

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 7, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

TAILEM BEND SILOS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Over some period disquiet has been expressed in the Tailem Bend area concerning the erection of silos in the centre of the town. These silos are, I understand, now being constructed by the Railways Department. The Tailem Bend council has expressed considerable distress over the matter. Approaches have been made to the Railways Department not only as to the unsightliness or unsatisfactory nature of the silos but also as to the inconvenience that will be caused to residents of the town and, in addition, as to the capacity of the roads constructed in the council area to carry the traffic necessary to bring materials to the silos. None of these representations (and I understand additional representations have been made to the Government) seems to have been successful. Indeed, as I have said, I am informed that the construction of the silos is proceeding. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have an investigation made into this matter to see whether better account cannot be given to the request of local residents and the council to have these silos re-sited rather than that they should be allowed to create a situation in the town that will be to the detriment of the majority of the residents?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss this with the Minister as a matter of urgency. I understand that the Railways Commissioner is personally looking into it at present.

SANDERSTON AND MILENDELLA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made regarding the provision of a reticulated water supply for primary producers in the

Sanderston and Milendella areas, in the Angas and Murray Districts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Doubtless the honourable member will recall that I have told him that the Government had prepared a scheme along the lines of the one to which he has referred, and this scheme was subsequently submitted to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report. I understand that next Monday the committee will visit parts of the area concerned regarding the supply of water to country lands in the Sanderston and Milendella areas, that inspections will be carried out on Monday morning, that at 2 p.m. evidence will be taken at the Milendella hall from interested ratepayers, and that further evidence will be taken in Mannum that evening from representatives of the Mannum council. After this investigation, the committee will again consider the matter.

PORT AUGUSTA BARYTES

Mr. RICHES: The following report appeared in last Saturday's *Melbourne Age*, at page 15:

A new company, Jemma Exploration Pty., has been formed in Melbourne to produce barytes at Port Augusta, South Australia. The company's plant will have maximum capacity of about 1,000 tons a week, and is expected to start operating in about eight or nine weeks. It is understood to be negotiating to sell barytes to Asian markets. Although the company's mineral areas near Port Augusta contain a lot of barium sulphate, it is investigating other minerals. In the same area are copper and manganese mineralization, as well as talc. These are being examined to see if they are commercial. In Victoria, Jemma Exploration is looking for nickel and cobalt in Gippsland, and also in the far west of the State. Associated with the company are two Melbourne men, Messrs. R. C. Davison and R. G. Muller.

As this industry seems to be of some magnitude and the report states that it will be operating in eight weeks, will the Premier say whether he has any knowledge of these operations? If he has, can he give any information to the House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have no knowledge of this project. I cannot recall any approach having been made for any type of Government intervention or assistance in the matter. The arrangements may well be within the knowledge of the Minister of Mines: I would expect that to be so. Many projects proceed quietly and swiftly if no particular problems are associated with the industries concerned, and apparently this must be the case in respect of this industry.

Mr. Riches: Will you inquire of the Minister?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. No difficulty about this industry has been referred to me and I do not know of any approach having been made to the Industrial Development Branch on behalf of this company, although there may have been some long-arranged programme in respect of which contact was made before I took office. I will bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Mines and of the Director of Industrial Promotion.

Mr. Riches: Is there any truth in the story?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer the article to these two gentlemen and bring down a report dealing with the article and with the project.

GERANIUM AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: The drinking water supply at the Geranium Area School is provided through a pipeline that runs close to the underneath side of the roof of the building. Many times during the year, particularly in summer months, the water is extremely hot, and inquiries have been made whether some system could be devised whereby the water could be cooled. I understand that it has been suggested that a pipe could be taken down into the school tank, which is situated in the schoolyard and which would act as a coolant before the water was used for drinking. Will the Minister of Works look into the matter, consider this suggestion, and ascertain whether something cannot be done as urgently as possible?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: It seems that, although a school in the honourable member's district is getting a free supply of hot water he now requests the supply of cold water. I will consider whether something can be done.

BUS FARES

Mr. HUDSON: Recently, the Chairman of the Municipal Tramways Trust announced an increase in bus fares for travel on the first and second sections. For one section the cost has risen from 5c to 10c (an increase of 100 per cent) and for the second section the increase is from 10c to 15c. My question also concerns the rail rapid transit system under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan which on each line involves removing some stations so that stations will be spaced much farther apart than they are at present, and recommends that feeder bus services be provided to connect to the more widely

spaced stations. I point out to the Attorney-General that the increased fares mean that, apart from the cost of the rail fare, a rail rapid transit journey that involves connecting with a feeder bus could involve a bus fare of 20c a day for one section each way or 30c a day for two sections each way, in addition to the cost of the rail fare. I presume that these higher charges for one-section or two-section journeys would, almost certainly, make the use of a feeder bus service inappropriate, as only a small number of people would use it. Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, say whether it is a fact that the Government has decided to do away with the rail rapid transit system proposed under the M.A.T.S. Report, as it would involve a cost to the traveller far in excess of what the traveller would be willing to pay? Further, was the increase in bus fares approved by Cabinet?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Of course it is not a fact that Cabinet has made any decision on the question of the rail rapid transit system, as the honourable member knows perfectly well. The Government has stated repeatedly in the last two or three months that no decisions will be made on the M.A.T.S. proposals until the comments, criticisms and suggestions of the general public have been expressed over a period of six months. The reply to that part of the honourable member's question (as he well knows) is "No". The Government very much regretted that it was necessary to increase fares at all but, economically, this became absolutely essential and could not be avoided.

Mr. Corcoran: Last year—

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, well, the honourable member talks about last year, but I have figures to show that what has happened recently has made this rise in fares unavoidable. During recent weeks, the following weekly wage increases have been awarded by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust: \$2.20 to tradesmen; \$1.35 in the total wage; \$3.00 to bus drivers; \$2.50 to tram motormen; and \$1.25 to \$1.50 to bus conductors.

Mr. Virgo: Do you think it should be taken off them?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did not say that, I did not imply it, and the honourable member knows that what he has said just is not so. These higher wage rates will increase the trust's operating costs by \$220,000 in the

present financial year and by \$290,000 in 1969-70. Since fares were last adjusted in October, 1966, there have also been other wage increases, costing a further \$280,000 a year. A re-assessment of the trust's budget indicates that without the fare increases there would have been a loss of \$396,000 for 1968-69, with a higher figure for 1969-70 when the full effect of these wage increases will be felt. I am told that the trust has been making all practical efforts to improve efficiency and reduce costs, and the present fare increases are essential. The one-section fare has been increased from 5c to 10c and the two-section fare from 10c to 15c. The last increase in the one-section fare was in 1957 and in the two-section fare in 1964. I have taken this opportunity to give those facts and figures to the House, because I think it is important that the general public should know that the Government and the trust believed that there was no other way to cope with the increases in wages and other costs that have occurred.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I refer to the Municipal Tramways Trust report, which was laid on the table of this House earlier this year. This shows that the best trading result since 1945 was achieved by the trust during last year and that the loss this year is the smallest deficit incurred by the trust since 1945, when a surplus of \$18,000 resulted. The deficit is certainly small and, given assistance similar to that given to the trust from time to time by previous Governments, one could expect that, with such a trading result as this, the position mentioned in the report could continue to occur: namely, with Government support, increased operating costs could be absorbed.

Despite the statement in the report, we have now been informed that bus fares in certain areas will be increased, and these increases will hit heavily many people who need to use the buses for daily transport. Having regard to the increases in wages and, given this background regarding the operations last year and also considering the normal Government support to enable the trust to maintain low-cost public transport, there should not have been an increase in bus fares at this time. Will the Attorney-General say what can be the justification, with the trading background shown in the report, for increased bus fares, if the Government is prepared to continue the normal support which has been given for years past to the trust and to which I have referred?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable Leader, apparently, did not listen to

the figures I gave when replying earlier to the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson).

Mr. Corcoran: He did.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, if he listened, he either did not understand the figures or has deliberately ignored them, because they show clearly the increase in costs that would result from the increases in wages, and I tell him again that the reassessment indicates a loss of \$396,000 for this year. This is because of the increases that have occurred, I think, by and large since the State Budget was framed. I think this is the first year for many years in which we have not directly supported the trust, and my recollection is that members of the Opposition did not question that when the Budget was before them.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The trust got \$20,000 last year.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. It was thought then, luckily, that it could be cut out altogether. By and large, the wage increases have occurred since then. I know that the report is couched in fairly optimistic terms, but I again draw the Leader's attention to the words I used earlier (and his deputy assures me that the Leader listened to what I said), that wage increases have necessitated a reassessment of the situation since the report was issued.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why not give as much as we gave?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What amount?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We gave \$20,000.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow these interruptions and conversations between the honourable Leader and the Attorney-General to take place. A question has been asked and the Attorney has replied to it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He hasn't.

The SPEAKER: Well, the Leader can ask a subsequent question.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General said that the Government would not be making any decisions about particular parts of the M.A.T.S. Report until the six-month period had elapsed, the implication being that the report was not considered when the particular increase in fares was determined. However, I point out that the rail rapid transit plan in the M.A.T.S. recommendations presumes low-price fares for one and two sections, otherwise members of the public who will use public transport will never be induced to travel by bus for a mile or two to railway stations

that will be much more widely spaced, if they have to spend 20c or 30c a day in bus fares in addition to the railway fare. It would therefore seem that there is a strong case for reconsidering the M.A.T.S. recommendations with respect to eliminating certain stations: for example, between Oaklands and Brighton the M.A.T.S. Report proposes that the Warradale and Hove railway stations should be eliminated and that the people going to those stations should travel by bus either to Brighton or Oaklands. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider these points when the Government determines its attitude to the rail rapid transit system?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot for the life of me see any connection between the increases in the fares that were gazetted a week ago and any decision on the rail rapid transit system which is proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan, although the honourable member in his question implied that there was some reason, because fares have been raised in this way, for abandoning the whole concept of the feeder bus services. I personally cannot accept that there is any connection at all between the two.

Mr. Hudson: You realize that the increase in bus fares applies particularly to short trips?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, if I had not before, the honourable member has repeated it not once but several times in the course of explaining his questions today, so I could not have missed it, could I? But I cannot see that there is any connection between the short-term matter of raising the fares, as has been done, and the long-term projects in the M.A.T.S. Report, to which the honourable member has referred. I am surprised that the Opposition has waited until today to raise this matter. After all, these rises were gazetted last Thursday; they came into operation—

Mr. Corcoran: That has nothing to do with the question.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —on Saturday, yet the Opposition has waited until Thursday to comment on them.

Mr. HUDSON: I realize that the Attorney-General is not an expert on transport matters and that in this House he is purely the agent of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Although it may not be possible for the Attorney to appreciate the connection between the rise in bus fares for the one and two-section journeys and the rail rapid transit proposals in the M.A.T.S. Report, I assure him

that there is such a connection, and I would therefore appreciate his passing on my remarks to his colleague so that he might consider them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If and when there is a decision to put into effect this part of the M.A.T.S. proposals I am sure there can be at that stage a proper reassessment and readjustment of M.T.T. fares.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Following the figures under the heading "Operating Costs", the Tramways Trust report for the year ended June 30, 1968, on page 4 states:

The above items were more than offset by improved operating methods which saved \$223,000, lower depreciation charges \$48,000, reduced interest \$43,000, savings in the cost of materials and other sundry items \$3,000, and an increase of \$16,000 in sundry receipts. These economies enabled the lower revenue receipts and higher wage costs to be absorbed and the loss for the year to be reduced.

In view of his reply to the Leader, will the Attorney-General consider the fact that, in previous years, the Government's practice has been to assist the trust, in the hope of avoiding the type of heavy increase in fares recently imposed on the public by the trust? Can he say whether Government assistance could not have been provided to avoid this increase, as the wage and salary increases about which he has spoken could well have been (and no doubt were) anticipated some time ago by the trust as a result of applications before the court?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My recollection is that the sum disbursed by the Government to the trust over the years has dropped progressively as the trust's finances have returned to better shape.

Mr. Broomhill: Since the introduction of buses.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let us say that the overall undertaking of the trust has improved financially because of one reason or another. I think that, for a few years, the sum provided by the Government was only \$20,000 a year. I think that last year (the last year of the honourable member's Government) \$20,000 was provided. This year the Government felt able to cease this financial assistance altogether, and the matter was quite evident in the Budget, although I do not think it was questioned at that time by any honourable member.

Mr. Broomhill: Yes, it was.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, if it were, that was the appropriate time to do

it, and I congratulate the honourable member if it were he who raised the matter. Since then the increases to which I have referred have occurred. We were faced with an alternative. Obviously, as the honourable member implied in his question, the expected deficit could be made up in two ways: either by a subvention by the Government (it would have had to be substantial in view of the figures I quoted this afternoon) or by an increase in fares. The trust recommended these increases in fares to cover the extra costs, and the honourable member knows as well as any other honourable member (I hope) the financial situation in which the Government is placed, and that is why this course of action has been preferred to the other.

Mr. HURST: During the Budget debate, the omission of provision for assistance to the Tramways Trust was mentioned. The Treasurer, in reply to the member for West Torrens, stated:

The trust's finances have improved and, indeed, have been comparatively stable since the big losses sustained during re-organization. The Government hopes the trust will now operate without direct financial assistance from the Budget. This does not mean, of course, that such assistance would not be forthcoming if genuinely required.

In view of the savage increases that have been imposed on certain sections of Municipal Tramways Trust routes—the charge for the first section being raised from 5c to 10c (100 per cent increase) and that for the second section being raised from 10c to 15c (50 per cent increase)—would the Government reconsider this matter, because it could have serious effects on the transport system of the State, and see whether some assistance could be given the Tramways Trust to avoid the imposition of these savage increases?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to discuss with my colleague this matter and all the other matters raised this afternoon by honourable members.

HAM PRICES

Mr. VENNING: Is the Treasurer, as Minister in charge of the Prices Branch, aware that wholesale prices of Christmas hams this year are considerably above those quoted by manufacturers last year, even though the producer is receiving only 27c a pound for pigs as compared with 34c a pound last year? In other words, the margin between the producer's price and the wholesale price is 50c

a pound this year as against 36c a pound last year, using leg hams as an example. Will the Treasurer ask the Prices Commissioner to investigate this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. I am grateful to the honourable member for raising the matter and for giving me these figures. I will refer the question to the Prices Commissioner as a matter of urgency and ask him to report to me as soon as he can.

SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the Government's present attitude to its pre-election undertaking to provide medical services for independent schools?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have obtained the following report, which was submitted to the Minister of Health:

Following your instruction for a survey to be carried out to determine how many independent schools would avail themselves of the medical service offered, three meetings were arranged with the Catholic Director of Education, Headmasters Association (Independent Schools) and Headmistresses Association (Independent Schools). So far, the first two meetings have been held and the meeting with the Headmistresses Association is scheduled for early November. At this stage it appears that all Catholic schools representing 25,000 children out of a total enrolment of 37,000 children in independent schools will avail themselves of this service and the headmasters of the other independent schools present at the meeting felt that their school councils would also avail themselves of this service. Only one letter has been received so far confirming the school's acceptance, but others should be received soon.

I think the member for West Torrens will understand from that current report that moves are being made to implement my Government's election promise as soon as is practicable.

CIGARETTES

Mr. EVANS: A report in today's *Advertiser* states that in the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday the Minister for Health (Dr. Forbes) announced that he and the State Ministers of Health were investigating the possibility of introducing legislation to make it compulsory to state on cigarette packets that smoking might be hazardous to health. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Minister of Health and also investigate the possibility of introducing legislation to control cigarette advertising on television?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This matter is receiving much publicity at present. It seems

to be generally accepted by medical practitioners that harm can be done by excessive cigarette smoking. The question is in two parts: first, a warning, in effect, to people who smoke cigarettes; and secondly, restriction of cigarette advertising. I believe the Minister of Health is competent to consider these matters fully and, no doubt, he will also obtain a report from his advisers.

TARCOOLA SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Education may recall that the negotiations regarding the provision of a cooling system and water supply for the Tarcoola school were rather protracted. Will she ascertain whether a tender has been accepted for this work? If one has been accepted, will she make every effort to have the work completed as soon as possible, so that the facilities may be available during the coming summer?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In view of the imminence of summer I will certainly take up this matter urgently and obtain a report for the honourable member.

HOMES FOR AGED

Mr. GILES: Because of the lack of satisfactory accommodation for aged people, the percentage of aged patients is increasing in country hospitals. Will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, say what assistance is available from the Commonwealth Government to build aged persons' homes in the country?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a detailed report.

GREYHOUND RACING

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 22 about the extension of totalizator betting facilities to greyhound racing?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a short reply, which I think I hardly need read but, having looked at it, I believe it stands as the answer to the honourable member's question. At the moment at least, the Government does not intend to introduce legislation to provide for betting facilities at dog racing meetings in this State. I am mindful that individual members expressed their opinions on this matter to some degree when the relevant legislation was before the House either last session or during the previous session. That Bill was introduced by the honourable member himself and,

from memory, I believe he then said he did not expect an application for this type of betting on dog racing.

Mr. McKee: Not at that time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I repeat that the Government does not intend to introduce legislation to provide for such betting.

SPARE PARTS

Mr. EDWARDS: It has come to my notice that several of the large machinery firms importing farm machinery into this continent are not providing spare parts for machines which they have sold and which break down. Last week a farmer told me he had purchased a header for about \$15,000 and had used it for two years. This year, when it was given its pre-season run, it blew a head gasket and the owner was unable to obtain a replacement in Australia. Also, another farmer told me that he recently had trouble with a large tractor he had bought from a firm, which had imported it from overseas. When it broke down, he was told no spare parts were available in Australia. The same problem applies in relation to motor cars and trucks, motor car manufacturers being one of the greatest offenders in this connection. In view of this, can the Premier say whether something cannot be done to protect farmers in regard to this serious problem of obtaining spare parts for imported farm machinery?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will ask the Treasurer to obtain the views of the Prices Commissioner on this matter, because the Commissioner may very well have encountered this problem in his price-fixing deliberations or in assessing the availability of certain goods. However, I remind the honourable member that one of the sales points that most wise purchasers look for when purchasing machinery is the availability or otherwise of service for machines. It well behoves anyone purchasing a motor vehicle or tractor or any harvesting machinery to ensure that the maker or the firm from which he buys the machine is reputable and that it will continue in business and provide the necessary service.

MOONTA RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUGHES: I refer to the proposed cancellation of rail passenger and parcel services between Moonta and Adelaide. Recently I received correspondence from the Moonta corporation inviting me to attend a council meeting at Moonta to discuss with the council the future of rail transport to that area.

At the meeting on October 21, I answered questions put to me by councillors. However, I was unable to answer three questions, and I believe that only the Minister of Roads and Transport would have been able to answer them. The Mayor of Moonta made a statement to the *Advertiser*, part of which reads as follows:

Mr. Dowling said tonight that Mr. Hughes, M.P., had attended this week's meeting of the Moonta council to answer questions with relation to the proposed closure. The council meeting was adjourned to enable this matter to be discussed. Mr. Hughes was unable to answer many of the questions put to him, but read a prepared statement to the council.

I point out that the part of the article which states that I was unable to answer many questions is totally untrue. However, it is true that I read a prepared statement, because that statement contained all the information I had received from the Minister. In an endeavour to please the corporation, I ask the Attorney-General to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the alternative service will run past Moonta to Moonta Bay and on to Port Hughes; whether the fares will be lower or higher for road transport than for rail transport; and whether passengers using the proposed road service will be forced to stay overnight in Adelaide.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to try to help the honourable member in his difficulties and to seek this information from my colleague.

RENMARK HOUSING

Mr. ARNOLD: The Loan Estimates indicated that, during 1967-68, eight houses were built in the Renmark area and that the building of 30 houses was to be commenced during 1968-69. Can the Minister of Housing say whether the proposed programme is under way, and will he supply information about the availability of rental houses in the Renmark area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If my memory is correct, the honourable member asked me a question on this matter about five or six weeks ago, and yesterday he asked me whether I had any further information on it. I made a preliminary inquiry this morning, and I have asked my secretary to obtain from the General Manager of the Housing Trust an up-to-date report, which I hope will be available for the honourable member on Tuesday.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: On October 24, I asked the Premier to obtain from the Minister of Health certain information about alterations and improvements to the Mount Gambier Hospital. As I have not yet received a reply, will the Premier raise this matter with his colleague again to see whether that information can be obtained?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As the honourable member's question is still with my colleague, I will again bring it to his notice and ask whether he can expedite a reply.

MOUNT BURR HOUSES

Mr. CORCORAN: When I visited Mount Burr recently I was told that the Woods and Forests Department would not supply power points for bedrooms in departmental houses. Evidently this was a policy adopted during the time when the department supplied to the town power from its own resources, but the town has long since been supplied with power by the Electricity Trust. I understand that at present two points are provided in the kitchen, and two in the lounge room. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests to see whether this policy cannot be reviewed and adjusted so that power points can be installed in the bedrooms of these rental houses?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask my colleague to see whether this can be done.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. FREEBAIN: Although the session is now well advanced, there are no fewer than 21 items of Government business listed on the House of Assembly Notice Paper for consideration. Traditionally, this House has not sat on Thursday morning and Thursday evening. However, because of the great pressure of business that the Parliament is now facing, will the Premier consider having the House sit on Thursday morning or Thursday evening, or at both times?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know whether the honourable member thinks that he is underworked and, therefore, can sit on Thursday morning or Thursday evening, or whether he thinks he is overworked and wants to get rid of the business quickly. If he thinks there is a large amount of work on the Notice Paper now, he has not seen anything yet. I assure him that there is much legislative work to be done in South Australia and that much more legislation will be introduced

if there is time. I think the honourable member will understand that members generally have been fairly loquacious this session and that the times that are usually sufficient for the processing of much legislation in this House have not been sufficient so far. However, I am hoping that, with the passage of financial measures and also the passage yesterday of an important electoral Bill, we may now make speedier progress. I remind the honourable member that Thursday morning is at present set aside for meetings of Executive Council and Parliamentary committee meetings, and it is obvious that, apart from the Cabinet work that Ministers do, members generally have to do much work during a Parliamentary session, and they do this in the mornings and evenings available. Perhaps it would be desirable if Cabinet were diverted from considering, in the mornings, legislation that it desired to introduce. I appreciate the honourable member's concern (a concern shared by the Government) that we are rather slow this year in processing Government legislation. Nevertheless, I consider that much thought would have to be given to the matter before any of his helpful suggestions could be adopted.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government how the inquiry will be conducted by the committee appointed to deal with the introduction of full local government in Whyalla? Having considered the reply given yesterday about how the committee would function, I should be pleased if the Attorney would ask his colleague to ensure that the committee takes evidence in public, because I consider that it would be desirable for the public to know what evidence was being presented by organizations and individuals.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly ask the Minister whether this can be done although, of course, I cannot give any undertaking that it will be. There may be very good reasons for not adopting this suggestion, but I will certainly discuss it with my colleague.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: A period of three months has elapsed since the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was released to, or inflicted upon, the public. The Premier said, when releasing this report and many times subsequently (and the Attorney-General also said

it in this House yesterday afternoon), that the reason for allowing a period of six months after the release of the report was that this time would enable members of the public to consider the report and express their views, and that at the end of that period, the Government would make known its attitude to those views. Will the Premier say how many meetings have been organized since the report was released and how many of them he and his Cabinet colleagues have attended in order to ascertain the views of the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know what category of meeting the honourable member is inquiring about: whether he wants to know how many he has organized, or how many meetings councils have organized, or how many meetings other interested people have organized. I do not think he can gauge (as I suspect he intends to do) the Government's interest in this matter merely by the number of meetings Cabinet members have attended. I remind him that there is an easy way to get representations to the Government, and I believe the matter is of sufficient importance for the Government to say, at least, that all submissions should be in writing. None of these submissions will be overlooked—

Mr. Virgo: You haven't been to any meeting.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member seems to be implying that, because Cabinet Ministers have not attended every protest meeting organized by him or by other people, there is some political advantage for him in his ability to go to the public and say that Cabinet Minister have not attended every meeting. On that basis there is little point in my asking Cabinet Ministers how many meetings they have attended. I reiterate that the M.A.T.S. plan has been discussed, as the honourable member will have noticed, and I am sure that more suggestions will be received than have been submitted to the Government up to the present. All of them will be considered.

Mr. McANANEY: I should like to ask a question of the member for Edwardstown. As he has shown an interest in the M.A.T.S. plan, he no doubt knew that a seminar was to be held last weekend at the University of Adelaide. At that seminar opinions for and against this plan were discussed and some of the most learned people in Adelaide were present. As I did not see the member for Edwardstown at the seminar, can he say why, if he is so interested, he did not attend, because

if he had he would be better informed, even if no wiser, about this matter?

Mr. VIRGO: I was not at the seminar on Friday or Saturday for a good reason. I had previously made commitments, in association with my duties as member for Edwardstown, for both days, and they precluded my attending the seminar. However, I have arranged to have a full report in writing, including copies of the papers that were presented, made available to me shortly. In addition, I have also attended many other meetings and I have, with the concurrence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, arranged to see Mr. Flint of the Highways Department. This morning, with the member for West Torrens, I visited the display at John Martins and looked at the models and the latest maps, which I presume the member for Stirling has not taken the trouble to see. The important thing I found out this morning was that a detailed map showing where the freeways will go is available at John Martins, even though the Premier told me two months ago in this House that this would not be made available.

Later:

Mr. VIRGO: The Premier apparently misunderstood my question or, alternatively, deliberately avoided giving me the answer I was seeking. The meetings to which I referred were the ones that both he and the Minister of Roads and Transport had consistently stated were being sponsored by local councils at the request of the M.A.T.S. and, in fact, at the Government's request. At these meetings a representative of the Highways Department attends for the purpose of explaining the scheme, answering questions, and ascertaining the views of the public. Will the Premier say whether he or any of his Cabinet colleagues have attended any of these meetings and, if they have, which ones?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not believe the information the honourable member is seeking is useful information, as it has no bearing on any facets of the M.A.T.S. Report. As I understand it, the question is asked only for some political reason. I do not intend to ask my colleagues this question or to become involved in the question of how many such meetings they have attended. Instead of counting the number of meetings members may have attended, their time would be better spent in studying the M.A.T.S. proposals.

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of October 3 seeking information about a newspaper

report of the country roads programme and the effect it would have on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Of course, I was very happy to obtain the information for the honourable member.

Mr. Hudson: Ha! ha!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg has called me an insufferable little pipsqueak.

Mr. Broomhill: He should have said a big one.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Comparing my size with that of the honourable member, his description would be more accurate.

The SPEAKER: Order! Personal opinions are out of order.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Expenditure on roadworks in rural areas for the 5-year period 1968 to 1973 is as follows:

	\$ (million)
Construction in Rural Areas ..	69.48
Maintenance in Rural Areas ..	25.70
Grants to Rural Local Govern- ment ..	18.70
Loans to Rural Local Govern- ment ..	3.91
Miscellaneous Rural Expenditure	5.93

Planned total expenditure .. \$123.72

As the next part of the reply is in the form of a statistical table, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ROAD PROGRAMME

The construction programme for the various districts on roads in rural areas is as follows:

Item	Total expenditure for 5-year period \$ (million)
Central District—	
Main roads ..	6.45
Main road bridges ..	1.00
District roads ..	4.75
District road bridges ..	0.29
Special projects ..	7.05
	19.54
Eastern District—	
Main roads ..	4.00
Main road bridges ..	0.29
District roads ..	3.95
District road bridges ..	0.10
Special projects ..	3.92
	12.26
Northern District—	
Main roads ..	8.76
Main road bridges ..	0.86
District roads ..	1.77
District road bridges ..	0.40
Special projects ..	1.41
Far Northern roads ..	5.45
	18.65

Item	Total expenditure for 5-year period \$ (million)
South-Eastern District—	
Main roads	4.04
Main road bridges	0.03
District roads	3.51
District road bridges	0.11
	7.69
Western District—	
Main roads	9.00
Main road bridges	0.10
District roads	2.24
District road bridges	—
	11.34
Total rural expenditures	\$69.48

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: To answer the honourable member's question in the form of all main and district roads, showing particulars of every road, would require a voluminous answer. Substantial details of road construction were contained in the Minister of Roads and Transport's recent press statement, but the full details were not published in the press because of their length. I have a copy of that press statement available for the honourable member.

ROAD MARKING

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently about line-marking gangs working on the roads?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague has informed me that inquiries have been made regarding line-marking gangs working on October 16, and all except one gang claimed to have had signs out. This one gang was working in a 15 m.p.h. zone. In connection with the general problem, all foremen are given strict instructions that proper warning signs must always be erected. Instances do, however, occur where for some reason or other a gang fails to obey these instructions. If the honourable member will supply me with details as to the location of this occurrence, I will refer them to my colleague, who will no doubt arrange for the matter to be taken up with the foreman concerned.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: Early last month, or even earlier, I tried to obtain information concerning the Commonwealth Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution, which visited South Australia to investigate this problem. As the Premier promised to obtain a copy of the committee's report, can he say whether it is now available?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Not only do I not have a reply for the honourable member, but somehow he is not on the list. I will refer his question to my colleague again and obtain a reply for him.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Mr. RICHES: Can the Attorney-General say whether he has received representations from various bodies, including the South Australian Methodist Conference, concerning the prevalence and treatment of homosexuality in this State and, if he has, whether he has had the opportunity to consider those representations? If he has considered them, can he say whether the Government intends to act in this matter? It has been suggested (and I am not offering this suggestion, by any means) that the Attorney-General intends to extend the terms of reference of another Select Committee that he has announced in order to cover this subject, as has been done in other places.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not had what could be strictly called any representations on the topic, but when Mr. Trenorden called on me the other day in connection with the Government's Bill to lower the age of drinking, he handed me a copy of the report on homosexuality that had been presented to the Methodist Conference, and he asked me to read it. I have read it, although not closely, and I am keeping it by me. I have made no recommendations to Cabinet on this matter, nor has it been raised by any other Minister, and I do not at present intend to make any recommendations. The Government does not intend to extend the terms of reference of the proposed Select Committee (if the House agrees to its appointment) on abortion.

BRANDING FLUID

Mr. EDWARDS: It has been continually brought to the notice of stock firms and the makers of stock-branding fluid oil for the branding of sheep that the quality of the products which they are selling is poor. However, instead of improving, these products are deteriorating to the extent that, whereas when first used they would last from nine to 10 months, over the last two years one is lucky if one can read a brand six months after it has been placed on a sheep's back. This is a serious problem, particularly in view of the extent of sheep stealing taking place throughout the State. Will the Minister of Lands

therefore ask the Minister of Agriculture to see whether something cannot be done to improve the durability of the branding fluid used to mark sheep?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. As the honourable member no doubt knows, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, which has for many years been working on the quality of sheep-branding fluid, has achieved a considerable improvement. The honourable member would also be aware that the effectiveness of a brand depends largely on the density of the fleece and that some strains of merino sheep carry a brand much longer than other sheep carry it. However, I will obtain a report on the matter from the Minister of Agriculture.

ALD GATE SHED

Mr. EVANS: At Aldgate, in the Adelaide Hills, the Railways Department has recently given the local Apex Club notice to quit a railway store shed which the club has been using to store waste paper, a large quantity of which it collects during the year and forwards to the South-East. The reason for serving the notice is apparently that the department intends to install a fertilizer bagging plant in the Aldgate railway yard. However, local residents object to this on the grounds that the township is a residential area, in which no-one is allowed by the district council to establish an industry. On the other hand, the council has no control over the Minister of Roads and Transport or the Railways Department in this respect. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this plant may be sited farther out into the country where the fertilizer will be required? I point out that local residents and members of the district council are cross and disappointed at the proposed action to allow the plant to be established in the pretty little town of Aldgate.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sure that any action or decision has been taken only after exhaustive and careful inquiry of the alternatives available. I agree with the honourable member that the Aldgate station, as well as its surrounds, is a very beautiful area, and it would be a pity to spoil it. I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport.

CLOVERCREST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Education is aware that the Public Works Committee rejected a proposal to erect a new primary school at

the corner of Wright and Kelly Roads, Clovercrest, because the site was unsatisfactory, and that the Education Department has not located a suitable alternative site. When replying to a question in this House on September 24, the Minister said:

I understand that the building of the school must proceed on the site reported on, and the project will be referred to the Public Works Committee.

Can the Minister tell me the result of referring this matter back to the committee and whether the building of the school will proceed as previously expected?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I confirm that what I told the honourable member on September 24 is still the case: there is no alternative site. For that reason the department considers that it must proceed to build the school on the site that was originally referred to the committee. This matter will have to be referred to the committee again, and I believe that the committee now fully understands that there is no alternative site for the school. I will bring down a report on this matter on Tuesday.

RAILWAY SLEEPERS

Mr. RODDA: There are people who have had sleeper contracts for some years, who are tooled up, and who are major employers in and around Naracoorte. It has been reported to me that there has been a considerable cut in the sleeper quota, but that it has not been a general cut as some suppliers have not had their quotas cut. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, obtain a report from his colleague regarding sleeper quotas?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Certainly.

CITY TRAFFIC

Mr. LANGLEY: For years traffic lights at busy places have been a great help to pedestrians and motorists alike and, periodically, they have been further improved for the safety of all. As a motorist who constantly uses King William Street, I have seen many near misses of pedestrians while they were crossing King William Street. These near misses usually happen in the third lane of traffic. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to get a report from the Road Traffic Board on the suggestion that pedestrians should be made to cross at the traffic lights on this busy main street, in the interest of all concerned?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss this matter with my colleague.

BAROSSA RAIL SERVICE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 24 about the use of the Bluebird rail passenger cars on the Adelaide-Angaston line?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The count of passengers on the four passenger trains scheduled daily from Angaston to Adelaide, taken at Sandy Creek on each week day this month, reveals that the average is 11 passengers a train. Schoolchildren and commuters provide the basic loading on three of the four trains, and there is no reason to believe that casual travellers or commuters at present using private transport could be attracted to rail transport in sufficient numbers to justify the use of air-conditioned Bluebird cars on a relatively short run. Furthermore, the proposed cancellation of certain Bluebird services will not release sufficient cars to work the Angaston line service, as these will in all probability be required to meet increased commitments for broad gauge passenger trains following standardization of the Peterborough Division. It is realized that the Bluebird railcars provide a standard of accommodation that is unexcelled, but based on previous experience it has been found that patronage continues to be most disappointing on those lines where these railcars have been provided.

OAKBANK SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of October 16 about the Oakbank Area School dressing shed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A joint inspection of the swimming pool dressing shed at the Oakbank Area School was undertaken by architectural and structural staff of the Public Buildings Department. The recommendation arising from the report is that the building is beyond repair and that, therefore, demolition should be carried out immediately to prevent injury to students and staff. Further, consideration is to be given to the erection of properly designed change rooms and an enclosure for the existing filter at the northern end of the pool.

THREE-CORNER JACK

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 15 about three-corner jack weed in the Warrachie station yard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Approximately one-third of an acre of land within the Warrachie station yard is infested with three-corner jack weed. It is now too late in the season for satisfactory chemical treatment, but action is being taken to deal with the present crop by mechanical means. Long-term control measures will be undertaken next season.

REGIONAL OFFICERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On August 8, I asked the Minister of Education whether approval had been given to station regional officers of the Education Department at Mount Gambier and Whyalla. The Minister on that occasion said that no definite decision had been made but that when it was made she would inform me. I again draw the Minister's attention to the fact that an office was obtained at Whyalla several months ago and that rental has been paid for it for a considerable time. I should be pleased to know whether these officers have been appointed or whether they will be appointed soon.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Curiously enough, only yesterday I sent a minute asking what the position was regarding the appointment of regional officers at Mount Gambier and Whyalla. I have been informed that this matter is now in the hands of the appropriate authority, and I hope that I shall be able to announce very soon what appointments have been made.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Mr. RICHES: I was interested in the question asked and the reply given yesterday on the subject of Eastern Standard Time, and I noted that the Premier said he was consulting quite a number of organizations and that representations would be heard before any action was taken. Can the Premier say whether Parliament will be amongst the organizations to be consulted and whether Parliament will have an opportunity to discuss this matter before any action is taken?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter has not yet advanced to the stage where Parliament's permission could be sought. I understand, as does the honourable member, that private members' time is likely to cut off in this House as the session progresses towards its finality. Therefore, I cannot say that the House can express an opinion. On the other hand, I

believe that we will not see an alteration this summer. Although I am not giving any undertaking, it seems likely that another session of Parliament will occur before any change is made.

I am not seeking submissions from organizations by making a direct inquiry of them, but I am giving this matter much publicity so that the people interested in it can make representations. I think that is the fairest way to put it at the moment. I have spoken of it on several occasions, and I appreciate the publicity given to it yesterday and in today's press, because it alerts people to the Government's thinking. If it were not for difficulties to various individuals and industries, I would advocate a change this summer. However, as I outlined yesterday, there are difficulties, and although I personally favour a change I believe that those difficulties must be looked at. The matter is at a preliminary stage. Although I cannot guarantee that Parliament will be asked for a decision, I believe it will have an opportunity to express an opinion.

QUESTIONS

Mr. HUDSON: My question, which is addressed to you, Mr. Speaker, concerns members' rights in relation to asking questions of a Minister who is representing a Minister in the other place and who, I say with real respect, is acting as an agent between the member who asks the question and the Minister in the other place. This afternoon I directed three separate questions to the Attorney-General requesting that a matter be taken up with the Minister of Roads and Transport, in the other place, and on each occasion, although the Attorney regularly accedes every day to requests from other members, he refused to do this. Can you, Sir, exert any influence on the Attorney-General to try to get him to be a little more co-operative towards me? I think it is a complete and gross interference with the rights of private members that their only channel by way of question to a Minister in another place should be blocked off by the intransigence of the Minister who is acting in this place for that Minister.

The SPEAKER: I will certainly have a talk with the honourable Attorney-General about this matter. When I have talked with him, I have found him very happy to co-operate in most matters. I will see whether I can have any influence on him.

ROBERTSTOWN BUS SERVICE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Before I ask my question of the Attorney-General, I wish to say that I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, that I have always found the Attorney-General most helpful and co-operative; indeed, he is one of the most helpful and co-operative Ministers in a team of helpful and co-operative Ministers. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what time tables will be adopted by the bus services to operate on the Robertstown-Adelaide route? I remind honourable members that this is one route on which the rail service is to be cancelled.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to discuss the matter with my colleague.

SALISBURY-ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Mr. CLARK: Earlier this week I read a news item in, I think, the afternoon newspaper to the effect that the Minister of Roads and Transport was considering some scheme that would cheapen transport in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area, both bus transport to the train and general transport in that area. As this is a matter in which I am very interested and as I believe that the transport problem has militated against the development of this area, will the Attorney-General obtain from his colleague some details about this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: In this morning's *Advertiser* it is reported that in the Senate yesterday Senator Bishop suggested that, prior to any report being received of investigations into the Dartmouth site on the Mitta Mitta River, the Commonwealth Government should initiate talks between itself and the State Governments involved so that there could be no possibility of any misapprehension by the State Governments and no fear that the issue would be prejudged by the attitudes expressly stated by the Minister for National Development. As Senator Bishop's suggestion seems to be well worth while, will the Premier discuss this matter with the Minister of Works and his other colleagues in Cabinet to see whether or not South Australia is prepared to initiate an approach to the Commonwealth Government to arrange such talks with that Government and the State Governments concerned?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will take up this matter with the Minister of Works, but I must remind the honourable member that it is one

that I often discuss with my colleague. It is no new matter to us, for we keep it under constant review. I do not know what either the honourable member or the Senator thinks he will achieve at this moment. The honourable member is aware that the River Murray Commission meets with a representative of South Australia upon it, and that the minutes of some of its meetings have been quoted in this House and been made available to him. Also, he knows that at the moment technical investigations are proceeding. I do not know on what basis we would approach such a meeting or take such a stand prior to the technical findings being produced.

Whether we should re-assert the position that we shall not accept the findings I do not know. If we were to say at this moment, "On no account will we accept these findings", it would be no use having the investigations. If, however, I say, "We will accept the findings", again one wonders what would be achieved by this meeting. The Government keeps this matter under constant review. On one recent occasion I chided the Commonwealth Minister for pre-judging the situation and got no support from the member for Glenelg, who accused me of alienating the Minister's support. Since then the Minister has made another statement, and I wrote to him saying I could not understand why he continued to pre-judge the situation. I received an apology from the Minister, who said he would not do this again. As the Minister of Works and I, in Cabinet, keep this matter under constant review, I see no useful purpose in calling such a conference. If an issue arises, a conference will be requested at very short notice on behalf of South Australia's interests in this most important project.

Mr. HUDSON: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish to explain a point to the Premier for his benefit.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Is this supposed to be a personal explanation?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Are you explaining it to me?

Mr. HUDSON: On the occasion of the last statement by the Minister for National Development—

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Is this a personal explanation?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: Of course it is. On the occasion of the last pre-judgment by the Commonwealth Minister for National Development

of the Chowilla dam issue and his statement, as reported in the press, that the Dartmouth site on the Mitta Mitta River seemed to offer advantages at least comparable with the Chowilla site, it was at my instigation that the Leader of the Opposition wrote a letter of formal protest to the Minister for National Development about the matter.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: After—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I point this out to the Premier, because his remarks, when replying to my earlier question, were unjustified.

MARGARINE

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to a question I asked on October 17 about margarine quotas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

Margarine quotas are a subject of discussion at meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council, and quotas are fixed in the various States in collaboration with the Commonwealth Government. The present quotas for table margarine in South Australia have been in operation since 1956, and no action is currently being contemplated to raise the existing levels. The effects of the new legislation in Victoria designed to regulate sales of cooking margarines as a table spread are being closely watched and, if the Victorian Act proves effective, consideration will be given to the introduction of similar legislation in this State.

WHITE ROCK QUARRIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: On September 25, 1968, the Minister of Local Government replied to Mr. I. Fehlberg, who had drawn the Minister's attention to the clearing undertaken by White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited. On September 26, the Secretary of the State Planning Authority wrote to the Manager of White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited advising, *inter alia*:

The State Planning Authority considers that your company's recent action in clearing land in part sections 1107, 1108, 1109 and 1110, hundred of Adelaide, constitutes an infringement of section 41 of the Planning and Development Act and, if the company does not cease this type of activity, it renders itself liable to prosecution. In addition, the company must lodge an application requesting the authority's approval for the work already carried out since April 4, 1968.

The authority is awaiting receipt of an application and, when this has been considered, a decision will be made by the authority concerning the conduct of future quarrying operations by the company in the area. The note I have is dated October 31. I do not know whether an application has been received since then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply that the Attorney has read reveals that the State planning authority notified White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited on September 26 that it considered that the company had been acting in breach of the Planning and Development Act and was liable to prosecution. It seems that at the end of October no application to try to obtain from the planning and development authority approval for what was a breach of the Act had been made by White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited. In these circumstances, it seems that there has been a clear breach of the Act, that a complete mess that ought not to have occurred has been made of an area of the hills, and that no action is being taken by the Government to ensure that more mess will not be made. Since there has been a clear breach of the Act, will the Attorney-General say why there has not been a prosecution?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I read the reply, I became aware of the point that the Leader has now raised. I will make immediate inquiries about the matter.

WATER RATING

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Works tell me what has occurred following the studies made of a new system of water rating based on water usage?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot give the honourable member any results but I can tell him what action has been taken in this regard. This is a most important question. Some time ago I had discussions with officers of my department, particularly those on the administrative side, about the possibility of an alternative method of charging for water. As honourable members know, most water supply authorities in Australia base their charges on a rating system of assessed values of properties. This system came to Australia in the early days and follows the English custom. Only one other authority that I know of has looked at this new proposal of charging for water by measure or by use, and that is in relation to a country

scheme in Western Australia. Following suggestions and discussions with officers of my department, several proposals came to me, and I then authorized a computer study to be undertaken of this whole matter. That study is estimated to take about two months to complete. After that, of course, the results have to be assessed. I do not expect to receive the result of these studies very much before Christmas. They will take a long time to consider and assess to see whether it is possible to introduce another system. I cannot guarantee that this would be a better or more equitable charging system, but I am interested in the proposal and the exercise being conducted to see whether it is possible to introduce a different system. When the results are available, I will submit them, with recommendations, to Cabinet, and I will then tell the honourable member and the House of any decision made.

RAIL PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: A few weeks ago I asked the Attorney-General whether he would ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the extension of first-class rail pass concessions to railway employees for travel to other States would be considered. The Attorney was good enough to give a reply, part of which said that the matter was listed for the Railways Commissioners' conference in March of this year and that it was decided that no alteration would be made to the existing practice. The Attorney continued:

However, my colleague has told me that he has asked the Railways Commissioner to list for consideration at the next conference of Commissioners the issue of first-class inter-system passes to weekly-paid employees with more than five years' service.

Will the Attorney ask his colleague to request the South Australian Railways Commissioner to support and advocate the issue of these passes, not just to list the matter for consideration?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask Mr. Hill whether he will do that.

SCHOOLGROUNDS

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Education a question about a proposal that I had heard about of either the Education Department or the Engineering and Water Supply Department to restrict the acreage for the planting of grass at any school.

The Minister said that she had not heard anything about the matter and would inquire for me. Can she say whether she has any results from those inquiries?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The request for information would certainly have gone forward. However, I have not received a report on the matter, and I will ask for it and try to bring it down early next week.

FISH MEAL

Mr. McANANEY: Australian fish meal imports have increased by 300 per cent in five years, the amount imported in 1967-68 having been 62,000,000 lb. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain from the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation a report about the possibility of sufficient fish being available for the setting up of a suitable fish meal processing plant in South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

PAROLE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On Tuesday I asked the Attorney-General about the position of prisoners awaiting probation and pointed out that the Crown Solicitor's Department had given an opinion, with which I disagreed, about the interpretation of the relevant provision of the Statute, as to the date on which applications for probation could be considered and dealt with. The Attorney replied that, in effect, the matter was being considered. However, there is a large bank up of people who would normally have been able to apply for probation. There are more than 19 such cases and I understand that more cases are falling due for consideration almost every day. I and many other members on this side have had representations from the families of the people concerned, stating that probation is being considerably held up. It is now some time since the opinion to which I have referred was given. Can the Attorney say what urgent action is being taken so that prisoners, whose sentences were based upon the view of the judges that the normal procedure would prevail, should be able to get the same kind of treatment as has been given in the past, because otherwise the effect of sentences will be quite different from that intended by the courts?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I appreciate that the Leader is at liberty to express an opinion differing from that of the Crown Solicitor on these matters. I have to tell him,

though, that my personal opinion is that the Crown Solicitor and the Crown Prosecutor are correct in the opinion they have expressed. Between the Leader and me there is therefore a difference of opinion on this topic, as on a number of other topics. However, the Chief Secretary is at present considering what action should be taken in the light of the opinion which, I say, I have advised Cabinet is a good one. I understand that the matter is to be discussed again in Cabinet next Monday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the Attorney-General that it is some weeks since this opinion was given. Consequently, the Government has known for a considerable time that action would have to be taken to right the position. Whether the opinion the Attorney-General has adopted is correct or not is irrelevant. The point is that, since the Government has determined the position in this way, some action must be taken if people whose sentences have been based upon the contrary view on existing practice are not to be signally disadvantaged. When are we going to get some results?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader is incorrect in believing that the Government has had this opinion for some time. It came to my notice, I think, late last week.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I understood you had it before that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I knew the Leader knew about it and I heard that he would ask questions about it. In fact it was discussed in Cabinet last—

RABBITS

Mr. RODDA: Last week, whilst moving around my district, I noticed in certain areas near the Coorong and in and around Ardune, near Lucindale, that there seemed to be alarming numbers of rabbits. With the use of 1080 and a stronger strain of myxomatosis, it should be possible to keep this scourge under control. There is certainly a need for action in places where the rabbits are on the increase. Can the Minister of Lands say whether his officers are aware of a build-up in the rabbit population in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member is no doubt correct in his observation that in certain areas rabbits have considerably increased in number. I think it would be correct to say that in the long run it will be possible to eradicate them from large areas of the State. The most marked point

I can think of is the variation in the degree of infestation in various district council areas. Some councils have appointed vermin control officers, equipped them, and correctly trained them. These officers move around the district doing work for landholders and at the same time implementing the provisions of the Vermin Act. Such councils have been extremely successful in dealing with the vermin, although other councils have not done nearly as much in this direction. It is hoped they will do more, but the difference is very marked. As a result of a conference on rabbit destruction held in Adelaide about eight weeks ago, I hope that more councils will adopt the vigorous attitude I have described. I will obtain a report on the situation applying in the South-East and let the honourable member have it as soon as it comes to hand.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. HUDSON: I have just received from the Treasury the Financial Statement for October, 1968, and I notice that for that month the excess of payments over receipts was \$1,978,000, so the cumulative deficit for the four months of this financial year is \$6,088,000. This, of course, is in addition to the deficit that existed at the end of June, 1968. When we look at the detailed figures for receipts we notice that the railways are running at a monthly rate that is significantly below the monthly rate implied by the Budget estimate. The increase in bus fares that has just been announced calls to my mind that the Government may be in the process of making a similar announcement in relation to rail fares. In view of the overall budgetary position that has arisen, can the Premier say whether any proposal is under consideration at present for an increase in railway fares? If there is, will he continue the practice whereby any new industry is announced by him and any increase in fares is announced by the Director of Industrial Promotion?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased that the honourable member has noticed the numerous announcements about the increased tempo of industrial expansion in South Australia. Regarding his first question, I will consult with the Minister of Roads and Transport and with my other Cabinet colleagues and bring down a report.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. GILES: On October 2 the House resolved that an expert committee should be formed to investigate this State's water

resources. Even though we have had one of the wettest winters on record I do not believe we can afford to become complacent about this matter, because it is very vital to South Australia's progress. Can the Minister of Works report on the progress made in this direction up to the present?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I agree with the honourable member that no-one in South Australia should be complacent about future water supplies and water resources in this State, even though at present the metropolitan reservoirs are full. The stage at which they are full this year is later than the stage at which they were full in any previous year. Nevertheless, to keep up the supply the Government will be obliged to commence pumping from the Murray River through the Mannum-Adelaide main early in the new year. Shortly after the House carried the motion of the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), other investigations that I had initiated were stepped up and only this morning I had conversations about their progress. As I promised, at present the committee's terms of reference are being considered and drawn up, and its personnel will, I hope, be announced shortly.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

HOLDEN HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Holden Hill (Valiant Road) Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from November 6. Page 2291.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill. While in itself this impost does not form one of the greater imposts outlined by the Treasurer in his Budget speech, nevertheless it creates a real additional burden to many people. The cost of third party insurance in South Australia is not light and, on present indications, we can expect an increase in these premiums within months. In these circumstances, to load

on to third party insurance premiums another \$2 in stamp duty, purely for the purpose of revenue for use against hospital expenses, seems to me to be unjustified and unwarranted.

The motorist should not have to bear an impost of this kind, and I wonder where in the world we are going to get with imposts on motorists, because what is now outlined for the future of motoring in South Australia will make it an absurdly expensive pastime. Not only are third party insurance premiums now high, and comprehensive insurance premiums expensive (and in some cases inadequate in coverage, even for the money that one spends), but now this impost is being placed on the motorist. At present a study has been made public (although the Government says it has not accepted it) in which financial provisions are an essential part and on which the Government has invited the comments of the public. As a result of this study we are to have a considerable increase in registration fees, a doubling of the cost of drivers' licences, and an alteration of road tax cutting out the present exemption and reducing the load limit for road maintenance contribution tax from eight tons to four tons.

Mr. Broomhill: And if a motorist parks his car in the park lands it now costs him 10c extra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Just how far are we prepared to load the motorist? South Australia has had some increases in hospital fees which have been designed to cover increased hospital costs. At least they are designed to cope with the burden placed on the Government by the increases in costs. This was the aim of the increases in fees, but we found that we were able to get by with increases that did not cover the whole amount of the increases in costs because we obtained money elsewhere. I point out to the Treasurer that during the last three years we received considerable extra revenue for the Hospitals Fund. I appreciate that the States are faced with the fact that, if we are to provide adequate hospital services, increases in hospital costs will be at a greater rate than the increase in population and consequently not coped with in the formula of State grants reimbursement from the Commonwealth.

Therefore we have to provide some means of covering the extra cost. However, I do not believe this is the way to do it. Already there are heavy imposts on motorists, and there are other means of covering this particular extra cost to the Government than this one.

This is not a wise way to proceed. Before the last election I forecast that this tax would be imposed by the Liberal Government if it were elected, because it was something introduced by Sir Henry Bolte in Victoria, and I thought the present Government would do the same thing. I did not believe that it was right then and I do not believe it is right now. While I appreciate that the Treasurer has to obtain revenue, I dislike this means of getting it and, consequently, I intend to vote against the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support my Leader in his opposition to this Bill. During the Budget debate sufficient was said about the effects of this and other taxes on the general public. As the Leader said, the imposition of this tax falls directly again on motorists. The Government should reconsider the question of other areas of taxation, because the burden on the motorist today is almost intolerable. No doubt some part of the transportation study plan will be adopted and some of the cost of this must be borne by the motorist. We realize as well as the Treasurer does that there are difficulties in providing hospitals and other facilities. One can criticize the Commonwealth and its attitude on this question, and one can criticize the general health schemes that exist in this country and say that there is a need to improve them in order to relieve the burden that now falls on State Governments.

Apparently, the Government has decided to extract from people who own motor cars, or who drive them, this further additional tax. Most people who own motor cars realize that owning a motor car is not a luxury today but is almost a necessity and many of them are hard-pressed to maintain and operate their cars and pay the charges at present placed on them. This taxation has been imposed because the cost to the Hospitals Department of an accident covered by third party insurance is not met by this insurance, therefore, the Government considers that this cost should be added to that of compulsory insurance. One has no choice and it is a pretty neat way of extracting money from people. Receipts from this tax will go towards the Hospitals Fund and will help to bridge the gap in costs that are not now met by third party insurance. I had thought that people involved in a motor car accident were covered for hospitalization by third party insurance, which I thought eventually paid

for the cost to treat the injuries. Many accident cases remain in hospital much longer than do people who are hospitalized for other reasons. Is this why costs are not recovered, or is it because the costs of running hospitals are not met by the fees charged?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Not in any case.

Mr. CORCORAN: Then the Treasurer is saying that because they are not met in any case they should be covered to the extent they are being covered by this additional tax so far as any injury that is suffered is covered by third party insurance. Hospital charges have been increased in other directions, I suppose to try to cover some of the leeway caused with other types of illness. For instance, the increased hospital charges would be designed to cover that area not covered by third party insurance. If a person is unfortunate enough to be involved in an accident, or if he owns a motor car and is therefore likely to be involved in an accident, he must pay an additional \$2 a year, whether or not he is involved in an accident. This must be done in order to provide finance to the Hospitals Department to make up the leeway between the cost of looking after a patient and the actual money received. We have been told that only about 5 per cent of the people involved in accidents are hospitalized. Therefore, everyone who owns a motor car must bear the cost of the hospitalization of that 5 per cent. I hope, as I am sure all members do, that the figure is less than 5 per cent. Likewise, all the people who own vehicles have to bear the entire insurance costs. Indeed, as the Leader has already forecast, these costs will be increased again, and this will mean an additional impost on the taxpayers.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But 100 per cent of the taxpayers have to meet the cost of hospital losses, anyway.

Mr. CORCORAN: I suggest that more than the 5 per cent would take advantage of the hospital facilities. However, whatever the figure is, 100 per cent of the taxpayers pay for it. It may be argued that, because everyone must subsidize 5 per cent, this will be a deterrent from being involved in an accident, but I doubt that. The Government has not investigated or tapped other areas of taxation where it has taxing ability. It is not necessary for me to again go through the argument on succession duties. I agree with the Leader and all members on this side that the Government should

have tapped that area before imposing this form of taxation. Of course, the Government did not tell the people that it was contemplating this form of taxation. The honourable member for Gumeracha can smile. I suppose he thinks it is smart to deceive the people of this State. True, they may have been deceived on this occasion, but I bet they will not be deceived again. That is the penalty the Government must pay. Perhaps the honourable member missed the point I was making: that the Labor Government would have touched this area but that his Government has not. In any event, I guarantee that his Party will not touch it to the extent that we would have. Possibly the Government might close up some of the loopholes, but I do not think it will shift the emphasis, as we would have done.

The Government did not tell the people that this sort of taxation would be imposed, although it was challenged to do so. Indeed, it was challenged not only prior to March 2 but also after that to state what it intended doing. However, it said it could say nothing about its financial policy until the Premiers' Conference was held. Of course, that had no bearing at all on the matter. We knew what the position would be. I oppose this Bill and support my Leader's remarks because I believe that the impositions placed on motorists in this State are such that they cannot reasonably be borne by the majority of people who own a motor vehicle, which I consider a necessity today. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): Like the Deputy Leader, I support the Leader of the Opposition in opposing this iniquitous Bill. It cannot be called anything else. Apparently the Government thinks that, through imposing taxes of this nature and by tying it automatically to the public hospital charges by saying that this additional stamp duty will be used for public hospitals, it will win over the hearts of the people. In other words, it is designed to soften the blow, and to be a bit of a sop to the people. It does not fool anyone. It is yet another charge on the poor old motorist. It seems that Liberal Governments throughout Australia, whenever they want to raise a few bob, look first at the motorist and say "How can we squeeze a little more out of him?"

The present Government is following this line once more. The fact that this taxation is tied to hospitals does not soften the blow. The plain facts are that owners of motor vehicles must compulsorily take out a

third party insurance cover and are forced to contribute \$2 a year to this inept Government. It is no good the Government going on as it has in the last few months trying to blame the former Labor Government for the need to impose this iniquitous tax. That excuse has worn so thin and rings so hollow that one would have expected the Government by this time to start to stand on its own feet.

It would, perhaps, be logical to impose this tax on the motorists if they derived the direct benefit from it in, say, new or improved roads or something of that nature. However, it has been obtained to bolster up hospitals on the flimsy excuse that it is to cover persons injured in road accidents. Frankly, this excuse has worn so thin that it is no longer worthy of discussion. The Government should bear in mind some of the things that have previously been said because sooner or later it will have to answer to the public on certain things. The Government will have to face up to its criticisms of the Labor Government during its term of office. It is ironical that this Government is doing everything that it said the Labor Government was doing wrong and, in some cases, is doing it in an extremely worse manner. I remind members opposite of the *Voice of South Australia* pamphlet No. 3, which the Liberal and Country League produced and which, I understand, was distributed in most, if not all, Government members' districts. That Party cried then that State taxation was too high, but what has the Government done since it came to office? Has it reduced any area of taxation?

Mr. Ryan: Not one.

Mr. VIRGO: That is right, but it must reduce some taxation or it will stand condemned as being hypocritical, because surely if it said State taxation was too high this would mean that, if elected, it would reduce taxation. As the member for Port Adelaide said, this Government has not reduced any taxes.

Mr. Lawn: You cannot trust the Liberal and Country League Government.

Mr. VIRGO: I agree, except for one thing: we can trust that it will make sure it does not increase the taxation of its wealthy supporters and that it will not get into the succession duties field, to which the member for Millicent referred.

Mr. Hurst: We can be sure that the biggest imposts will be on the working people.

Mr. VIRGO: I agree with the member for Semaphore on that. Wherever it is possible for industry to pass on these added charges they will, in fact, be passed on.

Mr. McKee: I think the member for Stirling looks quite worried.

Mr. VIRGO: I am looking forward to hearing what he has to say. I have heard on the grapevine that he is the only Government member who will have something to say and that he will attempt to defend his Treasurer regarding this measure, something for which I think we ought to give the honourable member full marks, because he will have a pretty difficult job. Members opposite should recall what their Leader said prior to the election because, after all, they were elected on the basis of what was contained in their policy speech. However, there was not one word in it about putting on this tax; in fact, there was not one word about putting on any tax. Let me refresh the minds of members opposite regarding what the Premier said when he was Leader of the Opposition (a position he would still hold if electoral justice prevailed in South Australia). He said:

When we are elected to Government our first task will be to restore stability in the State's accounts.

He went on to say how he would do it, as follows:

We will do this by arranging a careful priority of spending, by making sure that we get value for our money in our spending, and by securing more money—

he did not say it would be through taxation—as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce.

When he was challenged by the then Premier of South Australia (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) "Where will you get the money?", what did the present Premier say? We found that he had a little brown paper parcel marked "Not to be opened until after March 2", and our Leader forecast that there was some pretty stiff medicine in it.

Mr. Corcoran: Full of nasty surprises.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. Frankly, I do not think our Leader himself even realized how iniquitous these things were; he knew they would be pretty bad, but I do not think he realized how crook they would be. We have a case of complete hypocrisy from members opposite.

Mr. McKee: The member for Eyre doesn't like that word.

Mr. VIRGO: I cannot help what he likes and what he dislikes. The public of South Australia was told through the local press, after a public meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall at which the present Premier and the Prime Minister were on the platform, that if South Australia joined the family and had a State Liberal Government it would get more finance from Canberra and would not have any financial worries of its own. Where is this finance? Where is this family that we joined? What sort of family is it? I hope we do not have any children of this family.

Mr. McKee: They haven't stopped fighting since.

Mr. VIRGO: True. I am rather concerned about an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Thursday, October 20, headed, "Economy Warning". I hope the Treasurer saw this and took some action regarding it, because it states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) and the Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) made it clear today that there was little chance of more money being made available to the States this financial year.

What does this mean? Is the Bill's impost of \$2 on the 1,000,000 motorists in South Australia only a flea-bite compared with what we will get later from this Government? Does it mean that we will shortly see implemented the Treasurer's threat that he would, if necessary, extend the stamp duties tax to wages and salaries? Obviously, this is the way we are going. I notice that the Treasurer is reading the paper, a copy of which I have just had handed to me, and I do not know whether he has seen the report on page 3 to the effect that the Prime Minister has refused to call a special meeting between the Commonwealth and the States to discuss their financial relations. This is the result of being in the family: the Prime Minister will not even talk.

The Bill seeks to place an iniquitous impost on the motorists of this State, and I do not believe it should be carried, for the reason that the Government has no mandate from the public at all. If the Government had a mandate from the 42 per cent of the population that voted for it, at least it would be able to crow over something, but it has not even got that. Not one word of this tax was foreshadowed before the election, and I hope that the Legislative Council runs true to form and carries out its claim, namely, that its function is to reject legislation any Government

seeks to introduce for which it has no mandate from the public. If the Legislative Council is honest in its approach, it should reject the Bill, just as we will reject it by voting against it.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I fully support the Bill. Although I said that I opposed the principle of the receipts duty and would have voted against that Bill if I had had the opportunity, I fully support the principle contained in this measure. We have been criticized apparently for not having a mandate to introduce such measures as this one, but our platform provides for sound and responsible Government.

Mr. McKee: Have you a mandate?

Mr. McANANEY: We went to the people, saying that we would bring stability back into South Australia's accounts.

Mr. McKee: Have you a mandate?

Mr. McANANEY: Making people pay for the services they receive or the costs they create is sound Government, and that applies in this case. The Opposition has referred to compulsory third party insurance. Surely it is not saying that we should not have such insurance. Does the Opposition say that these people who go about in cars injuring themselves and others, including pedestrians, should not have to pay for the damage they cause? We have been told that the cost of third party insurance will increase; people whose actions result in more expense to others should be responsible for that expense. We are simply carrying the principle a step further in regard to people who receive treatment in public hospitals at half cost. There is perfect justification for their paying the costs they incur. If this money goes into the Treasury the State's finances will be in a better condition than they are today. No-one likes to pay taxes, but there are one or two instances where motorists pay taxes for which they do not receive any direct benefit. However, every section of the community pays some kind of tax. Motorists are considerably subsidized: a large portion of the roads are paid for by rates that are paid by landholders. Pensioners in the Port Adelaide area have had their rates increased to \$60 or \$80 for the purpose of building roads for motorists to use.

Mr. Ryan: Are you trying to convince yourself or someone else?

Mr. McANANEY: This is sound financial logic and principle. The people who enjoy the privileges of using the roads should pay for what they get. The whole principle of the Opposition's attitude to taxation is that the Government should give to one section of the community and take away from some other section of the community. They took from one section of the community and gave to another section of the community and thought they were good fellows.

Mr. Hudson: Would you support a reduction in the ton-mile tax limit from eight tons to four tons?

Mr. McANANEY: I am speaking to this Bill and I adopt the principle that people (other than the poor, the sick and the needy, who have to be assisted by the Government) who receive benefits should pay for them. The member for Glenelg has made a suggestion, which would have to be analysed to see whether or not it is just. The only way to finance roadworks is by imposing petrol taxes. Much has been said about dress reform: whether members should wear pyjamas or shorts, but what we need is financial reform at both the State and the Commonwealth level. We should get down to sound principles of book-keeping. Perhaps we will then be a more just Parliament and will earn the respect of the people more than we do today. I fully support the Bill, because it has the right principle of levying charges on a section of the community that receives benefits. It is a just and fair tax, and I give the Treasurer my wholehearted support for the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I oppose the Bill and I do so in a situation of amazement, in view of the remarks made by the member for Stirling. He said the principle of the Bill is one that he supports completely and utterly. I challenged him on whether or not he would support a reduction in the ton-mile tax limit from eight tons to four tons which would bring this State into line with other States, which would provide considerable revenue and which would be in line with the principle he stated, namely, that people who receive benefits should pay for them.

Mr. McAnaney: I said I supported taxes on petrol.

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member will not agree with what I have said he is not consistent in his attitude to the road maintenance tax. The honourable member has already denied the principle he stated. He said

that if a person enjoys a privilege he must pay for it, no matter who he is or what he is. Surely farmers enjoy a privilege in carting their goods on the road without paying any road maintenance tax if their vehicles are between four tons and eight tons. If he believes in the principle he has just stated, the member for Stirling would agree that farmers should be in the same position as are all other members of the community with respect to the payment of road maintenance charges. If the honourable member is not prepared to accept this point, then he has obviously been putting up his principle as a little bit of bluff, and it does not carry any weight at all.

This Bill is another of the Government's measures made necessary because it has refused to obtain additional revenue from other sources available to it. The Deputy Leader has already made the point that succession duties were available to the Government as a source of taxation. I do not intend to belabour that point, because members on this side have made it often in discussing the financial measures of the current Government. However, I point out that Government members are indulging in something about which they were mighty critical in regard to lottery and Totalizer Agency Board revenue going into the Hospitals Fund. They said, in that case, that it did not mean increased expenditure on hospitals. The Minister of Works made great play on that point. However, he is now one of the Government members supporting the levying of this \$2 tax on compulsory third party insurance certificates, and he apparently agrees with the payment of that revenue into the Hospitals Fund. The statement that this money will go into the Hospitals Fund and will therefore represent additional expenditure on hospitals is just a little bit of covering to keep the public quiet.

Mr. Virgo: Sugar coating on the pill.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. However, this extra sum of \$840,000 in a full year will find its way into Consolidated Revenue. Regarding the statement that in this financial year the Hospitals Fund will have an extra \$840,000, I will lay London to a brick on that the Treasurer provides \$840,000 less out of Consolidated Revenue for hospitals.

Mr. Burdon: I do not think you will find a taker.

Mr. HUDSON: No. The Minister of Works said in the Budget debate last year:

So, from Consolidated Revenue the Government is giving \$3,000 more this year than it gave last year in respect of its normal allocation. Of course, it is giving from the Hospitals Fund this extra \$2,000,000, but a strong point of the Government when promoting the lottery was that all proceeds would go into the Hospitals Fund and these would in turn go to the hospitals, and in the meantime the normal allocation would not be cut back.

If anyone accepts the kind of argument he stated, then it will be readily apparent that the statement that the money raised from this levy of \$2 on all third party insurance certificates will go into the Hospitals Fund is just a little bit of sugar coating and does not really mean what it says. Government members even attempted to suggest, during the Millicent by-election campaign, that money from the lottery and T.A.B. going into the Hospitals Fund was really not finding its way into extra expenditure on hospitals. If that argument was true, then the motorists of South Australia can be satisfied that the \$840,000 a year the Treasurer is fleecing off them under this Bill will not find its way into extra expenditure on hospitals. What is really happening is that Consolidated Revenue is being supported to the tune of \$840,000 in a full year. I have put this on the basis of the argument used by Government members previously, and not one of them is prepared to challenge me.

This extra charge is being levied on a particular cost to the ordinary individual which shows a substantial increase every two years and which is due for another substantial increase early next year. The Treasurer and the Government generally should have considered, in introducing this particular item, that third party insurance rates were likely to rise next year by a substantial sum. Therefore, the \$2 levy imposed by the Government on motorists will be introduced in a year when all motorists will have to pay additional third party insurance. From previous experience, I do not think it is possible to deny that there will be a substantial increase in third party insurance rates next year. It has always seemed to me that, in so far as it is possible to define particular classes of risk of accident, where an individual belongs to a class or group of people that has a lower risk of accident, he or she should pay a lower third party insurance rate; on the other hand, those who can be identified as belonging to a class that has a much higher risk of accident should pay a much higher third party insurance rate.

I think it is probably wise that action be taken in this direction, first, because of the great prevalence of motor car accidents in this country. I have stated in this place previously that Australia has a higher rate of persons killed on the road per thousand of population than has the United States of America or almost any other country in the world: we have one of the worst records of accidents on the roads of any country. It is not just that our roads are bad, but also that our standard of driving is poor. I should have thought that raising the age for obtaining a driver's licence should be considered. After all, if it is true, as we are told by the insurance companies, that younger drivers are involved in more accidents relative to their number than are other groups of drivers, and if vehicular accidents are becoming a heavy burden on our hospitals and have necessitated (as the Treasurer tries to tell us) this increase in stamp duty, then surely every action should be taken to try to minimize the extent of accidents on our roads. Surely this Bill is not the right way in which to tackle the problems of hospital charges, motor vehicle accidents and injuries resulting therefrom. Surely this is entirely the wrong way of going about it.

For many years South Australia did not prescribe a driving test before a person could get a licence; for many years South Australia was the only State in Australia where this was so. There are many drivers still on the road today who have never taken a driving test and whose standard of driving has never been examined by any independent authority to discover whether or not they drive safely and satisfactorily. For some six or seven years now (I am not sure of the exact number) we in South Australia have imposed driving tests, but we permit people to get a licence at the age of 16. We hear many comments from all sections of the community about the alleged irresponsibility of the younger people. I, for one, believe that these allegations are greatly exaggerated. On the other hand, I think our accident rate is so disturbing that the Government of the day should be actively seeking ways of reducing it.

I should like to see an investigation into the effects of the introduction of the breathalyser. It has not yet been proved that the breathalyser has effected any substantial reduction in the number of road accidents. If it has, there may well be a case for making the breathalyser test even tougher than it already is. It is most disturbing to realize that in a

country which is as well off as Australia is and which, in general, has living standards that compare favourably with those of almost any other country, apart from perhaps North America, we should kill and maim on our roads more people in each 1,000 of population than almost any other country in the world. It seems to me to be a short-sighted approach for the Treasurer to say, "Accidents and the injuries they cause are increasing costs in our hospitals. We must provide additional revenue for the hospitals to meet these problems. We are imposing this \$2 levy on all motorists to meet this problem that has arisen. We shall not do anything else of a substantial nature to tackle our accident problem." I am taking what the Treasurer says about this matter at its face value but, as I have already indicated, I do not really believe he means what he says.

The whole purpose of this measure is to support Consolidated Revenue, and not the Hospitals Fund—and that, after all, is in line with the Treasurer's previous thinking on this matter, with what the Minister of Works said about the Hospitals Fund when he was in Opposition, and what members opposite said about it during the Millicent by-election campaign. In those circumstances, as the Government has plenty of sources of revenue open to it that it has not tapped and does not propose to tap more equitable sources of revenue from those people in the community able to pay, no member of this House is justified in supporting this Bill. I oppose the second reading.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, Millhouse, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McAnaney and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Hutchens and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Payment of duty."

Mr. HUDSON: This clause contains a number of provisions, which were explained by the Treasurer in general terms. He tried to justify this tax by referring to the difficulties being experienced in Government hospitals and claimed that what is charged by those hospitals for vehicular accident cases does not cover hospital costs. I said in the second reading debate that, if we accepted the argument that members of the present Government used previously against certain funds being transferred to the Hospitals Fund, the additional \$840,000 that the Government would get in a full year from this impost would not be spent on hospitals: the great bulk of it would go to general revenue. I consider that attempting to justify this measure by reference to the difficulties of public hospitals is merely putting on a false front. Consideration should have been given to adopting methods of reducing the road accident rate, thus helping to solve our hospital problem.

We should not just put on a charge because of the number of road accidents that are causing problems in hospitals. Has the Treasurer considered recommending to Cabinet other measures that might be taken, such as the stiffening of the breathalyser test, the adoption of different insurance rates for different classes of risks, the raising of the driving age, or any other measure that would help to reduce the number of road accidents? I also ask the Treasurer what assurance he can give that, in a full year, expenditure on public hospitals will increase by \$840,000, which expenditure would not have occurred if this Bill had not been passed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): The honourable member is surely speaking with his tongue very much in his cheek. I was one of those who criticized the lotteries Bill because I said that in that case the impression was intentionally created that the hospitals would benefit to the extent of the revenue from lotteries. I was assured that such was not the case, that my charge was improperly laid, and I accepted that at the time. However, when I introduced this Bill, I simply said that the money would be paid into the Hospitals Fund and that that would be done because the hospitals were rendering to the victims of motor vehicle accidents a service that was not fully paid for by the fees charged. Clearly the purport of what I said was that the revenue derived from this Bill would assist in bridging the gap between the cost of

treatment and the fees charged. That is all I have said or implied.

Attention has been given by all Governments, of whatever Party, to the matter of reducing the incidence of motor vehicle accidents and many measures have been introduced with that object in mind, but whether the object has been achieved is open to doubt. The honourable member knows that these matters have been under critical examination, not only because of the hospital position but also because of the tragedies resulting from motor vehicle accidents, which probably have a greater impact on the body social than the actual hospital costs. No-one has succeeded in entirely resolving that matter and there is little case for a criticism of this clause because of that.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand the Treasurer to say that hospital fees are not covering the costs involved in treating vehicle accident cases. This means that on this particular account the hospitals are experiencing a deficit.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. HUDSON: It also means that this deficit, up to the present, is being met from Consolidated Revenue.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. HUDSON: Therefore, if this deficit is partly relieved by the Hospitals Fund, Consolidated Revenue will benefit by the amount of money paid into the Hospitals Fund for this purpose.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Of course.

Mr. HUDSON: Therefore, effectively, the money may as well be paid to Consolidated Revenue anyway. The reason this is going into the Hospitals Fund is not particularly to satisfy members of this Parliament or even to satisfy the Under Treasurer (I should imagine he would be the last person to advocate the necessity for putting the money in the Hospitals Fund), but simply to make the pill of the \$2 duty more palatable for the public.

I have not yet heard anything from the Treasurer that does not make it clear-cut that the account that will really benefit from this \$840,000 is general revenue and that the actual spending by the hospitals will not increase as a result. The only way the

Treasurer can argue that paying receipts from this duty into the Hospitals Fund will provide a different result from what would otherwise be the case is by showing that this will lead to the hospitals' increasing their expenditure by an amount greater than that which would otherwise be the case. If that cannot be demonstrated, we may as well have said to the public that we must compensate general revenue for meeting the deficit arising in respect of hospital services because of the accidents.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed. Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, Millhouse, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McAnancy and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Hutchens and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 6. Page 2292.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is consequential upon the Bill we have just debated and passed. I do not like the principle in that Bill but, as the House has established the principle, and as the amendments in this Bill are consequential, I do not oppose the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, at 2 p.m.