

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 23, 1971

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

PETITION: BUILDERS LICENSING ACT

Mr. HALL presented a petition signed by 582 persons engaged in the building industry or trades allied thereto concerning regulations to the Act and the questionnaires to forms Nos. 1, 2 and 3 of the first schedule to the regulations. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would disallow or amend the said regulations.

Petition received and read.

MISS AUSTRALIA

The SPEAKER: I draw attention to the presence in the Speaker's Gallery today of Miss Australia, 1971 (Miss June Wright), accompanied by Miss South Australia (Miss Rosalyn Pett). I am certain that I speak for all members when I offer to both these beautiful young ladies our congratulations on their achievements and our best wishes for an exceedingly happy year in their respective ambassadorial roles.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE'S FINANCES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement. Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following the unsatisfactory conference held in Canberra on February 4 between the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the States, I announced that it would be necessary for the South Australian Government to introduce measures to increase revenues and to control expenditures. I now wish to explain to members the background to the decisions taken, as well as detailing the measures themselves. In February and June, 1970, at conferences of the Commonwealth and State Governments, attempts were made to negotiate a proper sharing of national revenue resources that would have regard to the responsibilities of each Government. The Commonwealth offered an improved system of taxation reimbursement grants, but all Premiers left Canberra convinced that the level of grants, even though improved, taken in combination with their own restricted revenue-raising fields would not suffice to finance social services and other State responsibilities at acceptable standards.

The South Australian Government, believing that the standards of service it would be able to support out of revenues available would be even lower than those of the other States, applied to the Commonwealth Grants Commission for a special grant. The commission accepted that a case had been made and recommended to the Commonwealth that a special advance grant of \$5,000,000 be paid. The Commonwealth accepted that recommendation. I expect that, when the year's actual results are known, we will be able to sustain a case before the commission that some further grant is justified in respect of 1970-71, and I will return to that in a moment. After having regard to the improved tax reimbursement grant, the special grant recommended by the commission, our own revenue-raising measures as set out in the Budget papers, and the minimum needs of schools, hospitals and other essential services, I presented to the House a Budget that forecast a deficit of just under \$5,000,000. As I explained then, the costs of further wage and salary awards were to be expected, and these would be offset in part only by increases in the taxation reimbursement grant through the operation of the formula. The aggregate of revenue deficits forecast by all States early in the year, including South Australia's \$5,000,000, was about \$36,000,000.

Since those Budgets were prepared, all States have felt the adverse effects of a number of wage and salary awards. For South Australia, the cost to Revenue Account in 1970-71 of the national wage decision, of other awards given since the Budget was prepared, and of determinations still under review, is estimated at about \$11,000,000. As the Budget took into account about \$7,500,000 for the carry-over effect of awards given last year and for minor determinations in July and early August, it may be seen that the 1970-71 results are being affected to the extent of a total of about \$18,500,000 from increased costs of all wage and salary awards. This is considerably greater than the \$10,500,000 for comparable items in 1969-70 and the \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000 a year for the previous three years.

The prospective cost of salary and wage awards since the Budget (that is, about \$11,000,000) will probably be partly offset by an increase of about \$4,500,000 in the tax reimbursement grant as a consequence of the operation of the formula. Thus the net adverse impact may be about \$6,500,000, and

this is the measure of the expected deterioration in the Budget result for 1970-71. There are some other movements in individual items of receipts and payments but in aggregate they may be expected to offset each other. The probable deterioration of about \$6,500,000 in the South Australian accounts is matched by comparable adverse movements in the Revenue Budgets of the other States. Instead of the aggregate of deficits of about \$36,000,000 forecast originally, it appears that the total of the six State deficits is now likely to be more than three times as great, at about \$110,000,000. That is a minimum figure based on the present published accounts of other States' Budget forecasts.

Despite this gloomy and worrying picture, with its serious implications for the future standards of State services, the Commonwealth has refused to make available any additional financial assistance, even though it was pointed out at the recent conference that expenditures this year were already committed, and that any special assistance would not increase the current outlay on goods and services; it would merely reduce the order of deficits and run-down of cash resources and would thus have no inflationary effect. While the Prime Minister has agreed to meet the Premiers again in April, it seems clear that each State will have no alternative but to look for ways of increasing its own revenues, of controlling its current expenditures even to the stage of holding standards below desirable levels, and of deferring capital programmes so that Loan funds may be available to finance unavoidable revenue deficits. The recent conference has offered us no hope whatever of relief. Let me make this quite clear. There has been some loose talk in the press that the States will get some assistance from the Commonwealth in April. There has been no such indication from the Commonwealth: the indications were in fact clearly to the contrary. What is more, we could obtain no undertaking that next year there would be an increase in Loan moneys, or even that they would be maintained at this year's level. In my view, the Commonwealth's attitude requires far too great an effort on the part of the public sector in the overall plan to avoid problems of inflation and too little effort on the part of large areas of private enterprise. It calls for a further distortion of the real priorities in the use of physical resources.

I return now to the part played by the Grants Commission in South Australia's financial situation and to the prospects of our

receiving further assistance by way of special grant. I believe we may reasonably expect a recommendation for some further grant-in-aid of the 1970-71 Revenue Accounts beyond the \$5,000,000 advance, but we cannot expect the commission to recommend grants sufficient to meet our deficits in full, irrespective of the level of financial effort we make to help ourselves. Under the commission's procedures we may expect a recommendation for grants sufficient to put us in much the same position as the "standard" States (presently New South Wales and Victoria), provided that our overall effort in raising revenues and in providing services is comparable to theirs. It follows that, if those two States are placed in a difficult situation because of Commonwealth policy, the claimant States of South Australia and Tasmania will also face a comparably difficult situation. If we wish to provide services at a level comparable with those of the standard States and not record deficits any greater than theirs, we must be prepared to tax and to charge overall equally as heavily. If we wish to hold revenue deficits to levels below those of the standard States, we must be prepared to tax and charge more heavily or to provide social services and otherwise function more economically.

The Government has reviewed very carefully the extent to which it may be practicable to contain or reduce current expenditures; and it has given firm instructions to all departments to achieve every practicable economy in staffing, travel, printing, and use of goods and services generally. While we would not entertain any unwarranted panic action, such as dismissal of staff, for example, we will look for any savings that can be made without jeopardizing the real standard of essential services.

However, a firm control on expenditures will be able to meet only a relatively small part of our present Revenue Budget problem and it is necessary for a number of revenue-raising measures to be introduced if essential services are to be maintained at minimum levels and deficits contained within manageable bounds. In looking at possible measures we have kept in mind five major factors. I have already mentioned the first; that is, measurement by the Grants Commission. I want to make clear that the commission does not expect us necessarily to levy every tax levied by the standard States and to apply each at the levels operative in the standard States. We are not bound to follow them in every particular but, if we want to achieve a comparable final Budget

result, we must be willing to make a comparable effort overall. New South Wales has a tax on poker machines that is expected to yield about \$34,000,000 in this year. I have said before, and I repeat now, that the South Australian Government has no intention of seeing poker machines introduced here. But that leaves us with a problem of looking for revenues in other ways, either in fields that New South Wales does not tax or in some areas at rates higher than are levied by New South Wales.

The second factor is the constraint or limit imposed by Commonwealth Government financial pressures and by the Australian Constitution (and the interpretations and decisions given thereon by the High Court). The Commonwealth Government has consistently made grants to the States on the firm condition that they refrain from levying an income tax or a pay-roll tax. It has refused at recent conferences to alter its attitude on this matter and, therefore, income taxes and pay-roll taxes continue to lie outside the area of State choice. The ruling given by the High Court in the successful challenge to the receipts duties levied by the several States has limited the opportunities of the States to impose duties on transactions.

The third factor is the extent of administration required in the levying of a tax or charge and the additional work that may be entailed for the businessman or private individual in making returns or payment. Clearly there are fewer problems of this nature in increasing an existing tax than in introducing a new tax. If a new tax is to be introduced it is obviously desirable that the administration be simple and the cost small in relation to the return. The fourth factor is equity and the avoidance as far as possible of charges that bear heavily on a small part of the community; in particular, of course, on the lower-income groups.

The fifth factor is the increasing level of costs that must be met by the business undertakings and the increase in charges necessary if the users of the services are to make a reasonable contribution to those higher costs. As a result of a review of all points I have mentioned, the Government has decided to implement the following revenue-raising measures:

- (1) A levy equal to 3 per cent of the gross revenues of the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
- (2) An increase of 20 per cent in the registration fees for motor vehicles com-

bined with a parallel requirement that the Highways Fund shall undertake financial responsibility for certain police road traffic services and the eventual financial responsibility for the proposed Kangaroo Island ferry service.

- (3) An increase in tax on bookmakers' turnover from 1.8 per cent to 2 per cent.
- (4) A levy of 7½ per cent of the admission charges made by persons and authorities licensed to provide public entertainment, subject to an exemption of admission charges not exceeding \$1.
- (5) An increase in bus and tram fares as recommended by the Municipal Tramways Trust.
- (6) An increase in rail fares and freight as recommended by the Railways Commissioner.
- (7) Increase of valuations for water and sewer rating purposes where they are below full present-day values together with an increase in the water rebate charge operative from next financial year.

The proposed contribution by the Electricity Trust of 3 per cent of its gross revenues from the sale of electricity will be in line with a levy introduced by Victoria in 1966 requiring such a contribution from its two publicly owned authorities responsible for the supply of electricity and gas. The concept of a contribution to Consolidated Revenue by those public authorities that are not called upon to pay income tax and some other costs and taxes that impinge on comparable private undertakings is common to all States and the Commonwealth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier's time has expired. If he desires an extension, he will have to seek further leave.

Further leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That principle has applied for many years to Government insurance offices, banks, airlines, brickworks and other business undertakings. As members know, the State Bank of South Australia has, since 1968-69, paid a contribution to revenue comparable with the amount of income tax it would have paid if it were a company. As the annual revenue of the Electricity Trust is now approaching \$70,000,000, its contribution initially will be about \$2,000,000 a year. The Government intends shortly to introduce legislation to provide for a contribution from April 1 next so that the 1970-71 Budget will benefit from one quarter's receipts of about \$500,000. I point

out that the trust's tariffs have been held so that they are presently no higher than they were 19 years ago, a remarkable achievement against a background of increasing costs in virtually all other areas. The trust, faced with increases in its own costs, particularly in wages and salaries and in interest rates, would, in any case, have had to contemplate some increases in tariffs soon.

Moreover, over the past 15 to 20 years its structures of costs have altered, as have practices in both industrial and domestic usage of power, and I believe the trust may wish to make a careful review of the structure of its tariff schedules. Pending this review, which will inevitably take some months, the trust will probably carry the impact of the proposed 3 per cent levy. The increased tariffs, when determined, will undoubtedly have to be somewhat greater overall than the 3 per cent required for public revenues. I would not attempt at this stage any precise forecast of the overall increase likely in electricity tariffs. Having regard to the amazing stability of tariffs over nearly 20 years, when costs and incomes have so greatly increased, the 3 per cent for Government revenues must be regarded as very modest indeed, whilst any other addition for the trust's own costs I am sure will likewise be modest.

It is now 17 years since the scales of motor vehicle registration fees have been varied. The Government intends that the fees shall be increased by an average of about 20 per cent from July 1 next, subject to a proviso that pensioners currently qualifying for public transport concessions will be protected against the increase by being given an appropriate percentage rebate upon the normal fees to be prescribed. The increased revenue derived will be next year about \$2,750,000 to \$3,000,000 and the extra moneys will be devoted to three main purposes:

- (1) An amendment of the Highways Act will be submitted to authorize appropriations of up to 6 per cent of the gross registration fees (about \$1,000,000 next year) towards meeting the rapidly increasing costs of police services in controlling and otherwise dealing with motor traffic and road safety. These direct costs already exceed \$1,000,000 a year.
- (2) Making the necessary financial provisions for a ferry between the mainland and Kangaroo Island, both in construction and operation.
- (3) A considerable proportion of the increased revenues will necessarily be

required for ordinary direct road provisions to offset in some measure the increased wage and salary costs that would otherwise have unduly restricted roadworks.

From July 1, 1969, when the winning bets tax was lifted, the tax on bookmakers' turnover was increased from 1½ per cent to 1.8 per cent to offset partially the loss of revenue. It is now intended to increase the tax, from April 1, to 2 per cent, the most common rate applicable in the other States. This will yield additional revenues of about \$110,000 in a full year, and about \$35,000 this financial year. It is intended to enact as from July 1 next an entertainment or amusement duty upon admission charges made by persons and authorities licensed to provide public entertainment. The proposed rate is 7½ per cent of the gross charges subject to exemption of admission charges not exceeding \$1. The proposal is that the duty shall be paid as a licence fee and administered by way of a statutory return rendered at prescribed intervals, so as to keep the administration as simple as possible. The duty will extend to race meetings, films, football, and other sports, stage shows, and other entertainment. A preliminary estimate of the revenue derivable is about \$200,000 to \$250,000 a year.

The Municipal Tramways Trust has recommended that a contribution toward rapidly increasing costs be made by reviewing tram and bus fares for the fourth, fifth, eighth, and ninth sections, which were last increased over four years ago in October, 1966. The Government has agreed to an increase of 5c for each of those sections from next Sunday, February 28. In the normal course this would not require an increase in the fares for children or pensioners upon the fourth and fifth sections but would require a 5c increase for them upon the eighth and ninth sections. However, in the light of the absence of any significant recent increase in pensions, pensioners will be exempted from the latter increase upon M.T.T. services. In a full year the increase will yield additional revenues of a little over \$300,000 (nearly \$100,000 this year), and to that extent will reduce the Government's obligation to make good the losses of the trust.

The Railways Commissioner has recommended that a contribution towards increasing costs be made by reviewing both passenger fares and freights. The Government has agreed that metropolitan fares be adjusted so that they will more nearly approach bus fares for comparable distances, so that the fare for

return journeys will be double that for single journeys, and so that periodical fares will retain generally their present relationship to return fares. This adjustment, to become operative from April 1, will yield about \$200,000 additional revenues in a full year, and perhaps \$50,000 this year. Because of longer distances involved in certain private bus operation and by railways, and because of the generally lower fare level by railways, the pensioner concession will continue to be the same as for children, that is, it will be 50 per cent of the adult fare as a maximum.

As to rail freights the Government has agreed that the Commissioner review all intrastate scheduled and special contract rates as may be practicable within the agreements made, and renegotiate contract rates having regard to increasing costs both as they affect the railways undertaking itself and its competitors in road transport. I am unable to give a firm estimate of the additional revenues likely to be available from these reviews, but I hope that a further \$300,000 at least will be obtained in a full year. Little of this is likely to be available in 1970-71. The Commissioner will discuss with his counterparts in the other railways undertakings the matter of interstate rates for both fares and freights with a view to achieving increased revenues commensurate with increased costs.

With water and sewer charges the Government's design will be so far as possible to secure additional revenues adequate to offset unavoidable increased costs so that this function will not absorb funds so urgently required to maintain our essential education, health, and social services. Generally, valuations are presently some 7 per cent to 10 per cent below full current values, and the proposal is for the next financial year to adopt full normal current values. At the same time the standard 35c charge a thousand gallons for rebate water will be increased to 40c, so that the increase in rate revenue is not automatically absorbed simply by reducing the amount of excess water paid for or by using more water. It is expected that the charge for excess water and water supplied by measure will remain at 35c a thousand gallons. The Government has received the report of the Special Committee on Water Rating, which was appointed by the previous Government. That report is presently being studied, but it is of such a nature that its main recommendations, if accepted, could not possibly be implemented for the next financial year, and we must, of course, protect the State's revenue position in

the meantime. The immediate proposals for adjustments in valuation and in rebate water allowances will not prejudice the ultimate implementation of the committee's recommendations should they be accepted.

The revenue measures I have reviewed will benefit the Budget by about \$6,000,000 in a full year, but it will be difficult to achieve a yield of more than \$700,000 this financial year. Having regard to the fact that the full year's cost of awards will add considerable sums to next year's State Revenue Budgets over and above the part year's cost in 1970-71, that there will be some further awards during 1971-72, and that the Commonwealth's present attitude gives no indication of any significant supplementary revenue assistance, we must contemplate the likelihood of continuing revenue deficits in all States. For South Australia, in particular, we must bear in mind that the carryover cost into 1971-72, because of the full year's effect of awards given this year, may be about \$14,000,000. This would compare with a carryover cost at the beginning of 1970-71 of about \$7,500,000.

Therefore, despite significant revenue-raising efforts in areas under our own control we must plan also to reserve an adequate volume of Loan funds substantially to cover present and prospective revenue deficits. The indications from the Commonwealth at the conference three weeks ago were that we could not expect support of Loan programmes at all significantly greater in 1971-72 than in 1970-71, and there is undoubtedly some serious risk of the Commonwealth seeking to impose a reduction. In such circumstances it would require a very firm control indeed of our works programmes if we are to hold sufficient Loan funds in reserve.

The Government has already given the necessary instructions to see that such a control is exercised. In this way I would hope that Loan funds in hand on June 30, 1971, may be within a \$1,000,000 or so of the accumulated revenue deficit. Endeavours will be made to reduce the margin further. For 1971-72, however, I am unable to forecast with any precision. Much depends upon the extent of any supplementary Commonwealth assistance, upon the extent to which the Commonwealth is willing to support Loan allocations, and the future movement of wages and costs. However, the expedient which all States must adopt temporarily to meet revenue deficits (that is, to divert Loan funds from development projects) must not be regarded as other than a temporary one, both because of the

effect upon development and because of the ultimate crushing impact of unrecouped interest.

All State Governments are now facing very serious financial difficulties, and they are likely to continue for some time. From the figures mentioned at and subsequent to the recent Premiers' Conference it is apparent that the deterioration in finances in most, if not all, of the other States since they submitted their Budgets has been greater than in South Australia. To give two examples concerning the States closest to South Australia in size, Western Australia went from a balanced Budget to a deficit of \$10,700,000, and the Queensland Government has announced that its Budget deficit of \$2,500,000 has gone to a prospective deficit of \$16,000,000. Some States have announced that they intend to deal at least temporarily with the situation by a slowing down of essential works programmes, and one has announced reduction of its recruitment of teachers and nurses. The South Australian Government's approach is that it will maintain all its essential works and all its essential social services.

Where necessary it will continue to expand education, health, and other social services, both by authorizing proper additional works provisions and with appropriate further recruitment. It will, so far as practicable, meet the recurrent costs involved by positive revenue-raising measures, which I have already announced. The Government has already taken measures to ensure firm control of expenditures both on works and services that are not immediately necessary, and it will continue to pursue those measures, but it will not be stampeded into a programme of slashing provisions irrespective of their necessity and public importance.

QUESTIONS

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. HALL: In view of the rage and anger that will permeate South Australia at the announcement just concluded by the Treasurer that he will put his hands even deeper into the pockets of South Australians, can he say why he has not controlled expenditure in the current Budget? The *Government Gazette* of Thursday, February 4, contains a table of payments from Consolidated Revenue Account for the six months ended December 31, 1970, compared to payments for the previous year. I draw to the Premier's attention a few comparative figures, on which I base my question.

Expenditure within the Electoral Department, for instance, has risen from about \$50,000 to about \$201,000, representing an expansion of 302 per cent. Expenditure within the Public Service Board Department has risen from about \$263,000 to about \$427,000, a rise of 62.3 per cent. Expenditure within the Attorney-General's Department has risen from about \$189,000 to about \$312,000, an increase of 65 per cent. Expenditure within the Registrar-General's Department has risen from about \$232,000 to about \$313,000 (by 34.9 per cent).

Under the Treasury portfolio, Superannuation Department expenditure has risen from about \$94,000 to about \$122,000, an increase of a mere 29.4 per cent; and in the Valuation Department expenditure has risen from about \$283,000 to about \$378,000, an increase of 33.5 per cent. Expenditure within the Minister of Works Department has risen from about \$13,000 to about \$25,000, an increase of 92.3 per cent. In the Public Buildings Department, expenditure has risen from about \$4,341,000 to about \$6,057,000, an increase of 39.5 per cent. Expenditure in the Minister of Education Department has risen from about \$9,000 to about \$17,000 (by 88.4 per cent). Under the Minister of Labour and Industry, the total expenditure has risen from about \$303,000 to about \$395,000 (by 30.3 per cent). In the Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government Department, expenditure has risen from about \$151,000 to about \$286,000, an 89.4 per cent increase. That is the basis on which I ask the Premier why he has failed to control expenditure in this current Budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Evidently, the Leader of the Opposition is not aware that there have been wage increases inevitably as a result of the provisions of the arbitration authorities.

Mr. Hall: Are you suggesting they are all due to that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will answer the Leader specifically in a moment. Without any increases at all in Public Service employment during the three years prior to the last financial year, wage increases in South Australia averaged between \$5,000,000 and \$7,000,000 a year to the Government. Last financial year, under the Treasurership of the Leader of the Opposition, the wage increases accounted for \$10,250,000. This year, as a result not of the decisions of Government but of the decisions of arbitration commissions, to

which I have heard members opposite constantly pay a tribute, the increase to the State Budget has been \$18,500,000. Let us take one department referred to by the Leader, namely, the Electoral Department: there has not been one extra employee in that department, but the increase in costs is evident to us. The Deputy Leader has talked about the increase in the Attorney-General's Department: may I point out that the honourable member introduced a measure into this House and set up the District and Criminal Courts Department, and that department has provided for almost the total increase in the Attorney-General's lines. It is about time we stopped having a bit of humbug from the Opposition and had a little more support for this State's needs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Treasurer give details of any specific savings to contain or reduce current expenditures that the Government has either effected or intends to effect? This afternoon we have heard from the Treasurer a long statement about financial matters which occupied 16 pages, although only one paragraph, on page 6, refers to any attempt to reduce expenditures to meet the expected deficit. That is merely a pious platitude.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I table the memorandum that I have sent to all Ministers on this matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer say whether it is intended to make specific cuts in expenditure, as opposed to avoiding further increases, to save money because of the expected Budget deficit? As I have said, the middle paragraph in page 6 of the Treasurer's statement contains a pious expression of hope that expenditures will be kept to a minimum. In reply to my question whether he could detail what precisely it was intended to cut down on, the Treasurer tabled a memorandum, dated February 10, which he apparently sent to all Ministers. On looking at that memorandum, I find that it is no more than an expansion of the pious paragraph in the Treasurer's Ministerial statement. I must say that I received such memoranda while I was in office; as such, they mean absolutely nothing. The tabling of this document does not answer the question whether the Government intends to make specific cuts in expenditure to try to save money, to cut down on anything that it had planned to do, and that is the question that I, now direct to the Premier, because I suggest to you, Sir, and to him that this matter is of great importance to the people of South

Australia. They have been told how they will be slugged by additional taxation and they are entitled to know whether the Government will play any part in this matter by cutting down its expenditures.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already announced that we think some measures can be postponed reasonably, and they specifically relate to the comfort of the honourable member in Parliament House. I seem to remember that a memorandum similar to the one to which he has referred was issued during the period of office of the Government of which he was a member. Even if he thought nothing of it at that time, I do not think the Public Service thought that.

Mr. Millhouse: Aren't you prepared to give—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage I will not say that \$20,000 will be cut off here and \$40,000 cut off there. We are examining every area of public expenditure.

Mr. Millhouse: That means absolutely nothing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member thinks that, I assure him that I will take some measures that he will take notice of.

SMITHFIELD HOSTEL

Mr. CLARK: Will the Premier inquire into the likely closing down of the migrant hostel at Smithfield and, if possible, try to keep this hostel operating? This question is based not just on a rumour: the information has come to me from a most reliable source. I have consulted with civic and industrial leaders in my district who are all of the opinion that it is to the advantage of the district and surrounding districts, including Playford and possibly Gawler, and people living in Para Hills, and so on, that the Commonwealth hostels at Smithfield should be kept open. It has been pointed out to me (and I completely agree) that many people who stay at the Smithfield hostel eventually work or live in the Elizabeth area and adjoining areas. Will the Premier therefore investigate this matter and, if possible, see that the Smithfield hostel is retained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. WARDLE: Does the Leader of the Opposition, as the previous Premier of this State and also as South Australia's signatory to the Dartmouth agreement, believe that

there is merit in the South Australian Government's proposals—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WARDLE: — to have ratified a somewhat watered-down version of the Dartmouth agreement, and does he think that the other parties to the agreement are likely to support such a move?

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition desire to reply?

Mr. HALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is inappropriate to talk about a watered-down agreement: as yet there is no water under the agreement with which the Government is fiddling around. Clause 13 of the agreement which is to be deleted under the Government's programme has no real bearing on the agreement which this State is asked to sign: it is simply formalizing the process already in existence. Anyone who has studied the agreement and presents it honestly knows well that there is no enforceable agreement to obtain Chowilla because there is no agreement covering Chowilla at today's costs of construction. The Government's inability to renegotiate on any basis proves there is no enforceable agreement, and the clause the Government wishes to delete is simply one which the other parties want to have in the agreement in order to formalize the present position. Clause 10 (a), which is vital to South Australia, was inserted in the agreement at my insistence. The Dartmouth dam will be of great benefit to South Australia, bearing in mind the increased water yield which has been negotiated for this State but which will only apply to its full extent if the ability of Lake Victoria to supply water at short notice is given to the State. The State will have the ability to obtain that water at short notice or to obtain an efficient short-term quota only if the inlet and outlet works at Lake Victoria are upgraded. It is essential, therefore, to have this clause in the agreement. I believe that other parties to the agreement will not take the document back to their respective Parliaments to have it altered, because they are obviously becoming tired of the politics at present surrounding this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: The Government has pursued a strange course in this matter. I recall an excerpt from the Government's policy speech made prior to the last election, namely:

In relation to the Murray River, we will renegotiate the agreement concerning the building of the Dartmouth dam to ensure that

South Australia's legal rights to the building of the Chowilla dam are not ended. We will demand, further, that new computer studies are made to ascertain the benefits of operating dams at both Dartmouth and Chowilla. We will seek to negotiate a commencing date for Chowilla to be inserted in an enforceable agreement.

The Government has not achieved anything by renegotiation, the proposal now announced by the Premier being only a mixture of all of the points put forward in the part of the policy speech to which I have referred. It is high time that the Government came to its senses in regard to this matter, and I believe there is only one way in which it can be brought to its senses: I should like to see the Upper House delay considering the financial matters about which we have heard today until the Dartmouth dam legislation is passed.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr. McRAE: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether the Government will urgently consider taking control of the Lyell McEwin Hospital as a Government-subsidized hospital? On several previous occasions I have raised this matter, which is one of increasing urgency in the community and amongst doctors.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. COUNBE: Will the Attorney-General reconsider the reply which he gave me on November 3, 1970, which appears at page 2255 of *Hansard*, and in which he refused to take action to restrict or review the play *Oh! Calcutta!*, which is to be shown in a theatre in my district, at Nailsworth? I point out that a tremendous wave of opposition to this production has come from members of the public, community and church organizations throughout the metropolitan area, and the Prospect council. Will the Attorney-General use the powers he already has under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act and reverse his previous decision, which I think he announced in conjunction with the Premier, to permit the play to be produced without restriction?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As I explained to the honourable member when answering his earlier question, some months ago the promoters of this show submitted to the Government a script purporting to be a revised or rewritten script for Australia. On reading the

script, I saw that the show apparently dealt with matters of a sexual nature in a rather explicit fashion and, in these circumstances, I concluded that the show could reasonably be regarded as indecent or obscene if performed before an audience of immature people. I therefore informed the promoters that, if they failed to exclude from the audience persons under the age of 18 years, it would be appropriate for the Attorney-General to exercise his authority under the Places of Public Entertainment Act and to prohibit the show. I also told the promoters then that the exclusion of people under the age of 18 years did not confer on the promoters any immunity from complying with the laws of the State which are designed to protect and preserve public decency. I said that, if those laws were infringed by the way the show was performed, the promoters would expose themselves to prosecution in the ordinary way. That is still my attitude. It seems to me that possibly this script can be performed in a way that does not infringe the law. This is a matter for the promoters themselves (for those conducting the show) to work out. The mere perusal of the script does not show conclusively that there would be offences against the law of South Australia necessarily present in its presentation. However, undoubtedly it could be performed in a way which would infringe the law and which would be offensive to public decency and public morality.

The position is that, if the show goes on, people who take part in it are subject to the same obligation as has every other citizen of the State, and that is to obey the law. If they do not do this, they expose themselves to the risk of prosecution. I have no doubt that the members of the Police Force will know how to deal with that situation and, in so doing, they will have my entire support.

Mr. Coumbe: How will you know if the cast of the show disobeys the law?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Because the police officers are charged with the responsibility of seeing that the laws of South Australia are complied with. I have not the slightest doubt that police methods are well able to deal with a situation of this kind, to detect offences if they take place, and to launch the necessary prosecutions. As I have said, if offences take place, the police officers will have my entire support. On the material before me at present, I do not believe there are adequate grounds for saying that the performance of

this show will necessarily offend against the laws of South Australia; it may well do so and, if it does, prosecution will follow and the people taking part will be dealt with. If those people can perform this show within the limits of the law, they have the same right as anyone else has to perform it, and persons of adult age have the right to decide whether or not they want to see a show performed in a legal manner.

HEALTH BENEFITS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to take up with his department, the hospitals and medical funds and the Commonwealth authorities the matter of the non-payment of medical benefits at country hospitals in cases where there has been no treatment by a qualified medical practitioner? A near relative of a constituent of mine was recently admitted to a country hospital with a gash in the leg that necessitated stitches. Because no qualified medical practitioner was on hand, this person was attended to by the senior matron in charge. However, as the treatment was not performed by a doctor, the hospital fund was not prepared to pay benefits. I realize that this matter could get out of hand: no-one would expect payment because his great-aunt had put a band-aid on the back of his hand, or something like that. However, it seems to me that treatment by a matron in a hospital should come within the provisions of the Act.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether there is any delay in the planning and establishment of the Kangaroo Island road link? The Minister will recall that while he has been in office he, on behalf of the Government, has announced acceptance of the recommendation of the committee of inquiry about this matter and several times he has reiterated the urgent need to have the ferry operating when the payment of subsidy to the Adelaide Steamship Company terminates in July, 1972. Although I have been in touch with the Minister frequently about this matter, no-one can say that I have harried him about it. However, I am somewhat concerned at the apparent delay in making progress with this project. I say "apparent" delay because progress is not apparent publicly, at any rate, and the time is running out. I realize that the

planning of a ship and of the shore installations is a complicated matter. I should like the Minister to confirm the assurance he gave last October about the time table as well as the intention, having regard to the Premier's statement this afternoon that the Government intends to finance this project from the Highways Fund.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There has been some unavoidable delay (I think that is the best descriptive term that I can use). Since the committee of inquiry first investigated the feasibility of establishing a ferry from Cape Jervis to Penneshaw, other factors have intruded into the position and, as the member for Alexandra knows, this has caused some concern. I think I told the House (I certainly told the honourable member) that, because of the changed circumstances and the large sum involved, remembering that it is public money, the Government had decided that there ought to be a further review to find out whether the changed circumstances would have any impact on the committee's original recommendation, and to this end I reconstituted the committee and asked it to review the position. I think it was a week ago that the chairman of that committee gave me his report, which reaffirms the previous recommendation that the Government should proceed to build the ferry. In the report the chairman points out that time is slipping by and that now there is no time to lose. The Government realizes this and only yesterday Cabinet took a further step by agreeing to the establishment of a small working committee to go ahead with the building of the ferry and the approaches. The matter of finance intrudes into this question now, as the honourable member has stated. The Government soon will be introducing legislation to amend both the Motor Vehicles Act and the Highways Act so that, amongst other things, this ferry can be built, and I look forward to getting the support of the member for Alexandra for the Government's measures.

KARAMEL COMMITTEE

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Education say when he expects to release the report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia, commonly known as the Karmel Committee? I understand that part of the delay is because of publishing difficulties, the committee having completed its report and presented its findings to the Minister. This is not an explanation, Mr. Speaker, but, because of the calibre of the personnel of the committee, their investigation and subsequent

report are expected to be of far-reaching importance over the whole range of education in South Australia and I, having initiated the committee when I was Minister of Education, pay my tribute to the undoubted ability of the members of the committee and to the effort they personally exerted in pursuing their original charter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The latest information we have received from the Government Printer is that the first 1,000 copies or so of the report will be available by about the middle of March. It is intended, as soon as sufficient copies are available, to circulate them to persons entitled to free copies and we also intend to provide sufficient supplies for bookshops, so the report will be released immediately. I also add my compliments to those of the member for Davenport for the work of this committee. The Government agrees that the committee's work is extremely valuable. We have arranged to print 7,000 copies, a fairly large printing order, and the report will be available for purchase at \$4. It comprises about 700 pages, which shows that it is an extremely large document. We consider that it will be of interest not only in South Australia but throughout Australia and, to that end, I have told all the major book sellers in Australia of the forthcoming publication of the report, the price at which it will be available to them, the contents of the report, and how they may order it. Already the Government Printer has received orders for hundreds of copies of the report and additional orders are being received all the time. Of course, we do not want to cause any delay in making the report available and, as soon as the Government Printer completes the job and makes the report available to us, it will be released. I will ensure that the honourable member, as well as all other members of the House, get an advance copy.

WHYALLA SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Education provide a free departmental bus service for secondary students from Iron Knob and Iron Baron who travel to Whyalla each day for their education? At present 33 students from Iron Knob and 12 students from Iron Baron travel to Whyalla each day, the cost being 30c for students from Iron Knob and 15c for students from Iron Baron. The cost of the bus service is subsidized by the Education Department but, nevertheless, the cost of transport for parents, some of whom now have three children travelling on the service

(and will have four children travelling next year), is great. I understand that next year about 60 children will require secondary education at Whyalla. Recently, I was present at a well attended meeting at Iron Knob, at which parents unanimously voted for a fully subsidized bus service.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be happy to look into the matter. However, I point out that the department is already experiencing considerable difficulty and is paying considerable costs in relation to this service. As the honourable member knows, the department cannot obtain the services of a private contractor to do the job at an economic rate and, as a consequence, a teacher-driver has had to be employed. The department has been unable to get a teacher who teaches at Whyalla to live at Iron Knob or Iron Baron. Indeed, if the department insists on this the teacher involved will probably resign.

Mr. Clark: What about the old days when a headmaster lived there?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the member for Elizabeth would realize, some teachers who teach at a local school live in that area. However, the driver that conducts this service at present lives in Whyalla and drives his own car to Iron Knob or Iron Baron each day. He leaves his car there, and takes the children to Whyalla each morning. In the afternoon he returns the children to their homes and then returns to Whyalla in his own car, so he has to drive 140 miles each day. Even under these arrangements, with the subsidy that is paid to the parents concerned (the full cost of the service is not met by them), this service is close to being the most expensive in the State. However, I will look into the matter raised by the honourable member and see that his suggestion is fully investigated.

SOLDIER SETTLER LOANS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works discuss with the Minister of Repatriation the possibility of transferring soldier settler loans, which usually run for 30 years, in the event of the sale of such a property? The Minister will no doubt appreciate the problems facing the man on the land today. For one reason or another, some soldier settlers may wish to sell their properties, and if the loans they have already received could be transferred to the purchaser it would assist both parties. One anomaly may be that the returned serviceman receives the benefit of low interest rates,

whereas others do not. I know of a specific case in my district where a possible sale did not eventuate because the loan was not transferable. In that instance, the vendor was in straitened circumstances. In view of the dire circumstances confronting the rural industries today, the implementation of my suggestion would materially assist these people. I should appreciate it, therefore, if this matter could be examined by the authorities soon.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member would be aware, many properties are passed on to the widow of the serviceman that purchased the block, and some to the sons of the soldier settler concerned. Although I shall be happy to discuss the matter with my colleague, it will have to be discussed with Commonwealth Government officials before a decision can be taken.

POISON

Mr. BURDON: My question, which I direct to the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Forests, concerns the laying, on public roads, of the poison 1080 by the Woods and Forests Department. Private landholders have told me that the Woods and Forests Department has during the last few years laid the poison 1080 on various lands as well as on public roads. Some private landholders have objected to this and have suggested that, before the poison is so laid in future, the department discuss the matter with them and that, if the latter objects, no poison should be laid on the land adjacent to their properties.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received similar complaints, and I have also received complaints that the laying of the poison 1080 in various areas is destroying bird life. I shall be happy to take up this matter with my colleague.

CUMMINS HOSPITAL

Mr. CARNIE: As it involves State finances, I intended to address my question to the Treasurer, but, as it also concerns health, I will address it to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health. In view of this State's present economic situation, will the Minister say whether the subsidy for the planned new hospital at Cummins will still be available? I have been approached by the hospital board, which has expressed concern that, because of this State's present economic situation, the subsidy may not now be available. Tenders for the new hospital close on March 5. In view of the consequent urgency, I therefore seek an assurance from the Government that this sum of about \$140,000 will still be available to the Cummins Hospital.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with the Treasurer and the Chief Secretary and let the honourable member have a reply.

MATRICULATION STUDENTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education say whether the people affected by the Matriculation examination mistake are to be helped financially or otherwise? Some parents have been put to considerable expense for school books and new uniforms, and some students will be affected adversely because of quota systems in the various faculties.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The question the honourable member asks in relation to school books has some validity because students affected by this mistake in the publication of the Matriculation results who now change courses may have books that are of no immediate use to them and may be required to obtain another set of books. This is definitely a problem. I certainly intend to require that in such cases these books be purchased back by the school. They will, therefore, be available for other students that need them. Ultimately, there should be no loss to the Education Department. For students at the universities, the Institute of Technology and teachers colleges who have changed their course as a consequence of this mistake, I will ask book sellers to take back books that have been purchased by mistake in this way. I am sure that we will obtain the co-operation of book sellers in South Australia: I should be most surprised if we could not. If the honourable member knows of any particular case involving a student I should be pleased if he would give me the details and I will take up the matter with the book seller concerned. Also, I intend to contact each major book seller in South Australia and ask that any students who have been affected by this change be allowed to return the books.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you ensure that there will be no such mistake in future?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps he is, Mr. Speaker, but it is relevant. When the member for Peake was in charge of the computer at the University of Adelaide no mistakes were made in its operation.

Mr. Coumbe: That is why I suggested that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This was not a mistake made by the computer: it was

a human error in relation to the cards put through the machine, not the programme. I have a detailed report from the Public Examinations Board concerning the unfortunate error that occurred, and there are one or two additional matters to which I should like to refer. Concerning uniforms, I should be interested to have details of any particular case: it could only be in relation to a student who went back to school and who made additional clothing purchases. I hope the school concerned can reach some kind of agreement with the student. The Government cannot compensate people fully for the inconvenience or loss involved in one or two cases. As a consequence of the mistake the cost to the Government is between \$30,000 and \$40,000 at least, because of the additional offers made of places at teachers colleges. I was told this morning that, of the 46 additional offers made of teachers college scholarships, 23 had been accepted, and this will mean an additional expenditure of at least \$23,000 by the Education Department. Additional places provided at the universities and at the Institute of Technology will carry a cost with them, so that the mistake has been expensive, and there is a limit to the extent to which we can assist.

Mr. Coumbe: You would have had to meet that cost in any case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. We had already filled the places that were to be offered. As Minister of Education I have said (on the recommendation of my officers) that we will stretch accommodation at teachers colleges and offer additional scholarships. Both universities and the Institute of Technology have stated that they will stretch accommodation within their quotas and offer additional places. To its credit (for once), the Commonwealth Government has stated that it will provide scholarships to those who should have been entitled to them and, presumably, it has gone above the quota that it intended to provide. All round, the mistake has been costly indeed, and has raised the question of the reliability of examination results in general.

At a meeting of the Public Examinations Board last Saturday morning a committee was appointed to consider in detail the whole problem created by this occurrence. Members of the committee are Professor B. Abrahamson (Deputy Chairman of the board, who was Acting Chairman during the absence of Professor Trevaskis), Mr. A. E. Norman (Senior Lecturer, Mathematics and Data Processing at the Institute of Technology), and Mr. David Morris (Secretary of the Public Examinations

Board). That three-man committee will consider the whole question of what action is necessary and what checking systems should be introduced to prevent this type of incident occurring again. The whole situation is most unfortunate and we must avoid a recurrence. I will consider the matter regarding uniforms further to see whether anything specific can be done, but I think the best solution would be for the individual student to approach the school and ask it to help. I am sure that, if the school is willing, it can provide some other student as a willing buyer to purchase the uniform without too great a loss being involved.

READER'S DIGEST

Mr. CRIMES: Can the Attorney-General say whether action can be taken to prevent the dissemination of publicity by *Reader's Digest* in Sydney by means of posting such publicity in envelopes marked "Urgent" in large letters and bearing the words "Open immediately", thus simulating an urgent telegram? A letter, which I received from one of my constituents, states:

Dear Sir, I have taken the liberty of sending you a letter, if you could call it such, which has been sent to me, I take it from *Reader's Digest*, Sydney. I am sure you would agree it is so designed to simulate an urgent telegram. When my wife took it from our letter box she became very upset, as at first glance she took it as an urgent telegram. Having her family living in a country town her first thought was that it could have meant a serious situation, perhaps in regard to her health, as there has been serious illness in the family. You may be well aware of this type of misleading advertising, or whatever you may call it. However, I am posting it to you for your interest, trusting in some way this type of postage can be controlled.

I have a copy of the irresponsible publicity put out by *Reader's Digest* that I shall be pleased to hand to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I agree that this is a highly undesirable practice. It was the subject of a question asked by a member towards the end of last year and, following that question, I communicated with *Reader's Digest* about using this form of publicity, and received a reply. I do not have it in front of me but it was to the general effect, as I understood it, that this organization would discontinue this form of activity, at any rate in South Australia. Now that this matter has been raised again, I will check that reply and, in any event, whatever the contents were of the reply I will take up the matter again with this organization.

TAXI FARE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs investigate the recent expenditure of about \$68 for the hire of a taxi to take an Aboriginal woman from Port Augusta to Andamooka? Recently, an Aboriginal woman arrived at Port Augusta from Andamooka and, because of her behaviour, an officer from the Aboriginal Affairs Department, rather than wait 24 hours for the normal bus from Port Augusta to Andamooka to depart, engaged a taxi for her immediate return. In view of the present position of State finances, will the Minister say whether he considers this expenditure is extravagant?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have inquiries made and bring down a report.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLL

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier say what is the cost of the Government's campaign to entice people to exercise their voluntary right to enrol as voters for the Legislative Council? Will he also ascertain the number of staff engaged in all aspects of this campaign and how much in wages has been paid to the officers concerned? If no extra staff has been employed in the Electoral Department, as has been suggested by the Premier, will he say how the large number of staff members (I understand about 20) engaged in this project would otherwise have been employed during the relevant period?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Returning Officer estimates the cost of the Legislative Council canvass at about \$15,500, which comprises the following: printing of forms, \$3,000; processing envelopes, \$500; and postage, \$12,000. An additional estimated \$20,000 would have been incurred in computer extraction of birth dates of two-thirds of the electors but, as this was necessary in any case for jury and other purposes, it was not a charge related to the specific purpose of enrolling Legislative Council electors. Since many electors have enrolled as a result of the campaign, it seems to me to have been a moderate cost, although I vividly recall, as no doubt the honourable member does, that on the last occasion we embarked on an exercise of giving everyone a right, which had been given by the previous Liberal Government to a selected few, it was called by the Leader of the Opposition a dastardly Socialist plot.

NURIOOTPA BANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier expedite payment of a grant to the Nuriootpa

School Bands Carnival Committee? When I asked this question of the Premier during the Budget debate, I was told that grants for the performing arts had been doubled; nevertheless, an officer had been appointed to rationalize (I think that was the word) these grants. The carnival in question was held in October and payment of the bills in connection therewith is long overdue. Buses have to be paid for, and the fact that the committee has not this year received this modest grant (a grant that it has received for about 12 years) has embarrassed it considerably. Will the Premier see whether the newly-appointed officer will ensure that this grant is made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Cabinet had before it only yesterday a complete report of all applications for performing arts grants in South Australia. The amount to the Nuriootpa School Bands Committee was retained, and the committee will receive its cheque (from memory, \$900) shortly.

UNION MEMBERSHIP

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether any further approach is available to a person who has consistently been refused admission to a union, each of the two unions to which he has been directed and has applied for membership stating that he should be a member of the other union? This matter arose as long ago as 1965, as the member for Tea Tree Gully may recall, she having been the member for Barossa at the time and having, I believe, interceded on this person's behalf. An application for membership has been made to both the Storemen and Packers Union and the Federated Clerks Union, and much correspondence has passed between these unions and the person involved. Other members also have received correspondence on the matter. I raise this matter particularly because of the difficult situation at present in which unionism is looked on as being compulsory. Notwithstanding the statements made by the unions concerned, the person to whom I refer is still unable to join a union.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What is his occupation?

Dr. EASTICK: According to the Federated Clerks Union, he is a storeman and packer, and according to the Storemen and Packers Union he is a clerk. Although I direct this question to the Minister of Labour and Industry, I may, if he wishes, direct another question to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who seems to be the chief prompter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why don't you give the facts so that a reply can be given?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The facts are well known to certain people, including the member for Tea Tree Gully and also the member for Salisbury, who was involved at one stage before becoming a member of the House. He told the person that he would be covered in the event of a strike and, as the member for Tea Tree Gully may know, that he could obtain strike pay should a strike be called. In referring this matter to the present Minister of Labour and Industry because of his close liaison with the union movement, I ask what further approaches are available to a person in this position.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in trying to get this person into a union. It is not often that a member of the Opposition shows such an interest and is prepared to take on such a responsibility for a person in this position. I will certainly take up the matter and make inquiries in the correct channels if the honourable member will give me the name of the person concerned.

DEEP SEA PORT

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Marine say when it is expected that the committee set up to take evidence on the next deep sea port in South Australia will complete its findings? Honourable members may recall that this committee was set up to ascertain where the next major terminal should be established in South Australia. Work on the facilities at Port Lincoln is well under way, and it is the committee's responsibility to take evidence on where the second deep sea terminal should be. It is important that the committee make its findings as soon as possible because the bulk handling co-operative is continuing to build storages at our terminals.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be well aware that this committee was set up by the previous Government to investigate ports on the West Coast, and it finally decided on Port Lincoln. I think it took the committee about 12 months to make its deliberations and decide on Port Lincoln as the future major port in that area. I expect that the present matters being investigated by the committee are no less difficult (in fact, they are probably more difficult) than the matters the committee examined before it decided on Port Lincoln. Although I have not received any preliminary report from the committee, in view of the

honourable member's question I shall be happy to ask what progress it has made and when it is likely that it will make its report to me.

FREE BOOKS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government has a stated policy on the criteria to be applied to applications for free school books? The Minister will be aware that I sought information from him nearly four weeks ago about what the Government's policy was, having regard to the fact that many people had been told that free books would not be available for their children during the 1971 school year, even though the books had been available free in the 1970 school year. My letter was acknowledged and I was told that the policy would be stated at the earliest possible time. In my letter I told the Minister that I required this information so that I could determine how to make representations on behalf of persons whose children had been denied these free school books. The schoolchildren have now been back at school for almost 2½ weeks and one person on whose behalf I wanted to make representations telephoned again yesterday stating that it was a considerable embarrassment to the child that the parent was still waiting to know whether the child would be considered for free books. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether a policy has been laid down and, if it has, I ask him to tell the House what it is.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In relation to free books there is a policy which has been laid down by previous Governments and with which I am not satisfied. Briefly, it involves applying a means test that takes into account the gross income of the breadwinner and the number of dependants and, if the income on the basis of each dependant is less than a certain figure, the breadwinner qualifies for free books for his children. If it is not, he does not qualify. For this financial year, because award wages had been increased, I gave instructions that the means test amount be increased so that it would be in line with the average increase in wages that had taken place, and this has been done. However, it is bound to happen in these circumstances where this sort of means test is applied that an individual who qualified for free books last year, whose income has risen more than the average or who has fewer dependants could well not qualify, whereas someone else who did not qualify last year and whose income has risen by less than the average or

who has more dependants could well qualify this year. The only assurance I give the honourable member is that the total sum the Government is spending under the free books scheme will be as high as it was last year. There has been no diminution in the amount of support given through this scheme. However, I do not regard certain aspects of this means test as satisfactory and I am now instituting a review of it to find out whether we can get, first, a more satisfactory means test and, secondly, a more satisfactory way to determine the individual applicant's gross income and number of dependants, because at present the Government has no suitable check on the statements made in this regard.

CITRUS

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, a statement on the financial position of Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited and its relationship to the financial situation of S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, the marketing authority for the Citrus Organization Committee? Last December Parliament amended the Citrus Industry Organization Act to reconstitute the Citrus Organization Committee, with the object of eliminating the confusion that then existed. One matter contributing to this confusion was the failure of Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited to meet its commitments to S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, and many citrus growers in my district are still waiting to hear the facts that led to this confused situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has made available the following statement:

Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited was incorporated on October 25, 1967, and commenced operations financed by an issue of paid up share capital of \$5,000 and a loan of a sum in the vicinity of \$40,000. Both the shares and the loan were from the funds of the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative (Australia) Limited. The Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited purchased two floor areas in the Sydney market at a cost of \$50,500 and two areas in the Melbourne market at a cost of \$54,500. Trading commenced in Sydney using the trade name of "Ward & Felton" (prior owners of one area purchased), and in Melbourne in their own name of Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited. Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited, having purchased previous accreditations, were supplied with citrus fruit by S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited from the commencement of business. Murray Citrus Marketing Company began to show signs of financial difficulties during September, 1970, and this

culminated in their requesting the A.N.Z. Bank Limited on December 3 to appoint a receiver. It is understood that the receiver, D. L. Nicholl of J. V. Delahunty, Public Accountants, Sydney, took over on December 14, 1970. The financial position of Murray Citrus Marketing Company Proprietary Limited on December 3, 1970, from details given to representatives of S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, was as follows:

	\$
Total Estimated Liabilities . . .	203,457
Total Estimated Assets . . .	75,000
Deficiency	<u>\$128,457</u>

However, this figure must be qualified in the light of certain contingencies, and the deficiency could be in the vicinity of \$173,000. On these figures it would appear that unsecured creditors are unlikely to receive any dividend. It would appear that there has been some discrimination against S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited as far as payment is concerned, as they are virtually the only supplier unpaid and there is evidence of transfers of funds from the Sydney account to the Melbourne account of Murray Citrus Marketing Company, and that the principal debtor to S.A. Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited was the Sydney marketing area.

OVERLAND

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport discuss with the Railways Commissioner the possibility of arranging to bring forward the time of departure of the Overland Express from Melbourne so that it may keep to schedule more easily and arrive on time in Adelaide? Having been involved both as a traveller and in meeting oversea friends travelling on that express recently, I know that it has on occasions been more than an hour (and, on one occasion, more than 2½ hours) late. I understand that this is due partly to the upgrading of the track on the South Australian side of the border and that this is only a temporary and not a common occurrence. In the meantime, in view of the impression of our services created with oversea and other people, will the Minister ascertain whether it would be possible for the train, if it were to leave Melbourne at 7.40 p.m. instead of 8.40 p.m., to get here on time at 9 a.m. as intended?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to discuss this matter with the Railways Commissioner. However, I should point out that although the upgrading of the track is one of the reasons for the delayed arrivals (that work being essential) the major factor is that traffic on the south line is at saturation point, and the delay of one train can affect a dozen trains. The traffic of the jet freight express is indeed an important adjunct to the finances

of the South Australian Railways, and I assure the honourable member that those jet expresses are not side-tracked for passenger trains willy-nilly. However, the Railways Department is as anxious as anyone to have its trains running on time. Regrettably, this does not happen as often as I should like and, if there are any possible ways of improving services, I assure the honourable member that they will be considered.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether work on the Modbury Hospital is progressing according to schedule?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: Some time ago the Government set up a committee to review wheat quotas in this State; that committee has met on many occasions and has taken evidence from growers. Will the Premier table its report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer this matter to the Minister of Agriculture, to whom a report has been made, and I will let the honourable member have the information he seeks.

HALLETT COVE CROSSING

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider reopening the old level crossing at Hallett Cove Estate?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will look into the matter.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. CARNIE (on notice):

1. What revenue did the State Taxes Department receive from succession duties in 1969-70?

2. What staff is employed who are directly involved in the collection of succession duties?

3. What costs, both in salaries and administrative costs, can be charged directly to the collection of succession duties?

4. What was the net gain to the Treasury from this source in 1969-70?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$8,312,120.

2. 17 officers.

3. \$69,400.

4. \$8,242,720.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Andamooka Rural School (Replacement),
 - Arbury Park Camp School,
 - Christies East Primary School,
 - Coober Pedy Rural School (Replacement),
 - Enfield Primary and Infants School (Replacement),
 - Metropolitan Abattoirs—Burford Gardens Sewerage Scheme,
 - Murray Bridge Water Supply (Improvements),
 - North Ingle Primary School,
 - Port Lincoln Bulk Loading Facility,
 - Streaky Bay Area School (Replacement),
 - Tumby Bay Area School (Replacement),
 - Whyalla West Technical High School.
- Ordered that reports be printed.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I move:

That this House—

(a) endorse the action of the Government in adopting the philosophy of action contained in the Adelaide Transportation 1970 Report prepared by Dr. S. M. Breuning;

and

(b) while mindful of the need for close co-operation between the Housing Trust and the State Planning Authority, take into account the differing functions of those organizations, and accordingly endorse the decision of the Government in determining not to constitute a single authority to perform the functions of those organizations.

Because about 20 of the 47 members currently in this House did not have the painful privilege of being here last session, it is necessary for me, in moving this motion, briefly to trace some of the factors relating to the situation we have reached. There has been a review of the transportation proposals and that review has been published and circulated to all members. For the benefit of those 20 members that were not here previously, I should like to clarify the allegation made by some members currently in Opposition that the Labor Government when in Opposition called for the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report and, because it was out of office when the report was made, refused to accept it. The facts are that on January 6, 1965, the then Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Yeates), with the authority of the then Premier (Hon. Sir

Thomas Playford) engaged the firm of De Leuw Cather and Company to carry out an investigation into Adelaide's transportation problems. On June 28, 1968, that firm submitted its report (now commonly known throughout this State as the M.A.T.S. Report) to the Hall Government. It is unnecessary for me to remind members that the Labor Government was elected on March 6, 1965, and that it remained in office until March 2, 1968, so that the report was ordered by the Liberal Government and received by it, and the Labor Government paid for it. I therefore hope that we will not have any repetition of the untruth we have heard in the past that this report was ordered by the Labor Government. I remind Opposition members that before the 1968 election the present Leader of the Opposition accused the present Premier of withholding from the public the M.A.T.S. Report. He has never apologized for that, either, but one would not expect it.

Mr. Venning: Would you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I would. If I made a mistake I would be the first to get on my feet and apologize. As most people know, the report was presented publicly in August, 1968. There had been a fanfare of trumpets: it was said that it would be the answer to a maiden's prayer and would solve all our problems. I invite members, if they can spare the time, to go into the Parliamentary Library and look at the comments of the present Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, and the former Minister of Roads and Transport, in which they eulogized this report as being the greatest thing we had seen, saying that it would be the answer to all our transportation problems. However, this is not what the public thought of it. After the public had the chance to consider the report they began to make critical comments about it.

Dr. Tonkin: You were a member of the public then, weren't you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was a member of Parliament at that time.

Dr. Tonkin: I am sorry.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Do not apologize again. If anyone dared to criticize the action of the then Government its policy was to label those people as crackpots and instant experts. The Government had a vocabulary for them a mile long: in other words, it was trying to rubbish any constructive criticism of the plan.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Is this a prepared speech?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assure the member for Alexandra that I am quite capable of making a speech without any assistance from him. In any case, I do not think any assistance he could offer would help me. I turn now to the events in this House. Much time was spent in presenting petitions and in questioning the Government on what it intended to do, how it was going to carry out the plan, and how it would deal with people involved in it. We had the amazing spectacle of the Government, although it had announced the plan as being the answer to a maiden's prayer, resisting every request made for the matter to be debated in Parliament. I ask members to note the contrast: the present Government, having had a proper review of transportation proposals for Adelaide, has introduced its proposals on the first sitting day after the report was made available, not 12 months later, as the former Government did, and then only as a result of the action of one of its political colleagues in the Upper House, Sir Arthur Rymill. Had it not been for him the matter would never have been debated in this Parliament: no Opposition member can deny that.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: So you consider that the Upper House serves a good purpose, do you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am the first to acknowledge that on this occasion it was one of the finest services that the Council has rendered to the people of South Australia. Without Sir Arthur Rymill, who was supported by the late Mr. Rowe and by Mr. Bevan, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Geddes and Mr. Whyte, the matter would never have come before this House. Even at the conclusion of the debate in the Legislative Council the former Minister, despite his colleagues' urging that the matter should be debated, said:

I defend the policy that was then adopted and I still hold that it is not necessary, for the reasons I have stated, for this M.A.T.S. plan to be debated in Parliament.

Mr. Jennings: A scheme that would cost \$400,000,000!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And the rest: I should like to have what it cost over that. It would do me for the rest of my life. The heat was put on the then Government, which was forced to bring the matter before both Houses. Before this we had the strange spectacle of Government members, particularly the former Premier (now Leader of the Opposition), describing it as a service plan, placing it in the same category as an extension of water,

sewerage and electricity services. The Government said that there was no need for the public uproar, although it was taking hundreds of people's homes and disturbing their livelihoods. Of course, this would not happen in the eastern suburbs or through Mitcham, because that part of the plan was to be deferred. I do not know who the Government thought it was fooling, but its actions did not go over very well. When the matter was finally discussed by this Parliament, the plan was in such a state that it did not warrant being called a plan.

The Government of the day said then that it would adopt the principles contained in the plan but that it would defer this part and some other part, so that there was a little there and some here, all of which went nowhere. Those members present in the House and the members of the public who were present in the gallery on the evening the debate concluded will never forget the antics of the former Premier, who is now Leader of the Opposition, when he panicked completely. The member for Mitchem knows that this happened: the then Premier was frightened that logic would overcome the numbers that he commanded, as his majority was slender. The Government had to rely on the casting vote of the Speaker, who was not strictly a member of its Party. Shortly after midnight when the debate was concluding the then Premier said:

The reputation of one of my Ministers has been referred to—

that is the only reason he gave— and therefore this, for the present Government, becomes a matter of confidence.

Because one of his Ministers had been referred to, at the eleventh hour the then Premier made the matter a vote of confidence. Also, he broke an undertaking he had given in relation to pairs. The then member for Whyalla, who was representing the whole of this Parliament in, I think, Trinidad, was given three minutes' notice to be in his place in this Chamber. The member for Stuart, who was then in the intensive care ward of the Royal Adelaide Hospital with a heart complaint, was also given three minutes to be in the Chamber; and the then member for Gawler (the present member for Elizabeth), who was home sick, was given the same time. So we had the despicable spectacle of the present Leader of the Opposition's showing his true colours, that his word was not worth taking and that there was no value in it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. The Minister, who, I thought, had obtained leave under Standing Orders to move a motion concerning the Breuning report, said that the word of the Leader of the Opposition was not worth taking.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That's right.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I find that offensive, and I ask that those words be withdrawn.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The member for Alexandra has objected to certain words used by the Minister and has asked that they be withdrawn.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I understand it, I said that the undertaking given by the Leader to honour pairs had been broken and, therefore, his word could not be taken or relied on. That is a statement of fact, as disclosed in *Hansard* of August 30, 1969, at page 950. Therefore, I suggest to the member for Alexandra, if he wishes to take exception to those words, that he should have arranged at the time for them to be expunged from *Hansard*. I am only giving the facts as they appear in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is not in any way a withdrawal. The Minister has stated that the word of the Leader of the Opposition is not worth taking, and I am asking that that statement be withdrawn. I do not know how the Minister lines this up with the dignity of Ministerial office.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The words objected to by the honourable member are not unparliamentary; they have been used on many occasions in this Chamber. If the Minister does not withdraw them I cannot rule that he must do so, because they are not unparliamentary.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: May I ask whether Standing Order 152, which provides that no member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House, is still observed?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing Order 152 shall always prevail in this Chamber, but the words used by the Minister have been used on many occasions in this Chamber and are not unparliamentary.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it will relieve the situation, I will leave that point and proceed with the next point of the debate.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you coming to the motion?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry if the facts I am relating for the benefit of those members who were not here are irksome to those members who were here, but their performance was disgraceful. The motion to adopt the M.A.T.S. plan, moved by the former Government, was carried in both Houses; it was nothing more, of course, than a Party vote, and the whips were cracking. Of course, like many other issues, it does not stop there, because at some stage or other every Government must account to the people who put it in office. This happened a little sooner than the former Government probably thought it was likely to happen.

Mr. Coumbe: What were the reasons for that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not going into the reasons, because they are really quite irrelevant to this debate. When the then Government and Opposition went to the people, the matter was placed in their hands to determine what should be done. Let me remind members what the Hon. Don Dunstan said on behalf of the Labor Party, namely:

A Labor Government will withdraw and revise the metropolitan Adelaide transport proposals. Freeways from north to south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg will be necessary, but we do not believe that a massive concentration upon elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private motor cars. We would be building problems American cities are now desperately trying to solve. The M.A.T.S. proposals will be re-examined by the State Planning Authority, assisted by a team of investigators experienced in the new technologies of public urban transit. They will advise, first, on how these newer technologies can best be incorporated into the development of Adelaide, and, secondly, how they can provide a new basis for industry here. We have all the technologies and all the industries necessary to make Adelaide the cheapest place of any major urban centre in the world to experiment with and produce economically those newer forms of flexible public transit which are designed to end jammed-up cities and heavy air pollution. The 1962 route for the southern freeway will not be acted on and when proposals have been agreed on by the State Planning Authority, it will, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, publish them and make them subject to objections for six months before a final decision is taken.

That was a clear and concise statement of what the Labor Government would do. I do not wish to reflect on what the present Leader of the Opposition said: I thought his comments were most oblique and obscure: whatever he said apparently satisfied him, but it did not satisfy the public. However, the Labor Party satisfied the public to the extent

that 51½ per cent of the public of the whole of South Australia endorsed our proposals. The member for Eyre can shake his head as much as he likes, but he should take care that it does not rattle right off! I suggest that if he does his homework he will find that 591,531 formal votes, of which the Labor Party received 305,478, or 51.65 per cent, were cast.

Mr. Evans: Try them again now!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Fisher is prepared to listen—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You got 57 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know the member for Kavel is most upset when he realizes that the majority of the people in South Australia support the Labor Party. I know he likes to go screaming and yelling about nothing. The plain facts are as I have stated them; these are figures that even he ought to be able to understand. The Labor Party received 305,478 primary votes, representing 51.65 per cent of the total vote; the Liberal Party received 258,856 votes, representing 43.76 per cent of the total vote; the Democratic Labor Party received 4,211 votes, representing .71 per cent of the total vote; and other candidates received 22,986 votes, representing 3.88 per cent of the total vote. If honourable members check, they will find that those percentages together total 100 per cent.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. I cannot see what this presentation of election figures has to do with the motion.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister shall relate his remarks to the motion under discussion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously the member for Bragg has not been listening to the debate. If he had, he would realize that the point I was making was that the Labor Party went to the people with a positive policy that has been put into effect by means of the Breuning report, which is the subject of this motion. This policy received the whole-hearted support of the people of this State. If the honourable member had understood this, he would not have taken his point of order. Unfortunately, some of the member for Bragg's colleagues, who are interjecting, do not like the facts being brought home to them; I believe they are afraid that their Party might suffer a further 14 per cent drop in its vote as the Liberal Party in Western Australia suffered on Saturday. Having received the

endorsement of the people of South Australia, the Labor Government immediately set about giving effect to the promises on which it had been elected. The Labor Party does not make empty promises, and one of the first things it did was engage the services of Dr. Breuning, asking him to review the transport problems in Adelaide and inform the Government about the line that should be followed. As it is most important for members to read the comments he makes in his report, I hope all members have read them. Members were paid the courtesy of having a copy of the report sent to them a few weeks ago.

Mr. Hall: You had an obligation to send the report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader is splitting hairs. I can recall having almost to go down on bended knees to get anything out of the former Government. It took me four months to get a map from the Highways Department through the Leader, who was then Premier, and his colleague, because they put a black ban on me. The order had gone out: "Don't give Virgo anything," and that order came from the Leader and his colleague. I believe that the report presented as a result of Dr. Breuning's investigation into our transport problems is a complete justification for the work done in reviewing our policy. It is a complete justification for the stand that Labor members took when in Opposition in relation to the dictatorial thrusting of the M.A.T.S. plan on the people by the former Government. Also, the report is a complete justification for the attitude of the present Premier as expressed in Labor's policy speech. All that was said has come true in this report.

Dr. Tonkin: I wonder why!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether the member for Bragg is so dumb that he does not know about this. If he is, then I am damn pleased that I have never gone to him for medical advice.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I take objection to that reflection on my professional ability.

The SPEAKER: As there is nothing in the motion about medical advice, the honourable Minister is out of order in referring to that matter; he must confine his remarks to the matter under discussion.

Dr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, Sir. The Minister has not withdrawn his remarks, and I should appreciate a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg has asked the Minister to withdraw his remarks. I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark

referred to and to confine his further remarks to the subject matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it helps the member for Bragg, I do not mind withdrawing my remark; I know nothing of his professional qualifications, but I understand he is a doctor.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must withdraw.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If my remark offended the member for Bragg, I do not mind withdrawing it. I should now like to deal with some of the comments Dr. Breuning made. This will particularly interest members who are capable of understanding what Dr. Breuning said and who have read the report. With regard to those who have not read the report and cannot understand it, more is the pity.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They've reflected on Dr. Breuning's ability.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Apparently it does not matter about reflecting on a person's professional integrity so long as he is not a member of this House. Throughout the report, Dr. Breuning has made the point as strongly as possible that Adelaide should not engage in building freeways and expressways as envisaged in the M.A.T.S. plan, but that it should use the time available to exploit the newer developments in public transport, which will alter the scene tremendously. For the information of those who have read the report (and from their silly interjections it is obvious that some members opposite have not taken the trouble to read it), I point out that Dr. Breuning says that, if we follow the M.A.T.S. plan, we will head for the very problems that the American cities are now trying to solve. It is no good saying one thing and meaning another. The point that Dr. Breuning has made in his report shows clearly that no further action should be taken on this stupid idea of building freeways, cutting great swathes through our metropolitan area, to create a situation in which we will increase poisoning, destroy the beauty of Adelaide, and eventually have to knock down more and more houses to build more and more freeways, from which we will get absolutely nothing. We do not have to follow that line, and Dr. Breuning says this clearly. If members had gone through this report, they would have seen his various recommendations. I do not consider it necessary for me to go through the recommendations separately and explain them, because I would expect them to be self-explanatory. If they were not, any further explanation from me would not help.

I want to refer now to one or two things the Government has done since deciding to adopt this report. First, the Breuning report states clearly that we should have a complete review of our transportation policy and that we should have a director-general, capable of co-ordinating the activities in all forms of transport, and that the various forms of transport at present operating ought to be brought within the one control and Ministerial supervision in a department of transport. We have already started the wheels of industry turning in this way. We have established a working committee to examine the details of what is necessary and I hope that the necessary legislative action can be taken in the next session of Parliament. We have also acted to secure a director-general of transport. Advertisements have already been inserted telling those interested our intentions and inviting them to apply.

We have already decided that there shall be an industrial research institute, that transportation research facilities shall be established as part of the institute, and that the director-general shall be a member of that institute. We have already taken all this action. Perhaps the other main point, from an organization point of view, is in regard to the establishment of the planning and development branch. We already have started work in that field. We have not reached the stage of filling positions within it but we are working for the establishment of this branch and the collation of the materials necessary. Already officers are working in this field and it can be stated truly that the nucleus of that branch has already been established. This will have to grow, but it will not blossom out immediately. It will grow as and when desired and when the expansion is shown to be desirable.

In the past all sorts of cynical statements have been made about the future of public transportation, and I assume they will be made on this occasion also. I distinctly recall the former Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition, referring to statements made by the present Premier when he was in America about the new forms of transport as being comedy capsules, Disneyland ideas, and anything else that could be derogatory. I invite members to do a little research. For instance, the cities of Los Angeles, Paris and Amsterdam will be the first to have aerotrain connections with their respective airports, while the first inter-city aerotrain probably will run between The Hague and Amsterdam. Are they comedy capsules? These things are happening.

Another report states, "Proto-car rolls in on time." Have any Opposition members taken the trouble to find out what is happening regarding Bay Area Rapid Transit, commonly known as BART? We could go on and on. Whatever publication we pick up, we find that city after city is realizing that its answer to transportation lies in public transportation. The more money that is spent in building freeways, the more money must be spent later to right the wrongs that have been done.

The whole question has been summed up adequately by Dr. Breuning in his report when he says that we must retain a flexible approach to our transport problems so that we can put into operation, and adapt ourselves to, the newer forms of public transport as they become available. If anyone thinks that transportation in the linear induction train sphere or in the dial-a-bus sphere is transportation in a comedy capsule, he is to be pitied rather than scorned. These forms are being introduced at present throughout the world. They can and will solve Adelaide's problem if we can adapt them to our conditions and, furthermore, they will provide a tremendously important industry for South Australia if we get in on the ground floor, and this is what we desire to do.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you table the pamphlets so that members may have a chance to see them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Torrens would like to see any pamphlets, I am sure that the Transportation Engineer in my office would be delighted to spend as much time as the honourable member has to show him these pamphlets and any others, of which there are many in the office.

Mr. Millhouse: He only asked you to table those.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am answering an interjection by the member for Torrens and I do not think it necessary for the little member to be butting in always. He is like a broody hen looking after her chicks, but these chicks do not need looking after.

Mr. Millhouse: He won't table them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course I will. The honourable member may have them now if he cares to come over for them. They are here.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Many other members may like to see the material and I have told the honourable member that it is available. Much more is available in our office and I should be amazed if there was not a

swag of material in the Parliamentary Library. However, it is too much trouble for honourable members to look for it. The Government will therefore try to help members by undertaking to provide these pamphlets. The Government has received a report prepared by an eminent person fully qualified in the field, and that report was written as a result of an on-the-spot check of conditions prevailing in Adelaide. He has implored us not to follow the recommendations of the former Government, but to follow lines which are in the interests of Adelaide and which will preserve its beauty; and he has suggested that we should retain our flexibility and be up to date in our thinking. As a result, the Government has adopted the plan as a philosophy of action. The Government has not, however, adopted Dr. Breuning's proposal in relation to the amalgamation of the State Planning Office and the Housing Trust.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have you adopted every other aspect of the plan?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the honourable member has even read the motion. I therefore commend to him tomorrow morning's *Hansard* pulls. The Government has not adopted the suggestion that the Housing Trust and the State Planning Office be amalgamated, for the good reason that, although it acknowledges the need for these two bodies to work together as closely as possible, it considers that, one being a planning authority and the other being a building authority, their functions cannot properly be combined. The plan submitted by Dr. Breuning is a good one because it provides something beneficial for Adelaide. The Government has adopted it, and I commend it to members.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNFAIR ADVERTISING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 2. Page 3292.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): An attempt was made previously by the Labor Party, when in Opposition, to introduce a Bill dealing with unfair advertising, and I suppose we could accept this Bill today as being a reflection of the difficulties the Labor Party has got itself into while in Government in recent months. It is introducing in the name of protection a Bill containing many provisions that will remove certain freedoms from members of the community. This Bill throws the complete onus of wrong-doing on

to the advertiser and not the publisher in relation to any advertisement. We are therefore dealing only with a restricted group of people who are to be affected by a Bill that has strong teeth. It is interesting to note the representations made to members of Parliament by the Australian Association of National Advertisers, whose representative has been to see me. An article written by this association on January 18 makes the following point:

The Bill states that "a person shall not publish an advertisement containing an unfair statement". "Unfair statement" is a particularly nebulous term. Presumably, it is used to describe a statement which is "inaccurate or untrue in some material particular". Or it is one "likely to deceive or mislead the person to whom it is directed".

Point 7 of the same article states:

The rejected 1969 legislation provided a fine of \$200. This was objected to at the time on the grounds that it was unduly high. However, the proposed legislation has increased the fine to \$1,000—a completely unrealistic and abnormally large fine to be imposed by a magistrate on a matter of personal opinion.

It therefore becomes a matter of personal opinion held by those who may not be well versed in the law regarding whether someone has been deceiving or misleading the public, as laid down in the provisions of the Bill. I remind members that this Bill is all-embracing in its definitions. The definition of "advertisement" states:

"Advertisement" includes every form of advertising (whether or not accompanied by or in association with spoken or written words or other writing or sounds and whether or not contained or issued in a publication) by the display of notices or by means of catalogues, price lists, labels, cards or other documents or material or by the exhibition of cinematograph films or of pictures or photographs, or by means of radio or television, or in any other way.

I do not know why the Government bothered to include all that detail in the definition because it may well have said "by any means". There is no reason for including so much detail. Indeed, I think it is misleading to do so and then finish up by saying "or in any other way". Verbiage such as this merely clutters up the legislation and takes up the draftman's time. The definition of "publish", which is also very wide, states:

"Publish", in relation to an advertisement, means to place the advertisement before the public or any member of the public by any means whatsoever and "publication" shall be construed accordingly.

We therefore have a definition in all-embracing terms that applies to a group of people who, one must assume, frequently break the law.

Otherwise, it would not be worth the while of this Parliament to pass legislation that did not affect a large section of the community. If only a few persisted in certain practices, obviously persuasion and co-operation could be effective in stopping these practices, especially as members of the Australian Association of National Advertisers subscribe to a code of ethics. Those who subscribe to this code are listed in the information supplied to all members. They are as follows: the Advertising Institute of Australia, the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies, the Australian Association of National Advertisers, the Australian Council of Retailers, the Federation of Australian Commercial Broadcasters, and the Outdoor Advertising Association of Australia.

If there is a wide membership or subscription to an Australian code of advertising standards (to which these six associations, which represent nearly all the advertisers or those who publish advertisements in Australia, subscribe), surely we have a means of co-operation between the Government and private industry, instead of having to foist discipline on to these people in this way. If we are to have discipline, we certainly do not want it in this way, because it is a ham-fisted way and is stronger than is necessary. It is also insulting to many business people.

The report of the Chairman of the Consumers Affairs Council in New South Wales is interesting. I advise members to examine it if they want to see how hard this group has been working in relation to unfair advertising. Members will see on page 15 of that report a general description of faults and misleading advertising, as follows:

The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs reported that some difficulty was being experienced in taking action against firms over false or misleading advertisements which relate to services as distinct from goods. Section 32 (1) of the Consumer Protection Act as it stands at present reads:

- (1) Any person who publishes or causes to be published any statement which—
 - (a) is intended or apparently intended by that person or any other person to promote the sale, disposal or letting on hire of any goods; and
 - (b) is to his knowledge false or misleading in any material particular,
 is guilty of an offence against this Act.

How does the Act apply in New South Wales? I quote from page 27 of this report under the heading "Advertising":

In a number of cases investigated by the bureau, however, it was satisfied that, although the advertisements were misleading this was inadvertent and the advertisers had no intention of deceiving the public when the advertisements were framed. A greater degree of care was called for on the part of some advertisers in preparing advertisements.

Only four of the cases investigated by the bureau concerned national advertisers and in each the advertising concerned was promptly withdrawn or modified in accordance with the bureau's suggestions. It has been the bureau's experience that, in general, firms have only to be informed that it is considered that advertising or trade descriptions are misleading in terms of the Consumer Protection Act and immediate action is taken to rectify the situation.

As mentioned in an earlier section of the report it is generally the practice to issue one warning before prosecuting under legislation administered by the Department of Labour and Industry. During the period covered by this report 21 warnings were issued and none of the firms involved repeated the offence.

I ask members to note these statistics. In New South Wales under the strength of the Consumer Protection Act, which gives specific power to prosecute for misleading and deceiving advertising but under which commonsense warnings are issued before prosecution, 21 warnings were issued for that year and every one of the warnings was successful. Therefore, why do we want this type of legislation with fines of up to \$1,000 without providing for warnings or the co-operation of the industry? We are using disciplinary measures which the Government in other directions has so often criticized. Discipline is all right unless it touches the Government or the Labor Party! It is all right for others but it not good for arbitration. Let us assume that there may be some honest people in the trade.

I should think that the Government would consider seeking in South Australia a reputation for a concern for others and for all sections of the community, and while protecting those who might have been taken in by misleading or deceiving advertising would not malign all of the Australian national and local advertising, as this Bill tends to do. We have a Prices Commissioner in South Australia who has served well under all forms of Government. We know his main function is in the negotiating field, and he exists because of the control he exerts. We have an individual who can, through his department, supervise the tone of advertising in South Australia and who can immediately contact the respective organizations of which the advertiser or the media is a member and have the advertisements rectified, as is done in New South Wales. To me this is a much more co-operative attitude than one

that degrades the image of all advertising. We should use co-operation rather than a disciplinary force that is too heavy with the impact of its penalties. I wonder whether political advertisements will come within this sphere.

Mr. Hoppood: Let us hope so.

Mr. HALL: I wonder how the policy speech of the Labor Party would stand up to the disciplinary measure now being introduced. Under the definition of "advertising" in the Bill, would that sort of policy speech be subject to prosecution? Whilst reading the policy speech to find out the basis on which the Labor Party makes its recommendation to control advertising, I found the following statements:

When the Labor Party was in office, the Industrial Development Department was established.

Later the speech states:

The whole of this programme was wrecked by the present Government . . . Not one single major development can be pointed to in their two years of office.

We know now, as we knew then, that this is an obvious untruth, and no Government member can deny that. The policy speech stated that there had been no major industrial developments for two years, but a long list of them was available to every person in this House.

The Hon. L. J. King: You intend to get back to the Bill later?

Mr. HALL: I remind the Attorney-General that it is within the provisions of the Bill—

The Hon. L. J. King: That has to do with goods and services.

Mr. HALL: This is the style of approach of members opposite in what they tell the public, and it shows the dual role they play as they stand up here safeguarded from the general public. A statement such as "not one major industrial development in two years" is completely and utterly deceiving, and provably so. With the Attorney-General having subscribed fully to that policy speech, I am suspicious about why we are involved with this legislation. Members would know that I have always shown much concern for the welfare of the general public concerning their trading arrangements.

Mr. Langley: Have you ever opposed the granting of any awards?

Mr. HALL: As the member for Unley would know, I was the author of the Book Purchasers Protection Act, which did much good in this State and which was introduced as a result of a real problem that had developed in this community. Designed for a specific

purpose it was not cast as wide as this Bill is cast. Having a background of involvement on behalf of public protection, I do not find myself at odds with the principle of protection, as long as it is properly carried out with a dignified approach to all sections involved. In this regard, if the Government had claimed, and the Attorney-General had claimed, that there were safeguards in the Bill one might have supported it, at least with some backward glances, because one could support a measure that would protect the community. However, this is not so because under clause 4 proceedings can be disposed of summarily. This means that we do not necessarily have an expert panel or magistrate to assess whether the matter is misleading. Such persons may have no experience enabling them to give a verdict and to assess properly the evidence placed before the court. Also, I believe this Bill could lead to frivolous complaints and court proceedings. One knows that individual contestants in the publicity field could launch prosecutions against each other in relation to this matter.

The Hon. L. J. King: This is easily cured, isn't it?

Mr. HALL: If the Attorney-General believes that, I suggest that he should provide that a prosecution can be launched only on his certificate. It is a major failure of the Bill that it does not provide this, and that is one of my main criticisms. I believe that the person charged should have the right, in the first instance, to go to a higher court than is provided and should not be bothered by summary court proceedings issued against him. He should not be prosecuted unless the Attorney-General himself approves the prosecution. I will certainly oppose the Bill in its present form. I make one further point: I wonder whether the Government has assessed who are the advertisers in South Australia. Over 50 per cent of all advertisements placed in the South Australian media are placed by national advertisers, most of whom have their headquarters outside the State.

If the Attorney-General and the Government cut this by half, they could easily deprive South Australia of revenue. We are not dealing with small sums: anyone who has had contact with the advertising media knows that advertising is costly and brings substantial sums to the firms who prepare the advertisements and to the media which publish them. If the South Australian Government prosecutes national advertisers, we know what the result

will be: we shall see advertisements taken away from South Australia, with a consequent loss of revenue. This is not as easy a subject as the Attorney-General would have us believe in his second reading explanation. At present, I oppose the Bill: whether I do so on the third reading will obviously depend on what happens in the Committee stage.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ENROLMENT)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 1. Page 3245.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): This Bill contains two important provisions, one giving 18-year-olds in this State the right to vote, and the other allowing House of Assembly electors generally in this State to be enrolled for the Legislative Council. It is not necessary for me to reiterate the Labor Party's policy in relation to enrolling people in South Australia on the Legislative Council roll. Our policy on this matter has existed for many years and we look forward to its implementation. In order to simplify the enrolment procedure, the Bill provides that any person who is on the electoral roll for the House of Assembly shall automatically become enrolled for the Legislative Council. It also provides that a person who shifts from one Legislative Council district to another will be automatically enrolled for the Legislative Council district to which he shifts. This is the way in which the Government desires the electoral system of South Australia to operate.

We know that the Bill is opposed by the Opposition and that it will not be looked on kindly in the Legislative Council, where there are 16 Opposition members and four Government members. A question was asked this afternoon about the enrolment of Legislative Council electors in South Australia in the last few months under a scheme initiated by the Attorney-General. I have been informed that about 125,000 additional electors in South Australia have been so enrolled; that represents a substantial enrolment and, I believe, brings nearer the day when the Labor Party will have a greater representation in the Legislative Council. This provision is long overdue, the present system having allowed the Liberal Party in this State to control the Government. I do not think any honest member sitting on the other side would deny that. We believe that every citizen in South Australia should

have the automatic right to vote for the Legislative Council and that there should be no qualifications.

As a citizen of this State aged 21 years, a person is required to enrol (and is automatically enrolled in respect of both Houses) and vote at Commonwealth elections, so why should he be denied the right to vote for the Upper House in this State? The history of the formation of responsible Government in this State will show that the Legislative Council was established so that the squattocracy of South Australia would always remain in control even if the peasantry were able to obtain a majority in the House of Assembly.

The other important provision in this Bill relates to the 18-year-old having the right to vote in this State. I understand that the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government have agreed to give this right to 18-year-olds; of course, many other responsibilities are involved in other areas. The right of 18-year-olds to vote was exercised, for the first time in Australia, in Western Australia last Saturday. It appears that, although this innovation was introduced by the Liberal Government in that State, the vote of the 18-year-olds has gone against that Party.

Mr. Mathwin: That's what happened in the United Kingdom.

Mr. BURDON: In a few years there could be another reaction against the present U.K. Government. In this Bill we are asking the South Australian Parliament to grant to 18-year olds the right to vote: the rights of 18-year-olds in relation to other matters will be dealt with in other Bills.

Mr. Mathwin: But you'll force them to vote: it's compulsory.

Mr. BURDON: In a situation such as this, the democratic right probably contains two ingredients: a privilege and an obligation. It is a privilege under our democratic system to vote, and it is an obligation people owe to the State and themselves to do so. I look forward to the implementation of the principles contained in this Bill, as they have been sought by the Labor Party for many years.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 24, at 2 p.m.