevance a 1969 newspaper report has to this Bill, which was introduced into this House during the present session and the second reading debate on which has taken place today. It has no bearing whatsoever on a 1969 newspaper report.

The SPEAKER: I should like to hear what the honourable Minister has to say, to see whether it is relevant. However, I ask the honourable Minister to confine his remarks to the Bill and to any statements that were permitted to be made during the second reading debate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Numerous Opposition members said that South Australia's proposed allocation was an indictment on the South Australian Government and especially on me, as Minister. Indeed, it was stated that it was the worst allocation that South Australia had ever received.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The trouble is that a few Opposition members are edgy because of the late sitting last night. If they listened to me, they would know—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about a late night.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If some Opposition members who are now complaining examine *Hansard* tomorrow, they will see that the remarks to which I am referring were made by numerous members. I draw attention to their criticisms made then that this was the worst allocation South Australia had ever received. However, it was received from a Liberal Government in Canberra. I commend that issue of the *Advertiser* to members because, if they read the report, it may educate them. I am interested in the Opposition's attitude to this Bill. The Leader said that he was opposed to all the increases and, one by one, his members got up and said the same thing. However, they were not willing to state exactly what their position was. If the Opposition is opposed to these charges and votes against them, as a result of which the increases are not adopted, we return to the alternatives that I cited in the second reading explanation.

Dr. Eastick: Be careful how much of that second reading speech you quote!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The point which the Leader made and on which he was supported by most, if not all, of his colleagues was that there should not be any increase in the State's revenue, so that South Australia would therefore forgo the assistance that the Government hoped to receive from the Australian Government if and when the Senate came to its senses. If the State's revenue is not increased, the Government will drastically have to reduce the Highways Department's programme and cut assistance to local government. That is what each and every Opposition member is advocating.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They want to have it both ways.

Dr. Tonkin: You weren't listening.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unless this additional revenue is raised (and this is spelt out in simple, clear terms), the Highways Department's programme and the assistance that is given to councils will have to be reduced drastically. That is what Opposition members have advocated tonight. I hope they are all willing to return to their districts and tell councils that they advocated a reduction in their vote.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hoggood, Hudson, Jennings, Kcneally, King, Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Burdon, Dunstan, and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Goldsworthy, and Wardle.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the definition of "caravan" include an ordinary trailer on which there is a mattress and a canvas top?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Although I imagine that it would, it is up to the Registrar to decide.

Mr. BECKER: Utilities can be fitted with a cover over the tray that more or less becomes permanent. How would such vehicles be classified?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When a person registers a vehicle, he makes a declaration that the Registrar either accepts or rejects. In the past, the registration fee of \$6 covered trailers up to a weight of one tonne. Therefore, whether a trailer weighed 152 kg or 660 kg, the registration fee was the same. However, now the position will be different. In the case of a caravan, a person will make a declaration to the Registrar, who will exercise his authority in determining the position. In the instance of a utility's being converted to a caravan, I would understand that the vehicle would be basically a utility.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Registration fees for certain pensioners."

Mr. BECKER: It is encouraging to note that a concession has been made in the case of pensioners. Could this concession be extended to people on fixed incomes, such as superannuation payments? People who qualify for a small pension may miss out on the concession card.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If people qualify for a pensioner certificate, they qualify for this concession.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the concession for pensioners apply only to a motor car or motor bike, or will it cover trailers and caravans?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The existing provision will simply be maintained. As far as I know, it applies to any one vehicle, other than a commercial vehicle, of a weight less than two tonnes. The principle involved has not been altered, the figure of 15 per cent having simply been converted to 30 per cent. This is the only way of maintaining registration fees of pensioners at the same level.

Mr. Mathwin: Does this cover caravans?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is one vehicle.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Interpretation."

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say what stage planning has reached for persons other than police officers to conduct practical driving tests? I agree with the Minister that we should relieve the Police Force of a considerable amount of this work.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This depends on a number of factors, not the least of which is the passage of this Bill. The plans to which the honourable member referred are well advanced but, until the legislation is passed, we do not have the funds to implement them.

Clause passed.

Clause 12—"Temporary driving permit."

Mr. MATHWIN: New section 72a provides for a penalty of \$200, but there is no provision for a maximum penalty and a minimum penalty. Will there be any flexibility in imposing penalties?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In all legislation, the penalty stated is the maximum, and it is up to the court to determine what the penalty will be, up to that maximum.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—"Licence and learner's permit fee."

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister give further details of his plans for road safety?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Later, I will introduce legislation to amend the Highways Act, and road safety will be dealt with there. Of the \$2 increase in the driver's licence fee, 50c will be devoted to road safety.

Clause passed.

Clause 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Fee for practical driving test."

Mr. RODDA: Can an authorized examiner fail a person who has undergone a driving test, and can the authorized examiner refund the fee?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: New section 79b simply provides for the increased fee.

Mr. MATHWIN: I take it that pensioners have to pay the full fee for the practical driving test. Is any assistance given to pensioners in this connection? I point out that some pensioners are required to undergo a test annually. Do such pensioners have to pay a fee each year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The tests to which the honourable member has referred are covered by a different provision, and no fee at all is attached to such tests.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, as it comes from Committee, is still objectionable to members on this side. In replying to the second reading debate, the Minister said that the Opposition objected to funds being made available to local government. I tell the Minister that that has never been—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader must know by now that, in speaking to the third reading of the Bill, he must speak to it as it has come out of Committee. This is a Bill dealing with amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act.

Dr. EASTICK: What I say relative to the Bill may be entirely different from what the Minister says.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is a reflection on the Chair.

Dr. EASTICK: If it is a reflection on the Chair, it is deserved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Dr. EASTICK: At no stage during the debate on this issue or on the provisions in the Bill as it entered the third reading stage was there a statement by members on this side that local government should be denied funds.

The SPEAKER: Order! Those remarks are out of order, because in the third reading stage only the Bill as it actually came out of Committee can be discussed. There is no provision for any deviation; discussion must relate to the actual wording of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: The wording of the Bill provides for an impost on the people of this State for one purpose and one purpose only, namely, to cover the mishandling of the economy of Australia by the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must rule those remarks out of order. There is nothing in the Bill except provision for certain increases authorized by the various clauses. In the third reading stage, that is the only matter that the House can discuss.

Dr. EASTICK: The Bill at the third reading stage is not acceptable to members on this side, who acknowledge the importance of local government and recognize its needs. We will oppose the Bill, appreciating that, if the Government accepts its responsibility to adjust its priorities to ensure that funds are spent where they should be spent, it can provide for those funds without proceeding with these imposts.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Rus-sack, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Burdon, Dunstan, and McRae.

Noes—Messrs. Allen, Tonkin, and Wardle.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 22, at 2 p.m.