

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

UNION BAN

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Marine say how much revenue the Marine and Harbors Department has lost because of the ban placed by the Seamen's Union of Australia on giving tug assistance to Greek ships coming to South Australia? The Minister will be aware that, because of this ban, several ships with, apparently, attributable Greek ownership have been prevented from berthing in South Australia. As a result, on several occasions lifeboats have been used to ferry South Australian passengers to the ships standing out to sea. I also understand that, because of the ban, Greek freighter ships have not called at this State. It is obvious, therefore, that there has been a significant loss of revenue to the department and, therefore, to the Government of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the Leader will appreciate that I have not the figure at hand, but I am well aware of the circumstances he has outlined. I shall be pleased to obtain this information for him and to bring down a report as soon as possible.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Marine say whether he is acting to ensure that the new Chandris line ship *Britanis*, which the company hoped to berth here on March 21, will be allowed to berth? I understand that, if the ship is not allowed to berth here, in future the Chandris line will by-pass Adelaide, and this may mean our losing about 10 or 12 berthing fees during a year. We understand that in the other capital cities the foolish persons who brought in these restrictions have shown some sense and are not carrying out these restrictions on the berthing of Greek ships. I ask the Minister to ensure that the present state of affairs does not exist when the next Greek ship comes to Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have told the Leader that I will obtain the details he has requested. Further, yesterday I received a letter from the Australian agent of the Chandris line, as a result of which Cabinet discussed the matter yesterday, and Government action is contemplated soon to see whether the situation can be resolved. I will tell the honourable member what is the outcome of that action.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Attorney-General say whether he has sanctioned *Oh! Calcutta!* for viewing by persons over 18 years of age? A weekend newspaper on Sunday and also yesterday's *Advertiser* contain reports of a statement by organizers of *Oh! Calcutta!* that they are not worried about possible police intervention at the play's Adelaide premiere.

The view expressed by Mr. McKinna, the Commissioner of Police, was that he would not be sending officers to view the play with the object of initiating a prosecution, because the Attorney-General had said that the play was suitable for viewing by persons over 18 years of age. That is my reason for asking the question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: My attention was drawn to the remarks attributed to the Commissioner of Police to which the honourable member for Stuart has referred and, because of the concern that I felt about any false impression that might be created in the public mind about my attitude in the matter, I provided the *Advertiser* with a carefully prepared statement, setting out my attitude. That statement is the answer to the honourable member's question, and it is as follows:

An impression appears to have gained currency that I have, in some way, approved or sanctioned *Oh! Calcutta!* for adults. This is not correct. I have merely indicated that, after perusal of the script, I would feel bound, by reason of the subject matter and content, to prohibit the performance (irrespective of the manner of presentation) if minors were admitted. Exclusion of minors, however, as I have repeatedly said, confers no immunity from compliance with the law. Clearly, this script could be performed (although not necessarily) in a way which would contravene the laws relating to public decency. Because of that, I would hope that the police will attend the opening performance, and any other performance, for the purpose of detecting any breaches of the law. I have sought a conference with police officers to discuss the matter.

That statement was provided to the *Advertiser* yesterday. A version of it was published in today's *Advertiser* at page 24 with the vital omission of the sentence, "Because of that, I would hope that the police will attend the opening performance, and any other performance, for the purpose of detecting any breaches of the law." I consider that the omission of that sentence from the published statement had the effect of distorting the true meaning and effect of what I was conveying, and it is quite a serious thing when a carefully considered statement by a

Minister on a matter of public importance that has excited much public interest is published not in full but in a form that could actually be misleading. For that reason, I now specifically request the *Advertiser* (and I am sure it will comply with that request) to publish the statement in full, including the important sentence that was omitted from the report in this morning's paper.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney-General say whether it is a fact that last week, when I asked him whether he was exercising the powers that he undoubtedly possesses under the Places of Public Entertainment Act, he refused my request, which was supported by organizations not only in my district but in other districts as well, to ban this play? Does the Attorney-General still refuse to exercise those powers to ban the performance of this play?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes. In my view, it would be quite inappropriate to use the power under the Places of Public Entertainment Act to prohibit the performance of a play simply on the basis of the perusal of a script that could conceivably be performed in accordance with the law. Having perused the script, I consider that by reason of the subject matter the play must be regarded as obscene if presented to young people. Concerning adults, I think that whether or not the play infringes the law of South Australia can be determined only when it has been presented and, indeed, only from performance to performance, depending on what is done on the stage. For that reason, any question of prohibiting the play at this stage is quite premature. I believe that the proper course is that when the play is presented (because the script raises the possibility that it might involve breaches of the law in its presentation) each performance should be policed by the appropriate authorities. As I have said in reply to the member for Stuart, I hope that the police will take a lively interest in what takes place if this show is presented, and, in order to determine what course of action, if any, is then appropriate, I will certainly study carefully the reports made to me. The view I take is that, because the script raised the possibility that the show might involve a contravention of the law, it is important that its performance should be policed. For that reason, I have given the indication as set out in my answer to the member for Stuart.

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many letters protesting against the staging of the play *Oh! Calcutta!* has the Attorney-General received since taking office?

2. How many petitions similarly protesting has the Attorney received?

3. How many signatures do they contain?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 234 letters.

2. 8 petitions.

3. 267 signatures.

MOTOR TYRES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport confer with or call a conference of interested parties with relation to the disposal of motor tyres? Motor tyres are a by-product of the motor industry and their disposal is causing many problems, including that of pollution if they are burned. If they are not burned deliberately they remain a fire hazard wherever they are stored, and they attract vermin in some areas. It is obvious that there is no easy solution to the problem. An artificial reef of tyres was to be constructed, but that would involve much expense and effort. Will the Minister have present at this conference, or informal discussion, representatives of councils as well as of the motor industry, and perhaps anyone else who may be interested and who could help solve such a problem?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter comes within the province of the Minister for Conservation, who is currently thoroughly investigating all aspects of this real problem. I assure the honourable member that as soon as my colleague has any information he will present it to the House.

HALLETT COVE ESTATE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Local Government assist the Marion City Council and the people of Hallett Cove Estate to clear up a peculiar problem that has arisen concerning the roads in that estate? The Minister will be well aware that the problem of sealing these roads has been before the Marion City Council and the Highways Department for some time. As a result of an approach to the council by local residents late last year the following letter, dated December 2, 1970, was sent to the residents of this estate by the Town Clerk:

Dear Sir/Madam, As a result of certain inquiries, the council has investigated the subdivision of portion of section 560 laid out as Hallett Cove Estate in the hundred of Noarlunga, county of Adelaide, which subdivision appears on Lands Titles Office plan No. 2132. These investigations indicate that the land was subdivided in 1913 and that the streets and roads listed hereunder, namely:

Pindee Street
Nungamoorra Street
Cadna Street
Nardoo Street
Larnoo Street
Yartoo Street
Peera Street
Moorra Street
Wonggo Street
Boonga Street
Pennayoona Street
Kooraweera Street
Burrington Street
Nanto Street
Murnada Street
Esplanade
Cove Road (previously called Railway Terrace)

have at all times been private streets and roads and, as such, have not vested in the council. The council is, in law, under no liability to make or maintain streets or roads delineated in this subdivision. According to the assessment book of the council, you are the owner of land in the area. I am directed by the council to write to give you notice of the above and to point out to you that the council is under no obligation to make or maintain the street or road abutting your property. The council has directed me, in fairness to you, to draw your attention also to the fact that, if the council gives you notice that it intends to make the street or road pursuant to section 343 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1969, you may in all likelihood have to bear the cost of making such street or road and of providing certain services: for example, street lighting. Your proportion of the cost of making the street or road abutting your property would be calculated ratably in relation to the frontage of your land abutting the street or road.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) A. D. McCLURE, Town Clerk.

One of my constituents, in writing to me, concludes his letter as follows:

If, as Marion council insists, the roads in this subdivision are legally private, it follows that each individual property owner possesses exclusive rights over road frontages. Exercising these rights could well prove very stimulating.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to look into what is obviously a complex question and to bring down some information.

WATER QUALITY

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Works say whether he has any information about the unsavoury appearance or condition of the

water supply in some eastern suburbs, and how long it is likely to be before the quality of the water improves? Over the weekend several people living in the Payneham and Glynde areas have spoken to me (and this was really unnecessary for, as I reside in the area, I had seen it for myself) about the rather milky appearance of the water provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department over the past several days. Although I know that the Minister has already made a statement, to reassure residents in the area about the quality of the water can he now say how long the present position is likely to obtain?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, contrary to some suggestions that have been made that the colour of the water could have been caused by the addition of fluoride to the water supply, the addition of fluoride has had no bearing on the colour of the water. Secondly, I assure the honourable member that people will not endanger their health in any way by consuming the water. Thirdly, the milky appearance of the water in the eastern suburbs is due to the fact that water coming from the Menindee Lakes carries with it a very fine colloidal clay. Unfortunately, as there is nothing the department can do to remove this clay, it is likely that this condition of the water will obtain for about three months.

LITTER

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether Cabinet has further considered imposing on-the-spot fines for litterbugs? Twice previously this session, when I have asked the Minister questions about this matter, he has sought to misconstrue my questions; in fact, he has tried to rubbish my concern about the litter that spoils so much of our environment. Some days after I last asked the Minister a question on November 10, the Premier, obviously at variance with his Minister, was reported in a newspaper as saying:

The State Government is examining whether litterbugs should be made to pay on-the-spot fines. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday that, generally, he was not happy with any form of on-the-spot penalty, but this action might be necessary for people who constantly disregarded the law.

In the *Advertiser* of January 14, in an article dealing with Singapore as the venue of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, the following comments appear:

The streets are spotless. Not a piece of paper or a cigarette butt in sight. The absence of butts is understandable. Singaporeans are now fined if they drop a fag on the footpath.

I ask my question in all seriousness and sincerity, as I am concerned for the appearance of both town and country in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Answering the question in all sincerity and being concerned with the cleanliness of South Australia, I can inform the honourable member that this type of question comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Conservation, who is currently looking at the matter of on-the-spot fines and consulting representatives of other States who, I believe, are also currently considering the problem. In due course information will be brought down to the House.

DR. BOGLE'S DEATH

Mr. McRAE: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Police Force in 1963 received any directive or suggestion from the Commonwealth Government that the interests of national security could best be served by the police not discovering who was responsible for Dr. Bogle's death? In this respect, I refer to an article written by a Mr. Chandler that appeared in last night's *News*.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know, but I will inquire.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education say what criteria were used in determining the aid to be given to independent schools, which he announced yesterday? Although I realize that comparisons are odious, I noticed, from the list of schools being given assistance that was released by the Minister, that Our Lady of the Pines, a convent that I have the distinctive pleasure to represent, is in category A, whereas the Penola convent, which is doing equally good work, is in category C and, although there may be reasons for it, Naracoorte is not mentioned at all. I should be pleased, therefore, if the Minister could say on what basis he determined these various categories.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I arranged for a copy of the relevant report to be made available to each member. Indeed, I notice that one or two members already have their copies. The honourable member will see that two lists appear in the report, and that Naracoorte has been left out of one of the lists by error, although it has been included in the

list at the end of the report. That school has been informed today that it is in category C.

Mr. Rodda: That is correct.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for that interjection. In relation to the criteria, I merely laid down general terms of reference for the committee to use, and I told the committee that I wanted it to examine the fees charged, the revenue collected from each pupil, the size of classes, and the various other factors set out in the report. I included in the terms of reference a general proviso giving the committee complete freedom to consider any other matter it thought was relevant. Members of the committee have told me that, in order to meet the time table set for it to enable first payments to be made in the first term of this year, the committee could make only limited investigations in respect of various independent schools. Nevertheless, I believe the committee has done an excellent job; it worked hard to get as much information and to see as many schools as it could, and the Government intends that the committee should continue to exist. This will mean that next year it will have more time in which to make its investigations, so it will be able to be better informed on the problems facing independent schools than it is this year. The Government believes that the committee's recommendations should be accepted in toto, and it intends to implement those recommendations. I have no doubt that certain independent schools will be able to advance arguments and comparisons to show why they should have been included in one category instead of another. However, in each case the committee had before it details of fees paid, revenue collected, sizes of classes, indebtedness of the school concerned, and so on, that led it to place the school in the category chosen.

COOLTONG TREES

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a statement from the Minister of Irrigation regarding a plantation of trees on a channel reserve at Cooltong? Some weeks ago I approached the Minister of Irrigation, on behalf of a Cooltong resident, requesting that every effort be made to ensure that a plantation of native trees on a channel reserve be interfered with as little as possible during installation of an irrigation pipeline.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that an approach was made to him by the honourable member, on behalf

of people in the district, regarding the effect of the original location of the Cooltong pipeline upon some trees which had been planted on the Crown lands channel reserve. He points out that it must be realized that the Lands Department, when approval was given to plant trees in this area, insisted that the approval was conditional upon the removal of the trees if such a project as the present one was to be installed. He has, however, given further serious consideration to the location of this pipeline and has now authorized a deviation from the original line to try to save as many of these trees as possible. It is estimated that about three-quarters of the total number of trees can thereby be retained. It is impossible to provide a route that would save all the trees if the hydraulic efficiency of the pipeline is to be maintained at an acceptable level without appreciable additional cost and delay. Further consideration of alternatives has caused considerable delay in the commencement of this important project. The deviation approved and the delay and investigation of alternatives have added to the cost of the project at a time when Government costs must be closely contained.

BUS STOPS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is his department's policy on the siting of bus stops in the metropolitan area? Several constituents have approached me, expressing concern at the location of bus stops near intersections and junctions throughout the metropolitan area and the danger thereby created for motorists using these intersections and junctions.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In general, bus stops are located where they create the least traffic problem but provide the maximum benefit to persons in the area served. However, if the honourable member, rather than speak in generalities as he has done, gives me specific instances in which he thinks bus stops are improperly sited, I will have them investigated and, if they are improperly sited, I will have them shifted.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, while in New Zealand I saw bus stops that were indicated by yellow lights, and this made them easy to see at night. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether consideration has been given to the special lighting of bus stops in this way and, if it has not, will the Minister consider this suggestion?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Minister of Education was telling me of the value of oversea travel, and I commend the honourable member for bringing back what I believe is a suggestion worth considering. I do not know whether it has been done here: I have not heard of it, but it is worth considering.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked last week about grain shipments from the Wallaroo and Ardrossan terminals?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the reply contains many figures, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS

The total tonnages of grain shipped during each financial year from 1954-55 are as follows:

	From Ardrossan Tons.	From Wallaroo Tons.
1954-55	161,892	156,176
1955-56	193,705	116,782
1956-57	236,520	145,741
1957-58	121,116	178,987
1958-59	107,907	246,536
1959-60	53,052	101,950
1960-61	154,366	399,804
1961-62	145,978	414,057
1962-63	125,798	196,933
1963-64	196,961	307,243
1964-65	214,257	223,694
1965-66	152,590	111,432
1966-67	185,977	151,621
1967-68	33,359	72,075
1968-69	223,369	108,673
1969-70	174,010	286,012
July 1 to Decem- ber 31, 1970	127,927	133,219

EDUCATION CRISIS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier justify his statement that education was at crisis point when his Government came to office but now has been largely rectified? The question is asked on the basis of a report in the *News* of February 18 that the Premier has made the statement to which I have referred. We see in the newspapers in the last day or two reports that the Government is prepared to engage science teachers and mathematics teachers for as short a time as an hour a week.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: An hour a day.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For an hour a day. Science and mathematics play an important part in all secondary school curricula.

Resignations from the department are still running at an extremely high rate, according to our information, and the difficulties of independent schools are still considerable. The small grants recently made to independent schools have been more than absorbed by increased costs and there is a cut-back in the school building programme. The project for the Port Lincoln High School has been revised considerably.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was, of course, dealing with the immediate crisis which faced the Government last year and which had brought educational establishments almost to breaking point in many cases. I do not suggest for a moment that extremely serious problems in education do not remain, but the penultimate Minister of Education in the Hall Government was often heard to say that there was no crisis in education at all, but that was not the view taken by our Government. In fact, as the honourable member knows, the present Government has increased education expenditure markedly in the Budget for this year, a course that has been criticized by the honourable member's Leader as being beyond the financial capability of the State. As to the grants for independent schools, I point out that they exceed those promised by the honourable member's Party before the last election and in many cases, as a result of the actions of this Government, schools are markedly better off than they would have been under a Liberal Government. The total amount exceeds that promised by the honourable member's Party.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Very slightly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In many cases the grants to the schools are twice what they would have been in terms of the promise made by the honourable member's Government, and our grants have been made in the areas of greatest need. We have lessened the tension from the position of breaking point, which faced us when we took office. I do not suggest for a moment that there are not still very serious problems, but the honourable member, as a former schoolteacher, has not yet condemned publicly, as I have heard, his Prime Minister for asking that this State make cuts in education expenditure.

MINISTERIAL DELAYS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked last week on a certain matter about which I had not received a reply from him?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As promised on February 25, I have checked on the matter raised by the honourable member. I find that his constituent has placed the matter in the hands of his solicitors. The opinion of the Crown Solicitor has also been sought. As the matter is *sub judice* at this stage, I consider that I should not make any further comment, except to say that I understand that Mr. Bascombe's solicitors will be communicated with shortly by the Crown Solicitor.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education investigate the availability of textbooks in State and private secondary schools? I list the names of some books not yet available, although they have been paid for by parents of schoolchildren. The school to which I refer is at Daws Road, and the person who passed the information to me is the parent of a child attending that school. The parent lives in my district although the school is not situated in my district. For Leaving English the books not available but paid for are *English Mainly Modern*, the author of which is Colmer, and *Intact Assignments—English*, and Heath is the author. For Asian history, *Asian Modern Century* by Rich is not available. In economics not one of the books is available out of three required. The first is *Student Economics Part I*, by Brown, the second is *Australian Economic Framework*, by Draham & Day, and the third is *Pocket Compendium of Australian Statistics*. For biology, *Web of Life and Students Practical Manual Part I* are not available. I understand that in Matriculation one book that is not available anywhere in the State is *Eight Metaphysical Poets*. Will the Minister investigate and obtain a report on this situation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that the Premier and the member for Elizabeth have a copy of *Eight Metaphysical Poets* and I am sure that they could be prevailed on to lend them to meet this emergency situation. However, I will investigate the matter raised by the honourable member.

CRADOCK ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Works say when the single wire earth return power service will be connected to the Cradock district, as I understand that about 14 residents recently applied to have the power connected to this district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from the Electricity Trust as soon as possible.

SAFETY RUN-OFFS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what progress has been made in providing safety run-offs from Cross Road into the grounds of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute? I believe this is an important question because of the recent tragedies that have occurred on that section of Cross Road, and land adjacent to the institute would provide an excellent run-off.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question of general safety on the Mount Barker Road is actively being considered. Also being investigated are matters of a mechanical nature and the possible requirement of fitting a special type of brake to vehicles, as well as the matter of run-offs. As I am not completely *au fait* with the present position, I think it would be desirable for me to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SHIPPING

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked last week about losses caused by the lack of a direct shipping service between South Australia and Japan?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because most of the Japanese vessels calling at Port Adelaide belong to a shipping conference which has decided that containerable general cargo from Australia to Japan shall, where possible, be shipped in containers, most of the containerable general cargo from South Australia to Japan now goes by rail to Melbourne to be shipped from that port in Japanese cellular container ships. This state of affairs will continue until such time as either a cellular container ship berth is constructed at Outer Harbour or the smaller Japanese roll-on-roll-off vessels start calling at No. 25 berth, which is capable of accommodating them. It is most difficult to give an estimate of the direct loss in port revenue due to the present situation, but a very approximate figure would be \$15,000 a year. Indirect losses to the State due to delays and loss of export business cannot be assessed.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Government has obtained a firm undertaking or intends to obtain such an undertaking from the Australian National Line or its associates that the Pacific Australia Direct vessels or Japanese K Line vessels will use the new roll-on roll-off facilities at Port Adelaide? Following the opening of this

facility on January 15, a press report stated that plans had already been made to double the size of the facility and that money had been made available for that purpose. Further, the Government had an undertaking that the facilities would be used at least by the Australian National Line for the shipment of steel and probably by the Pacific Australia Direct vessels and the Japanese K Line vessels for other purposes. I want to know whether this statement arose from discussions or whether a firm undertaking was given. If there has been no firm undertaking, is it intended to obtain such an undertaking for the full use of this port facility?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have no specific undertaking; we have merely an indication of intention. In fact, the biggest vessel of its type has already been into the berth. From what has been told to us about the requirements of the line, we expect that we will have ships using the facilities and that we will need to provide facilities for the ships seeking to come into the port.

IRRIGATION METERS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about installing water meters in irrigation areas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An original order of 330 meters ranging in size from 10in. down to 4in. was placed and these meters are on hand. Up to the present, 62 have been installed, the details being: four of 10in., 14 of 8in., 27 of 6in., and 17 of 4in. The upper river area was selected for the initial installations, and it is expected that metering will be completed by December, 1972.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works say whether the reply given to the member for Murray indicates that it will be 1973 before the department is prepared to consider allowing water to be allocated on the new basis? At present, 44in. of water an acre is allocated in respect of land over which a water right has been granted, and this has meant that the activities of the people concerned are at present restricted to the actual acreage. However, it has been suggested that if metering proves that people are, in fact, using less water than the 44in. an acre over which the licence has been granted they might be permitted to expand their acreage up to the full use of the water allocated. I understand the department required that meters should be installed for 12 months before it would consider this matter in detail. Does

that mean it will be 1973 or the harvest year of 1974 before the matter to which I have referred can be considered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, that is the situation as I understand it; the honourable member asked a question and answered it himself. In fact, I think it was explained recently to a deputation of people who are concerned about the use of water meters that it was only proper that a suitable time be given for people to assess, with reasonable accuracy anyway, the quantity of water they required, when they could measure it, to produce whatever commodities they do, in fact, produce. I do not see that it is possible to limit the period. I thought even longer than 12 months had been suggested: it may even be two years before the position is known, but I will check on this. The honourable member should bear in mind that the position could change with experience and that his is really a hypothetical question at this stage. However, I think the department's attitude at present is that it should be at least 12 months, if not two years, before the position can be assessed accurately and before we can decide whether to use another basis for measuring water.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

Mr. HALL: In view of the termination in June, 1972, of the subsidy arranged by the previous Government and paid in support of and to maintain the freight service to Kangaroo Island provided by the *Troubridge*, and in view of the proposals, which I believe the Government has accepted, to establish a ferry service between Cape Jervis and Penne-shaw, can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when work will begin so that the ferry service will be available when the subsidy in respect of the *Troubridge* is terminated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope to be able to reply to that question within a day or two.

APPRENTICES

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say how many apprenticeship indentures have been undertaken in the past 12 months and whether the number compares favourably with that of previous years?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall be pleased to bring down a report for the honourable member. The matter of approved training for apprentices is currently being considered at Commonwealth and State levels,

and only recently I, with other State Ministers, attended a meeting in Sydney which was called by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service. At that meeting it was decided that a national conference be held, and that conference, which is to take place in Canberra early in May, will consider the recommendations from the meeting to which I have referred.

LAND TAX

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Treasurer further consider the ramifications of the Land Tax Act as it applies to assessments or rates? The assessments now being sent out to country districts relate to July 1 of last year, and landholders, particularly those on Kangaroo Island, are shocked at the evident increases. In the nine months since last July, we have witnessed what is almost an unprecedented loss of confidence in the wool industry. Many properties for sale are being retained and only forced sales are taking place, so it is likely that values will become obsolete quickly. Will the Treasurer consider this matter in view of the decline over the last nine months since the date of the assessments to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with the Valuer-General and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: In regard to the land tax assessment notices, which have been going out for some time, regarding the unimproved value of property, can the Treasurer ascertain for me whether the assessment is as at June 30, 1970, exactly, or whether it was determined before that date? In the case of the Hills catchment area, the direction that was given preventing the subdivision of land comprising less than 20 acres outside township areas was, in fact, given in April, 1970. I instance the case of a property of about 300 acres, the unimproved value of which, in 1965, was assessed at \$17,000, the present assessment being \$94,000. The owner tends to think that the valuer concerned has assessed the property on the basis of its potential as a subdivided area adjacent to a township area. If the properties in question were valued before June 30, 1970, the value of many properties has been over-assessed. Although landholders realize that they have a right to appeal, many people in the catchment areas have been affected by the Government's direction regarding the use of their land and,

if one could ascertain when the values were assessed, it would help the people concerned in their approach regarding appeals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the Valuer-General.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say whether he remembers what he told farmers, at the farmers' march on July 23 last year, about land tax, and whether he handed to the land tax committee a copy of the Labor Party's policy speech, in a similar way to that in which he handed a copy of that speech to Dr. Breuning? The Labor Party policy speech states—

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders, the honourable member is not permitted to comment when asking a question. The honourable member may seek leave of the House to explain his question, but the Standing Orders do not permit him to comment.

Mr. VENNING: I was just explaining what was in the Labor Party's policy speech prior to the last election.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has not sought leave of the House to explain his question. Does the honourable Premier desire to reply to the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do remember what I told the farmers' march. I do not know what the honourable member was referring to in relation to the land tax committee. The assessments have been carried out by the Valuer-General in accordance with the terms of the Act. As I explained to the House when the Government took office, in view of the apparent fall in rural values in certain areas of this State I requested the Valuer-General to make a reassessment so that assessments made prior to our Government's taking office would be revised and brought into line as nearly as possible with current values. That was done, and significant reductions in assessment amounts then took place in certain rural areas. That is in accordance with the policy of my Party. I did not hand to the Valuer-General a copy of the Labor Party's policy speech; I gave him the instructions I have outlined to the honourable member.

LOTTERIES

Mr. McRAE: In view of current economic circumstances, will the Treasurer consider increasing the number of lotteries? In New South Wales, lotteries that have been used to finance the luxurious Sydney Opera House

have been regularly filled. In our own circumstances, in which our hospitals are in jeopardy, I believe that greater publicity should be considered to try to get the people of South Australia to co-operate in this area, as they co-operated, for example, when South Australia was in difficulties regarding water restrictions. The line of logic I am asking the Treasurer to consider is that if greater publicity is given to our lotteries it may be a means of obtaining revenue for those very areas where we are in difficulty, particularly in regard to hospitals and schools.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with the Lotteries Commission. However, I point out to the honourable member that our reports previously have been that South Australia has a much smaller effective base for investment in lotteries than New South Wales has and that we are not likely to get a more effective return on lotteries activity than the present return. In addition, of course, I point out that at the outset, when the Lotteries Commission was established, it was indicated by the Labor Government that we did not intend to go in for much publicity of the kind "Be in it to win it!", trying to induce people to part with their money on the never-never in order to have some illusory hope that they might win the lottery, because it was argued that this was socially inadvisable, and I think that is true. We are devoting the lottery money in South Australia to improving hospitals and have never put it to things like the Sydney Opera House, which not only will not be an opera house but will not even be a concert hall, as far as one can make out; in fact, it will be a \$107,000,000 monument to incompetence, and nothing else. We are not doing that sort of thing, but I will discuss with the commission the possibility of taking other courses to improve the returns from lottery revenue.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the statement he released yesterday regarding the shortage of teachers, I ask the Minister of Education what is the extent of this deterioration in the number of teachers, especially in the science and mathematics disciplines, and how many teachers are needed in these categories.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There has been no deterioration at all. This position has been with us for a considerable time, and the shortage is not confined to this State: it is Australia-wide. Indeed, it is not confined

to Australia, either: it is a world-wide shortage. The answer comes back basically to the fact that people with science and mathematics qualifications have so many alternative forms of employment. I point out that, at the beginning of this year, about 1,000 teachers were available at the teachers colleges for appointment to schools, with only just over 350 available for secondary schools. This year there has been a record enrolment into our teachers colleges as well as a record enrolment by far of students undertaking mathematics or science studies. We will not get any benefit from that record enrolment until four years hence. The policy we adopted in relation to this problem was to fill up the country vacancies so that we were properly (not generously) staffed in our country secondary schools at the beginning of the year for clearly, in respect of country vacancies existing at the beginning of the school year, we could not in most cases find local people in those areas to take mathematics and science classes. We created several positions of senior master and senior mistress in country schools in order to induce teachers to go to country areas.

Regarding the metropolitan area, I am not sure how many mathematics and science teachers we would like to have if we could get them. Although I will obtain this information for the honourable member, I point out that the position changes from day to day. People who are qualified for appointment to our schools are still coming into the department seeking positions. We hope that, as a consequence of our appeal for people to undertake mathematics and science teaching on a part-time basis, we will be able to cover all the positions in the metropolitan area as well. If that is done, we can say that the position has improved considerably compared to the position that has obtained in recent years.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say what stage the Education Department has reached in the planning of the Ridgehaven Technical High School and whether this secondary school is still to be the next built in this area, as I have been previously informed? I point out that, as the attendance at the Modbury High School exceeded 1,000 this year, an accommodation problem has arisen.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the general problem of secondary school accommodation in the area represented by the honourable member. As I do not have the information she requests with me, I shall bring it down for her.

CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on progress being made with regard to the proposed reservoir to be situated just above the Clarendon weir? Many people who own land in the area that will be the catchment area of that reservoir are beginning to hear rumours that the Mines Department, which is working with the Engineering and Water Supply Department on this project, is having difficulty in finding a suitable base on which to construct a wall that will be suitable for the reservoir. As their livelihood is affected, the people in the area are concerned about these rumours. They believe that their land may be acquired and that, in future, it may be found that the reservoir cannot be built on this site and that the land is therefore not needed. The time factor is also important. If there is a delay in constructing additional major water resources on the Murray River, the reservoir at Clarendon may be required soon by the State. The matter has now become urgent. In reply to questions last year, we were told that by now the reservoir would be under tender, prices having been received. I understood that by about July this year construction would be ready to commence. Will the Minister obtain a report immediately?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Only last week the Engineer-in-Chief and I discussed this matter. Yesterday I dealt with a docket that involved the expenditure of a certain sum for an exploratory adit in connection with the building of the Clarendon reservoir, to establish whether there was a base or foundation on which the walls of the reservoir could be constructed. I cannot tell the honourable member (and no report is available on this) the exact time table for the construction of the reservoir; this depends greatly on the financial situation, involving the Loan Fund for next financial year. As the points raised by the honourable member are most important to his constituents, I will discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief and give the honourable member what information I can about the future of the dam, particularly as to the suitability of the area as a site for the dam.

COOLTONG PIPELINE

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Irrigation a report dealing with the installation of the new irrigation pipeline at the Cooltong irrigation settlement and give details of the commencement and completion dates of the work and the earliest date on which the new installations will operate? Yesterday, I received the following letter:

At a settlers' meeting held on February 16 the following motion was carried: That the secretary write to Mr. Curren, M.P., asking him if he would ask a question in the House of the Minister of Works asking for specific details of the proposed improved irrigation water supply for Cooltong. Details required include: commencement of contract, completion of same, and earliest date on which scheme will be in operation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report from my colleague and to bring it down.

HOSPITAL INQUIRY

Dr. TONKIN: As the Premier has been kind enough to answer my previous questions about the Committee of Inquiry into Hospital Communications, I ask him what aspect of the conclusions of the report of that committee it is considered precludes the publication of the reasons underlying the recommendations made by that committee. The Premier's offer to me for me to view the confidential portions of the report is not acceptable. Some of the recommendations are clearly most desirable, but others have caused much unease amongst various members of the community. If, in fact, these matters are called "confidential" to protect the people giving evidence before the committee, one must be cognizant of the rights and privileges of those people. On the other hand, if "confidential" means that members of the committee and their findings must be protected, I believe members of the public who have expressed unease about the matter have every right to express that unease. The main problem is that people consider that the control of nursing and medical services in hospitals is being taken out of professional hands and placed in the hands of lay people. That is the basis of my question. I should like to hear the Premier's reasons for going along with the recommendation that the conclusions of the committee should not be made public.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is impossible to deal with the reasons underlying the committee's recommendations beyond the

extent that they have been dealt with in the recommendations without revealing matters upon which the committee based its judgment. Many of those matters are the result of evidence that was given in confidence, some of which is explosive in nature. The evidence given before the committee revealed a series of situations that were clearly undesirable, and dealt with certain personalities and situations in such a way that grave harm to hospital administration and to the administration generally could occur if they were made public.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: And you can't expect to receive frank evidence if it is going to be splashed all over the place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite so. The honourable member suggested at an early stage of this inquiry that people were not appearing before the inquiry because they were frightened of giving evidence. In due course, however, that proved not to be the case.

Dr. Tonkin: I am worried not about the evidence but about the conclusions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One cannot deal with the conclusions without dealing with the evidence, and some of the evidence given was indeed frank. In all the circumstances, the committee recommended that publication be limited to the matters that the Government has published, and that recommendation was not made to protect the committee: it was made to protect the witnesses and other persons involved in administration who are trying to carry out their duties as they see them but who could conceivably be considerably harmed by the kind of criticisms made before the committee. In all the circumstances, the Government considered the committee's recommendation and concluded that it was correct.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether copies of the conclusions (not the evidence) of the committee will be made available to the Matron, senior nursing administrators, the Medical Superintendent, senior medical staff, the Chairman and members of the Board of Management, tutor sisters and ward sisters of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, all of whose positions or activities are referred to in the report, and will he say what avenues are available to these people for discussing or rebutting the facts leading to the committee's recommendations on their activities? In replying to my previous

question, the Premier said that potentially explosive situations were revealed by the evidence given. Presumably, the evidence given by various people reflects on senior hospital, medical and nursing administration, since that is what the recommendations basically consist of. The inference that one must draw where there is no indication otherwise is that the people involved in administration had no opportunity to answer the matters referred to the committee regarding their own activities. If this is not so, I would welcome the Premier's reassurance, as, I am sure, will the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The people involved were given an opportunity to appear before the committee, and the matters affecting them were certainly put to them. There is no question of that. However, regarding the question of administrative staff and the extent to which matters in the report affecting members of that staff were discussed with them by hospital administrators or by members of the Hospitals Department administration, I will take up the matter.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister for Conservation say whether the Government has considered transferring the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department to the newly created portfolio of Conservation. At present, this department comes under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. With the present rural situation as it is, this Ministry no doubt has many problems to deal with, and I have received many complaints from fishermen that they are experiencing difficulty in having matters dealt with by the department. For this reason, and because this department is one of conservation, I ask my question. If the Government has not considered this matter, would it investigate the possibility of transferring this department to the control of the Minister for Conservation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This is one of the areas being examined by the Government. However, the question facing the Government is whether the department should be divided, with the flora and fauna sections being transferred to the control of the Minister for Conservation, and with the fisheries section remaining under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. Apparently, it is thought that the fishing industry could adequately be dealt with by the Minister of Agriculture. I am surprised to hear the hon-

ourable member say that some fishermen have found it difficult to have matters they have raised dealt with by the department. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture would be pleased to hear of those complaints so that he could hasten the consideration of any inquiries made by fishermen in the honourable member's district.

KESWICK INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain when turn-right traffic lights are to be installed at the intersection of Anzac Highway and Greenhill Road, Keswick? Accidents at this intersection have been caused mainly by motorists trying to cross the path of south-bound and north-bound traffic. The Minister has previously said that when traffic signals are installed allowances are made for the installation of turn-right signals.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have a reply soon.

RIVER FLOW

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me the flows of the Mitta Mitta and Murray Rivers above Albury and the flows of the tributaries below Albury from July 1 until now, as well as the storages held in Lake Eucumbene, the Hume dam, and Lake Victoria?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member.

FIRE FIGHTING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding subsidies on the cost of equipment used by volunteer fire-fighting organizations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not intended at present to vary the basis of subsidizing fire-fighting equipment used by volunteer fire-fighting organizations, or to extend subsidies to expenditure outlaid by individual property holders on such equipment. At present, subsidies are provided on moneys expended by registered fire-fighting organizations on approved items of equipment, and funds for this purpose are made available annually by the Government and insurance companies on a \$1 for \$1 basis. As I indicated to the honourable member when he raised this matter, the whole organization and administration of voluntary fire-fighting services throughout the

State is at present under review, and it is probable that in due course the methods of financing these services will come under scrutiny.

SALT CREEK WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have received a letter from Mr. Tiver, a landholder of Salt Creek, saying that, so far as he is aware, it is not intended to extend into the Coorong area any subsidiary spur main being constructed from the Taillem Bend to Keith main. As the Minister of Works knows, this area is indeed popular and is becoming progressively more popular with tourists. However, at present it has no water supply of any quality, so that anyone camping along the Coorong is obliged either to take water from adjoining landholders, store-keepers or roadhouses or, indeed in certain instances to buy it, or he must carry it with him. This therefore makes this area's tourist potential marginal. I understand one problem is that a main would have to be constructed across the Messent Reserve, and that the commissioners are being asked to consider the provision of adequate water supplies for the future development of this reserve. I should be pleased, therefore, if the Minister would examine this aspect while this scheme is being constructed, as it is important both to the future development of the Messent Reserve and, particularly, to the Coorong, which more of the travelling public is visiting. Also, a caravan park or something of that nature could possibly be established at Salt Creek.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the matter for the honourable member.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education give the House a progress report on the preparation of plans for the new Gladstone High School? These plans were withdrawn and were to be reconsidered by the department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I hoped that the Gladstone High School project would be ready to go to the Public Works Committee by now. As the honourable member knows, it has been the subject of redesign, and one or two remaining difficult problems associated with that redesign have still to be finally sorted out. I hope the project can go to the committee soon. I inquired about the matter last week, but I will inquire again to find out what is the latest position.

EDUCATION FACILITIES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether the full student facilities available at South Australian universities, the South Australian Institute of Technology, and our high schools will be used effectively during 1971? This morning, at the Roseworthy Agricultural College speech day (I appreciate that this is not within the Minister's province), the Principal stated that, whilst there were vacancies for 65 first-year students this year, the list closed with only 54 applicants. His report states:

We made provision to take 65 new first-years but closed our list with only 54 after taking every applicant with the minimum academic requirement of five subjects passed at the Leaving public examinations. There was no selection on the basis of preferred subjects (English, mathematics, physics and chemistry) and there was no exclusion on the ground that the applicant was unlikely to succeed.

The purpose of my question is to find out whether there is a dearth of persons seeking tertiary or sub-tertiary education and, of course, education extending down to secondary standard.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the position at Roseworthy, which I discussed informally with the Principal when I was at the college a couple of weeks ago, is peculiar to that college. At the universities, apart from in the faculties of medicine, architecture and, I think, physiotherapy, the quotas have not caused difficulty this year. Just about everyone qualified for admission has gained admission. This year we planned to admit to teachers colleges 1,700 first-year students who were under Education Department scholarships, and the final admission figure is about 1,700. In addition, I think there are 90 or 100 private students, so the places that we have available in the teachers colleges have been fully taken up. I know that last year enrolments at the Institute of Technology were not quite up to expectation. I think they are up to expectation this year, but I will check that for the honourable member. I think that the position at Roseworthy has come about as a result of the extremely difficult problems being experienced by certain rural industries. This may have a double effect. First, it may affect the number of people who could afford the costs associated with tertiary education at Roseworthy. Many farmers who may have contemplated paying for their boys to take the course at Roseworthy may have had to reconsider.

Secondly, the problems in the rural industries may well have affected the assessments by young students of future employment prospects in those industries. That is the only explanation that I can give. The situation is certainly worrying in relation to the future of Roseworthy. In certain areas, rather than build facilities in stages we have constructed the entire facilities, although they will not be fully utilized for some time. This applies to the Marden and Royal Park High Schools, which were opened this year. At these schools accommodation is available for, I think, about 1,000 students, but the first year enrolments are only 200 to 250. That kind of excess capacity would apply also at The Levels.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on when it is expected that roadworks on Greenhill Road from Goodwood Road to Glen Osmond Road and the provision of traffic lights will be completed? During the summer months excellent progress is being made by the Highways Department on work along Greenhill Road and at intersections on the road. Traffic signals are being installed already at the intersection of Peacock Road and Greenhill Road, where there is a large build-up of traffic, and the completion of this work would help traffic considerably. Also, there is a considerable build-up of traffic at the intersection of Unley Road and Greenhill Road at peak periods. I am sure that the Highways Department's work will be an excellent job when it is completed and that the traffic build-up will then be at a minimum and a more even flow of traffic will be maintained along these roads.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

BUS FARES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the increase in bus fares from last Monday involved extra travelling expense for pensioners? This week a constituent, who is a pensioner, and his wife boarded a bus at Oaklands Park and were charged an extra 5c each to travel to the city. This pensioner was under the impression that the increase was not intended to affect pensioners.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the honourable member knows, the bus to which he refers is privately operated, and the concession that the Government announced for pensioners on the eighth and ninth sections applied only to Municipal Tramways Trust buses. I should be surprised if there were eight or nine sections between Oaklands Park and the city.

Mr. Mathwin: Yes, there are nine.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If that is the case, the answer is that it is a privately-operated bus service, not an M.T.T. service.

KARCULTABY AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say when the proposed new school will be built at Karcultaby? Parents with children at the Minnipa and Poochera schools have expressed to me concern at the lack of progress being made on this project. As the Minister knows, many parents in this area are finding it difficult to send their children away for education, and they desire to have the building of the Karcultaby Area School expedited so that they can avoid the expense of sending the children away for further education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Sketches for this school have been commenced. It is hoped that tenders can be called for the work in the middle of 1972 and that the school will be available for occupation towards the end of 1973. Whether that time table can be adhered to will depend on how the current attitude of the Commonwealth Government develops in future. At present we have a situation in which the total value of projects that we are now designing is significantly more than the likely sum we will have available from State sources in the next two or three years. That is not assuming that there will be any decline in the money available from State sources. The honourable member will appreciate that an approach was made to the Commonwealth Government by all States that co-operated in carrying out a survey into education needs. The conclusions of that survey were presented by the States to the Commonwealth Government in May of last year, the previous Minister of Education acting on behalf of South Australia. The Commonwealth Government indicated at Budget time that no additional funds would be available for recurrent expenditure, but it requested the State to provide additional information on priorities regarding capital projects. South Australia sent this information to the Commonwealth Government early in October last

year. We are still awaiting a reply from the Commonwealth Government to the request made on behalf of all States.

Mr. Coumbe: Was there much difference between the priorities?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We were asked to classify all new projects that we hoped to construct in the next five years into categories of "Extremely urgent", "Urgent", "Necessary" and "Desirable". We carried out that classification, and all the projects we had on our list we regarded either as necessary, urgent, or extremely urgent. We had none that we could place in the "desirable" category. I estimated that, if the Commonwealth Government was willing to assist with a few million dollars extra each year, we could adhere to our current time tables. If we do not receive extra assistance from the Commonwealth Government, some of the present time tables will have to be revised.

INDUSTRIAL CODE

Mr. McRAE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to introduce a new Industrial Code this session or later this year? Many inquiries have been made by the public about the present industrial legislation. Some are centred around equal pay, as there seems to be injustice in the present Act because many female employees do not seem to be receiving the benefit of equal pay that it was intended they would receive. Some inquiries centre around the difficult questions of Commonwealth and State registrations of unions, and around the difficulties and technicalities found in the present Code in dealing in a judicial manner with disputes. Can the Minister say whether the new legislation will be framed in such a way that these matters can be dealt with to the advantage of unions, employers, and the community?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Matters concerning the Industrial Code are being actively considered at present, especially those to which the honourable member has referred. It is hoped that a Bill will be introduced soon to rectify many existing anomalies, and the Government considers that this legislation will be the most modern in Australia.

PATAWALONGA BRIDGES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether priorities for bridges to be built over the Patawalonga in the next

three years can be amended? The reconstruction of the King Street bridge is to commence in February, 1972, and within three years construction of a new bridge over the Patawalonga basin from Military Road to Tapley Hill Road is expected to start. Whilst the King Street bridge is being rebuilt, all traffic in and out of the area bounded by the Patawalonga and the beach will be forced to use the Anderson Avenue bridge, a wooden structure which has single lane traffic and on which there is a weight limit. In the event of a fire or any other emergency, overweight vehicles would be forced to travel along Tapley Hill Road to West Beach Road and then come back to the area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was interested to read the honourable member's article on this matter a week or two ago published in the Messenger press, and I thought that his views should be considered. I will discuss with officers of my department whether any action such as he has suggested is possible.

MILK

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what has happened to a new innovation in keeping milk fresh that was advertised here several years ago? When Mr. Bywaters was Minister of Agriculture he announced that a new type of milk that would keep fresh for many weeks without refrigeration was being manufactured. On one occasion he exhibited a pint of milk which had been kept for one month without refrigeration but which was still fresh.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to consider this matter. Perhaps the construction of the cows caused a problem.

WILTSHIRE COMMITTEE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made concerning the Wiltshire committee, which was set up to deal with the accreditation of colleges of advanced education and like institutions? I know that a question concerning this was asked last year, but can the Minister say whether anything further has happened?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Immediately before the opening of the Commonwealth Conference on Education, a meeting of State Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister was held in Canberra, and the Wiltshire report was discussed. The present position is that all

States except one (not South Australia) have agreed on the terms under which a national agency should be established and on the powers of the agency. The Commonwealth Government wishes to have a national accrediting agency that has a little more power than some of the States are prepared to agree that it is desirable that it should have. We have tried to persuade the Commonwealth Government that the proposal we have made to the Commonwealth Minister would work satisfactorily. Whilst it pays some attention to State prerogatives in the matter, it gives effective power ultimately to the national agency. The present position is that the Commonwealth Minister has indicated that he will consider further his position and that the Commonwealth Government will ultimately decide on the proposal put to it. If the honourable member would like precise details about the negotiations at this stage, I would be willing to let him have them on a confidential basis.

COURIER SERVICE

Mr. HALL: In view of the difficulty that South Australians are having in communicating with Britain, because of the United Kingdom postal strike, and as the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union has placed a ban on the handling of all mail addressed to the four couriers who have advertised in South Australia and who have said that they will personally see to the delivery of mail in the United Kingdom on the payment of a fee, I ask the Premier whether he will ascertain, for the guidance of those who may wish to use this courier service, whether or not the couriers may attend at their local post office in order to ask for and receive mail, thereby overcoming the present situation in which delivery to their own premises is now prevented.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As this is a Commonwealth matter, I should have thought that the Leader was in perfectly as good a position as I am to ask his Commonwealth member or the Commonwealth Minister about the matter. It is not in the hands of the State Government to exercise any power in relation to the matter.

ROAD CONSOLIDATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport examine the possibility of having suitable notices erected in the vicinity of roadworks where salt water is being used for consolidation purposes? Constituents have brought to my notice the fact

that in certain areas where reconstruction is taking place sea water is being used to consolidate the new roadworks and that, some time after traversing the roads in question, they have noticed remarkable signs of rust on the chassis and body work of their motor vehicles. The people concerned are asking that, where salt water is being used on roadworks, signs be erected so that when a motorist arrives home he can hose down his vehicle to get rid of the effects of salt.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member will be good enough to tell me the location where salt water is being used, I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the department.

FURNITURE REMOVAL

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Education investigate the system for the removal of the furniture and possessions of married teachers with a view to improving that system? During the summer vacation, when married teachers are transferred from one country school to another, my parents again experienced the early arrival of the removal van. They arrived at their new school, which was about 90 miles from their previous posting, at 3 a.m. Many teachers are honoured, at farewell functions, by the parents of their students. The removal of their furniture in the early hours of the morning is an insult to teaching staff.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure what happened in relation to the honourable member's parents. I do not know whether a party went on until 3 a.m.—

Mr. Becker: The van arrived early.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that within the department we arrange with the removalists for a series of chain removals, as this is a way of getting the necessary movement at a minimum cost. However, clearly the teachers concerned must be notified in a way which is reasonable and which does not put them to any inconvenience. I will look into the whole matter. If the honourable member can give me any further details about the case that has come to his attention, I shall be pleased to have them.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain from the abattoirs a report on the

progress being made in relation to the suggestion of having two crutchers on the killing chain so that the sheep can be treated there rather than on the property from which they come?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier obtain for me the estimated cost of administering the rural reconstruction scheme, which is to be carried out in this State? I believe that the cost of administering this scheme must be met by the State Government, as it is not provided in the actual grant from the Commonwealth Government, which makes available only the money to be received by the beneficiaries under the scheme. I have heard a rumour that a large staff is already being put together to administer this scheme. I am concerned that, under a scheme such as this, we will have to carry a large financial burden that I believe is possibly unnecessary, as a small staff should be able to cope with this work. Although the rumours I have heard may be untrue, I believe we should have some idea, before we go too deeply into it, of the cost of administering the scheme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The sum we are receiving under the scheme gives us no great encouragement as to its effectiveness or extensiveness. However, it is the best we are able to get from the Commonwealth Government. I will obtain a report for the honourable member about the cost of administration.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say when the Minister of Agriculture is likely to introduce complementary legislation to give effect to the rural reconstruction scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the current session.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether any plans are afoot to appoint an ombudsman in this State? I see it has been predicted in a report that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's question relates to an Order of the Day, and it is not competent for him to ask a question in relation thereto.

G10

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What fee was paid to Social Technology Systems Incorporated in respect of the Adelaide Transportation Report, 1970?

2. What additional expense was incurred in transportation and accommodation costs for the members of that firm visiting Adelaide?

3. How long did they stay?

4. What additional expense was incurred in clerical, printing, and other services involved in the production of this report?

5. What was the total cost of this report to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$10,615, consisting of \$6,922 for consulting and travelling time, and \$3,693 for fares and expenses. I draw attention to the reply given on October 13, 1970, by the Hon. A. F. Kneebone, to a question asked by the Hon. C. M. Hill in the Legislative Council. He said that the total amount paid to Dr. Breuning and his associate was \$9,263, comprising \$6,041 and \$3,222, respectively. The reason for these different amounts is that the First National Bank of Boston duplicated the payment of our first advance of \$1,500 (U.S.). When this error by the bank was discovered later, a further payment of \$1,352 (Australian) had to be made.

2. Accommodation costs were included in the amount paid. The department provided transport to enable Dr. Breuning and his associate to acquaint themselves with the metropolitan area. No additional expenses were incurred, as an officer of the department was detailed to accompany Dr. Breuning on his tours of inspection.

3. Dr. Breuning and Mr. Kettaneh arrived in Adelaide on August 2, and departed on August 27, 1970.

4. \$564.

5. \$11,179.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many times has the Committee on Environment in South Australia met?

2. What centres in the State has the committee visited?

3. When is it expected that the committee's report will be available to Parliament?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The Committee on Environment in South Australia has received about 80 submissions and has met in Adelaide on 30 occasions, hearing evidence at about one-third of these meetings. In addition, the committee has spent 21 days on inspection visits and the hearing of evidence in country areas.

2. The committee has visited the South-East, the Lower Murray, the Upper Murray, the Barossa Valley, the Mount Lofty Ranges, and the metropolitan area, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Port Lincoln.

3. It is expected that the committee will make its final report to the Minister for Conservation towards the end of this year.

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Mr. CARNIE (on notice): What was the total cost of the recent alterations to the House of Assembly Chamber?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The total cost of the alterations was about \$8,500. The scope of the work was as follows:

- (a) Extension of the front benches on each side of the House. To enable this work to be executed to the appropriate standard, it was necessary to disassemble the benches and transport them to the departmental workshop at Netley. Extension of the benches also involved alterations to the tiered floor, modifications to the air-conditioning return ducts, cutting and reinstating electrical wiring, and renewing carpets in affected areas.
- (b) Reduction of front dais and relocating Speaker's desk and the table of the House. The dais in the Chamber, an integral structural part of the flooring, was required to be modified to enable necessary relocation of the Speaker's desk. Alterations were made to the seat of the Chairman of Committees to conform with the altered shape of the dais, and the table of the House was also relocated. These alterations necessitated modifications to the air-conditioning return duct work, complete disassembly and reconstruction of the table, and alterations to carpet areas and electrical wiring.
- (c) Extension of bookshelves across the front of the Speaker's gallery.

(d) Moving second Clerk Assistants' accommodation from the stranger's area in the Speaker's gallery to the front of the Chamber opposite the Parliamentary Draftsman, and re-using and re-erecting redundant front panels of Speaker's gallery. The standard of the work is excellent.

HAPPY VALLEY LAND

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many acres of land has been acquired adjacent to the Happy Valley reservoir with the object of helping to prevent further pollution of it?

2. What is the acreage of each property so acquired?

3. What was the price paid for each property?

4. Is it intended that any extra annual grant be made to the Meadows District Council to offset fully or partly that council's considerable loss in rate revenue occasioned by these acquisitions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. About 291 acres was acquired.

2. The areas varied from 34 perches to 72 acres, 1 rood, 39 perches,

3. A total of 40 properties were acquired at a cost of \$650,790.31.

4. The purchase of land and property for this project is no different from other purchases made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department or by other departments, and there appears to be no reason why it should be treated in isolation from other property in respect of which no reimbursement has been made to the local government body.

MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice):

1. How much has the Government of South Australia paid in fees, salaries, and other expenses attributable to the Royal Commission on the Moratorium?

2. What expenses have been incurred, but not yet paid?

3. What is the estimated total cost of this Royal Commission?

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

1. \$36,639.

2. \$14,152.

3. It is not possible, at this stage, to estimate the total cost of the Royal Commission, 1970, which is obviously linked with the length of time the Royal Commission continues to function. The Royal Commissioner is anxious to complete the task for which he was appointed as soon as he is able to do so.

WATER RATING

Mr. CUMBE (on notice):

1. When was the report presented to the Minister by the special committee set up by the previous Government to determine whether a more equitable system of water rating could be introduced into South Australia?

2. Does the Government intend to present this report to Parliament?

3. If so, when? If not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. November 13, 1970.

2. When an evaluation has been made of the report, a decision will be made whether it will be presented to Parliament.

3. *Vide* No. 2. The cost of the committee appointed by the previous Government was \$29,021.

OVERLAND

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. For how long is the present programme of television advertising publicizing the Overland express to continue?

2. What is the cost of this campaign?

3. What improvement in patronage, and thus in revenue, is it estimated will result?

4. What further actions are being taken to make the Overland service attractive to the interstate businessman wishing to have a full day in Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Until March 4.

2. \$8,000, made up of \$1,550 for production of films and \$6,450 for television time.

3. This cannot be estimated with accuracy. The advertising campaign, both on television and in the press, forms part of a plan to attract patronage to rail. The club and cafeteria cars on the Overland are also contributory factors in this regard.

4. Present arrival and departure times are designed to provide a businessman travelling interstate with a full night's sleep and a

complete day in the city for business. Breakfast is served, without additional cost to sleeping berth passengers, in their cabins. A first-class meal is available in the railway dining room before departure of the Overland, and a full liquor service is available. The Overland tavern also provides this facility. The club car on the Overland is a meeting place for travellers where friends can be farewelled before departure and where light refreshments and drinks are served in very pleasant surroundings *en route*.

GOVERNMENT COMMITTEES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many committees have been set up by the present Government since taking office?

2. For what purpose has each of these committees been established?

3. How many members are there on each committee?

4. What fees have been paid to the members of each committee to date?

5. Which of these committees has still to report to the Government?

6. When is it expected that these reports will be made public?

7. Have all other available reports from such committees been made public, and if not what reasons are there for not doing so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In trying to obtain a comprehensive answer for the honourable member, it has been difficult to sort out what are formally appointed committees and what are administrative committees within departments. However, I have as comprehensive a list as I have been able to obtain. The replies are as follows:

1. 17.

2. (a) Committee for investigation of central grain terminal.

(b) Foreshore and Beaches Committee to report upon beach erosion, foreshore protection, planning and development.

(c) Committee to receive and examine representations concerning communications in Government hospitals in South Australia.

(d) Committee to examine and report on health and hospital services within the State and to make recommendations on the administrative structures required to ensure an optimum of health services in the future.

(e) Committee to recommend on the distribution of an additional \$250,000 a year to those independent schools with children attending primary schools.

(f) Committee of inquiry into impact of rates and taxes on pensioners and persons in needy circumstances.

(g) Transport Policy Implementation Committee: a working committee to co-ordinate planning and maintain liaison with various departments, and so on, to implement the Adelaide Transportation Report, 1970.

(h) Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1968, Inquiry Committee: to examine the application of the provisions of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1968, to commercial goods vehicles operating in this State.

(i) Committee to review the report on road safety prepared by the South Australian Government Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety.

(j) Advisory Committee on Passenger Coach Safety Testing and Control: to examine all aspects of safety standards in regard to passenger coach operation and, in particular, those vehicles used on charter and tourist operations throughout South Australia.

(k) The Road Safety Instruction Centre Planning and Development Committee: established to bring to fruition the Government's desire to improve the standard of driving and enhance road safety.

(l) The Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula Transport Committee: to reconsider previous recommendations in the light of reported changed circumstances. (Reconstituted by present Government.)

(m) Committee to examine all aspects of the allocation of wheat delivery quotas under the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act.

(n) Committee to investigate the establishment and operation of rural group-buying co-operatives.

(o) Committee to examine the operations of the Government Produce Department, with special emphasis on the functioning of the Port Lincoln branch of that department.

(p) Committee to advise the State Planning Authority on disposal of refuse and industrial wastes. Although not set up by the present Government, it has been approved by the Minister administering the Planning and Development Act.

(q) Committee to inquire into local government contribution to the Fire Brigades Board.

3. (a) 3;

(b) 5;

(c) 4;

(d) 8;

(e) 6;

(f) 5;

(g) 7;

(h) 5;

(i) 8;

(j) 9;

(k) 8;

(l) 3;

(m) 3;

(n) 4;

(o) 3;

(p) 5;

(q) 3.

4. (a) to (d)—Nil.

(e) —\$940.

(f) to (k)—Nil.

(l) —\$137.50.

(m) —\$3,382.

(n) to (q)—Nil.

5. All committees, with the exception of the following:

(c) Committee concerning communications in Government hospitals in South Australia. Extracts of recommendations and method of operation laid before Parliament on February 23, 1971.

(e) Committee on distribution of an additional \$250,000 a year to independent primary schools.

(m) Wheat Delivery Quotas Inquiry Committee.

6. Not known.

7. Yes, except for (m) Wheat Delivery Quotas Inquiry Committee (interim report for the information of the Minister of Agriculture, but not to be made public).

The reports of the following internal working committees under the Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government will not be made public:

- (f) Inquiry into impact of rates and taxes on pensioners and persons in needy circumstances.
- (k) Road Safety Instruction Centre Committee.
- (l) Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula Transport Committee.

STAFF

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many appointments in the following categories have been made since June 2, 1970, to assist Ministers or their senior staff:
 - (a) press secretaries;
 - (b) information officers;
 - (c) research assistants;
 - (d) development officers;
 - (e) personal assistants; and
 - (f) private secretaries?
2. What duties does each of these appointments entail?
3. What are the salaries of these officers?

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

1. (a) Seven—one replacement and six additional.
- (b) One—as replacement.
- (c) One—also as replacement of Senior Press Secretary.
- (d) One.
- (e) and (f) Three personal secretaries, including Secretary to Minister for Conservation, who does not have a Ministerial secretary in the same capacity as do other Ministers.

In addition, a press secretary and a research officer have been provided to assist the Leader of the Opposition.

2. (a) Compilation and issue of releases to press, radio and television and research and drafting of material required by Minister.
- (b) Compilation of information for speeches and releases by the Premier and the Chief Secretary.
- (c) Research as directed by the Premier and oversight of all press staff.
- (d) Research into and promotion of development of tourism and the performing arts in South Australia. This is a Public Service post and appointment.
- (e) and (f) Correspondence associated with appointments, deputations and the attendance of the Ministers

concerned at all functions. Preparation of Parliamentary bags and general secretarial duties as required.

Until these appointments were made South Australia was the only State where the Ministerial head of a department was at the same time acting as personal secretary to his Minister and was required to perform functions of a very much lower administrative level than was justified by his salary.

3. (a) \$160.60 a week—Press Secretary: Deputy Premier—Attorney-General—Minister of Labour and Industry. \$137.70 a week—Press Secretary: Premier's Department—Minister of Education. \$113.80 a week—Press Secretary: Minister of Roads and Transport—Minister of Agriculture.
 - (b) \$137.70 a week.
 - (c) \$170.20 a week.
 - (d) \$9,500 a year.
 - (e) and (f) One at \$5,840 a year and two at \$6,310 a year.

TRADE AGENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many overseas appointments have been made as trade agents by this Government since assuming office?
2. What are their respective salaries, allowances, and authorized expenses?
3. What are their terms of employment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been a little difficult for me to understand this question, because the honourable member has asked about trade agents on a salaried basis: we do not have any. I have endeavoured to make my reply as comprehensive as possible; it is as follows:

1. Two.
 2. (a) Trade Officer in the European zone: Salary
 - \$A10,500 a year from January 11, 1971, to December 31, 1971.
 - \$A11,000 a year from January 1, 1972, to December 31, 1972.
 - \$A11,500 a year from January 1, 1973, to the expiration of the three-year term of appointment.
- Allowances
- Living and housing—\$A1,750 a year for 12 months; thereafter \$A2,110 a year.

Travelling expenses—reimbursement of the amount necessarily incurred.

Entertainment expenses—reimbursement of the amount necessarily undertaken and substantiated by vouchers.

Hire of motor car—as necessarily incurred on duty.

(b) Trade Officer in the South-East Asian zone:

Salary

\$A12,000 a year.

Allowances

Housing and living—\$A2,880 a year for the first 12 months, thereafter \$A3,120 a year.

Travelling expenses—reimbursement of the amount necessarily incurred.

Entertainment expenses—reimbursement of the amount necessarily undertaken and substantiated by vouchers.

Hire of motor car—as necessarily incurred on duty.

Allowance—children: \$A550 a year for first child under 16 years and \$A380 a year in respect of other children.

Allowances occur only in the case of oversea residence.

3. Three years.

The following information relates to agencies appointed to represent the South Australian Government overseas:

1. Agencies have been appointed in Tokyo, Hong Kong and Singapore.

2. A retainer fee of \$A2,500 a year is paid for general representation, and for special assignments undertaken at the request of the Government a fee of \$A25 a man-hour worked on the assignment will be paid.

3. Three years with annual renewals thereafter and subject to six months' notice of termination on either side.

In addition to above, negotiations are currently proceeding for appointment of an agent located in Djakarta.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered the recommendations in the report on road safety of the South Australian Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety?

2. Does it intend to accept any of the recommendations? If so, which ones?

3. Has any action been taken yet to implement them? If so, what is it?

4. If no action has been taken yet, when, and in what form, is it intended to take action?

5. Have any of the recommendations been rejected? If so, which ones, and why?

6. Are there any recommendations upon which no decision has yet been taken? If so, which ones?

7. What is the reason why no decision has yet been taken on these recommendations?

8. When will such decisions be taken?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Government has constituted a small committee to consider the implications of the report. When it has been received, the Government will implement those of the recommendations it considers appropriate. The committee comprises the three members of the Road Traffic Board, and a representative from each of the South Australian Road Safety Council, the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the State Planning Authority, the South Australian Railways, the Highways Department, and the Motor Vehicles Department. It is expected that the report will be submitted to the Government in a few weeks.

3. to 8. See 2 above.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia respecting the River Murray and Lake Victoria and other waters, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is, with some important exceptions, textually similar to a measure that was introduced in this House on April 28 last year by the Premier of the day. In summary, it proposes the ratification and approval, but on this occasion with a vital reservation, of an

agreement entered into by the then Premier with the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. Honourable members will recall that that agreement was the subject of a detailed explanation and not inconsiderable debate at that time. For present purposes it is sufficient to say that it purports to amend the principal agreement of 1914 relating to the Murray River waters that has, to the present time, been amended six times. In substance, the amendments proposed by the agreement set out in the schedule to this Bill fall into these three classes:

- (a) a number of necessary machinery amendments to the 1914 agreement as amended, with which I suggest nobody can quarrel;
- (b) a series of provisions relating to the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir and the sharing of the waters that will be available following that construction; again, these proposals should receive wide support; and
- (c) a provision that has the effect of giving any one of the contracting parties the ability to prevent, for all time, the continuance of work on the Chowilla reservoir. It is, of course, to this most obnoxious provision that the present Government, and apparently the people of this State, have the strongest objection.

From the outset of its taking office, the Government indicated to the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the other States concerned that it was prepared to proceed immediately with the necessary planning work on the construction of the Dartmouth dam. The Commonwealth and the other States, however, refused to proceed until the agreement in the form rejected by this Parliament and the people of South Australia at an election was approved by us, thereby making it a condition of any further work at Dartmouth that we should forgo our rights to Chowilla, in the existing agreement.

The Government has put forward compromise proposals previously to try to break this deadlock, only to be told by the Commonwealth Government and the other States that they would accept no compromise whatever. We have had various statements from the leaders of the other States, particularly Sir Henry Bolte, to the effect that the Dartmouth dam is in danger. Sir Henry has even said that

he has now appropriated, for other purposes, moneys he appropriated for work this year on Dartmouth. As the moneys he could have appropriated this year for Dartmouth were very small indeed, this is simply grandstanding.

The fact is that both New South Wales and Victoria are over-committed in relation to existing water rights, and settlers in both areas badly need the construction of the Dartmouth dam. More recently it has been suggested that the reason why money cannot be expended on the Dartmouth dam is that South Australia is being obdurate. No attempt whatever has been made to break the deadlock by the Commonwealth Government or the other States. On this occasion, South Australia makes one further attempt to do so; that is, we will ratify so much of the proposed amending agreement as relates to the Dartmouth dam and the consequential amendments to rights to Murray River water that arise from its construction, and we will make appropriation of the necessary moneys for this purpose so there can be no suggestion whatever that we are holding up work on the Dartmouth dam. It could legally proceed according to the law of this State immediately this measure came into operation. We do not, however, propose to approve that part of the agreement that disposes of this State's rights in the Chowilla dam, and that would therefore necessarily remain under the existing law of this and other States and of the Commonwealth.

It may be suggested that the only way to ratify an agreement is to do it in total or not at all. In fact, that is not necessarily so, since the form of this agreement and the legislation enacted elsewhere and previously proposed here in relation to it do not, in fact, enact it in law and do not make it an agreement that could be sued upon. Therefore, the Parliaments, in their ratification, have done nothing more, in effect, than note the proposed amending agreement. Therefore, what Parliament here is being asked to do is note approval of so much of it as we can agree upon and give the necessary Parliamentary authority for the expenditure of money. The existing agreement, however, does remain justiciable, and the Government believes that it is important that that continue.

This Bill, then, gives effect to the Government's intention to go as far as it possibly can to remove the impasse that has developed in relation to the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir, while conforming to its consistently-held policy, endorsed by the electors of this

State, that Chowilla must not be irretrievably lost to obtain Dartmouth. The manner in which the intention of the Government is given effect to will be apparent from a consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 are formal. By clause 6 (1), the agreement is ratified and approved subject to the reservation contained in subclause (2). Subclause (2) provides that the ratification and approval shall not extend to the ratification and approval of a specified passage in clause 13 of the agreement, this being the provision that, in the opinion of the Government, would lose Chowilla to the State. Clause 7, when considered alongside clause 9, gives a clear indication of the extent to which the Government is prepared to commit itself in its endeavours to resolve the situation. Specifically, the Government seeks authority to do all things necessary to carry out the agreement as ratified and approved; that is, to the extent that it is. In support of this desire it seeks, at clause 9, an advance appropriation to ensure that the necessary funds will be available to give full effect to its intentions.

Clause 8 provides for certain supplemental matters, and in this regard I refer honourable members to the second schedule to the Bill, which sets out what the Government believes are essential amendments to the agreement. These amendments are, I consider, self-explanatory. In this clause, when read with clause 9, the Government has indicated that it is prepared to commit itself in advance, administratively as well as financially, to carrying out the agreement as amended, should the other contracting Governments agree to these amendments. The first schedule to the Bill sets out the text of the agreement, which, as I have mentioned, was the subject of a detailed examination on the last occasion that it was considered by the House. Accordingly, I do not intend to comment further on it at this stage. The second schedule sets out the proposed amendments to the agreement, and was adverted to in relation to clause 8.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. G. T. Virgo:

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,

which Mr. Hall had moved to amend by striking out all words after "House" and inserting "endorses the M.A.T.S. plan as proposed by the previous Government."

(Continued from February 25. Page 3625.)

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): Before the adjournment of this debate last Thursday, I was expressing pleasure at the implication in Dr. Breuning's report that it would not seem to be necessary to move people from their established houses to other places, some perhaps far away. This situation will be welcomed by those people on low incomes who would have been involved in considerable expense if they were moved away from near their regular places of employment. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, which has received such strong support from the present Opposition, places great emphasis on automobiles and concrete highways for these automobiles to travel on. Sometimes I think that the support given to the M.A.T.S. plan by the Opposition is given because of the financial advantages that would be involved in it for some real estate agencies and also the promise of big profits for many private contractors.

I agree entirely with the remarks of the member for Mawson, who predicted that population figures in future for Adelaide, the metropolitan area, and South Australia might not turn out to be so great as had been forecast. On the basis of statements by people who should know, I say that there must not be a greater increase in population in South Australia and I say this because it is necessary that there not be a great and intense increase in population if we in South Australia are to play our part in human survival. The unspoken emphasis in the remarks of the member for Mawson was on the fact that we should be looking for quality in human beings, not necessarily for quantity. Sir Macfarlane Burnett, who has been described as Australia's most eminent scientist, stated:

The world has to tackle the problem of population explosion and institute progressive disarmament or the world will just blow up.

He continued:

Man is too absorbed in science and technology and not doing enough in the fields of sociology.

Here I draw attention again to the lack of knowledge of the member for Kavel of the meaning of the term "social technologist". That term indicates a recognition of the warning that was so urgently given by Sir Macfarlane Burnett, that we have to have regard for the needs of society in general and its welfare in our plans for the future. The fact that Dr. Breuning terms himself and is recognized as a social technologist indicates that he has knowledge of human needs in the development of transportation systems in the various parts of the world. The previous Minister of Roads and Transport said:

Good luck to people who have two cars in a family, provided they can afford them.

I consider that the warnings of the scientists that have been made so often show that this attitude means bad luck for the future of people in Australia, as indicated in the great cities in other parts of the world and, in particular, in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Another person of authority who warned against the M.A.T.S. plan and its possible application was Professor C. Manwell (Professor of Zoology at the Adelaide University), who, significantly, is an American who arrived here after working in England. He said:

Adelaide will be faced with a chronic pollution problem with the development of freeways in the M.A.T.S. plan. On still, hot summer nights people will open their windows to lead and carbon monoxide poisoning. Pollution levels that a normal person can resist can hurt the very young, the very old, and those with heart disease. We know that lead poisoning is a serious problem, leading to a number of diseases ranging from mental derangement to an inability to produce enough haemoglobin in the blood.

I do not claim to understand the meaning of that rather difficult word "haemoglobin".

Mr. Rodda: I thought you would: it means "red".

Mr. CRIMES: I thank the honourable member, but I am sure that the professor knew what he was talking about when he allowed his words to be published to the community. In another part of his statement he said:

The number of accidents in America is steadily rising, freeways notwithstanding. It is better to build roads which by-pass towns, protecting the town itself, residents, and road users. To cut up a large city with a freeway is madness.

It is possible to claim that this motor age is disfiguring the globe. I think it is reasonable to claim that the motor age will suffocate Australia in time unless Governments, scientists, and industrialists replace the present vacuum of values with moral concern for the needs of the community. The M.A.T.S. plan undoubtedly serves first the needs of the automobile, and yet when we consider Los Angeles (which unfortunately suffered a rather serious earthquake recently) we find that the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control will impose severe exhaust emission standards as an alternative to banning entirely the combustion engine.

I know that we are all concerned about the earthquake that occurred in Los Angeles and hope that it will not recur. During the earthquake slabs were torn from concrete freeways and several concrete freeways were badly buckled. Perhaps some good may come out of this unfortunate occurrence in that there may be further rethinking in Los Angeles about whether there should be continued obedience to the requirements of the automobile. Professor Morris Neiburger, an American authority, has warned that mankind will gradually suffocate in his own wastes. The Breuning report gives us the chance to have further and proper regard for the warnings of such authoritative people. Professor Paul Ehrlich, a United States biologist, described the world as "the poisoned planet".

This situation has arisen because of the regard that has been given to material things rather than to the needs of human beings. It has arisen because of a regard for machines and their products and the regard for concrete, which enables vehicles to travel from one factory to another and from the factory to the general community. Also, not the least regard it has is for profits that flow to private enterprise. The Breuning report shifts the emphasis from material things to the needs of people, and in this regard I recollect the Leader of the Opposition's rather sneering and smiling reference to the passages in the report that refer to a father and son kicking a football, to a family in the park lands, to a dozen or so schoolboys holding foot races, and to graceful girls in minis.

These passages indicate that Dr. Breuning is, and is thoroughly recognized as, a social technologist. In other words, he refers to people, and balances the requirements of people against requirements for the services

of the automobile and for general transport. It seems to me that the sneering attitude shown by the Leader of the Opposition and by several other Opposition members to his references to people indicate their dislike of having to do anything to assist people and to serve their needs in the future. This attitude indicates that they are concerned with materialistic values and not with human values. This Government chose to have a deep concern for the requirements of people, and this is reflected in the Breuning report. I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hansen): In the letter of October 30, 1970, accompanying his report Dr. Breuning states:

Adelaide can become a leader in transportation, based on the convictions of its people.

I claim that here is the crux of the basis of his recommendation: the idea of convincing the people of the need to experiment with and establish the most modern and futuristic transport system in the world. In theory that idea is all very well, but in practice I claim that it is impossible to achieve, because in South Australia we do not have the financial capacity now, and we will not have it in future, for such airy-fairy ideas.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How much were you going to spend on the M.A.T.S. plan?

Mr. BECKER: In moving the motion, the Minister said:

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.

How very noble it was of the Minister to inform new members such as myself of what had taken place as well as some of the history of the matter! How generous it was of him to think that we knew nothing about the M.A.T.S. plan or the history of freeway planning in the metropolitan area! However, he certainly made one mistake, because a district such as mine could easily be cut up beautifully with freeway plans. Indeed, since 1962 numerous ideas and recommendations

have been put forward regarding freeways in and around the Glenelg area. We must accept them as part of modern progress. We should accept that we must be able to move people, freight and other things from one point to another and, if it means that some people will have to live in the shadow of a freeway, that is progress and is not something that should be feared, as the Minister seems to fear it.

Unfortunately, the Breuning report did not, as the Minister wanted, completely throw out the M.A.T.S. plan. All members would be aware that the Minister has been conducting a vendetta against the M.A.T.S. plan ever since it was introduced, and we all know that he will be living within 150yds. of the Noarlunga freeway. That is one of the reasons why he has attacked the M.A.T.S. plan in the way he has.

Mr. Slater: That is most unworthy of you.

Mr. BECKER: We must be realistic about this. The people who are objecting to the M.A.T.S. plan are probably people that will have their properties acquired for freeways and expressways, and we cannot blame them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: That is only human nature. However, considering the number of people in the whole metropolitan area and, indeed, in the whole State, only a small minority are objecting. We must therefore be reasonable. It is all very well for one to say that we should not have freeways and that Adelaide could be cut up like Los Angeles and other cities. However, does anyone hear people in Sydney complaining?

Mr. Slater: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: I have heard no complaints from Sydney, and I lived there for three years, during which I saw the most beautiful and modern flats and houses being bulldozed and freeways being erected in their place. Indeed, a most modern freeway complex has been erected to serve the North Shore district. The people in Sydney do not complain about this: indeed, they ask why it was not done 25 years ago. My parents-in-law will be residing within 200yds. of a freeway in the Manly area, and all my father-in-law has to say is that he hopes the work is hurried up and the freeway is built because it will save him 20 minutes travelling time when he goes into the city. He is a typical working man, and he knows that he must accept advances like this

because they are part of progress. It has been proved in Sydney that freeways are necessary for modern transportation now and in the future. If one wants to move from one point to another, one must have the appropriate roads and facilities to enable one to do so.

What did Dr. Breuning say about this in the report? Nothing! All he was interested in was looking out of his motel window and watching the mini-skirted girls and everything else. What a great holiday he had! It is all very well to say that it is a great report: it is a discredited report and an insult to the people of South Australia who have had to finance the whole of its cost. When the Minister was trying to convince the 20 new members in this House, including me, that he was doing the right thing, he said:

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.

The member for Rocky River then interjected, saying, "Would you?" and the Minister said:

Yes, I would. If I made a mistake I would be the first to get on my feet and apologize.

We will not debate what happened last Thursday, but how can we accept the Minister's word, when he expects us to endorse the Breuning report?

Dr. Tonkin: It is discredited.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. I do not like to think that the report is a hoax, but it is indeed a joke. We are asked to accept this American freelancer's scheme of big ideals and airy-fairy suggestions. Well, we in Adelaide will not accept that type of report.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you speaking on behalf of your electors?

Mr. BECKER: We know the Minister's record in the old District of West Torrens. There are only two ways in which his colleagues can beat me at the next election, namely, by cheating or by putting a bullet through me. According to Dr. Breuning, "Adelaide has done pretty well for itself". The early settlers of this State first arrived at Glenelg North, which is in my district, and, bearing in mind the effect of the Breuning report and the M.A.T.S. Report on my constituents, let us have a brief look at our early transport system. Members opposite are going to have a bit of history discussed here. When Governor Hindmarsh arrived in the colony, he had to walk to the city: there was no other way. In 1838, the second Governor (Governor

Gawler) rode to the city on horseback. In those days, freight was conveyed by means of sleds, hand-barrows and trucks, and was handled by manpower.

Progress really came to the early settlers when bullock drays were used, followed by horse traction, but nothing else was available for 36 years. On August 2, 1873, the first Glenelg railway began, running between Victoria Square and Moseley Street. A further railway was established by free enterprise on May 24, 1880, running from North Terrace to Colley Reserve. Progress was on the march; Adelaide was really doing well for itself! Other railway lines ran from Glenelg to Marino, Glenelg to Somerton, and north from St. Leonards to a point somewhere north of West Beach. Unfortunately, lack of patronage and rising costs forced the latter three lines to close. On December 15, 1899, the State Government took over the operations of the two railway lines running from Glenelg to the city, and for the next 30 years the railways continued to give a reasonable service to residents of Glenelg and to a vigorously-growing city. However, on April 2, 1929, both services ceased. The electric tramway to Glenelg was then officially launched on December 14, 1929. At the opening ceremony, the tramway was described as being not only the best in Australia but also the best in the world. It was not the first electric tramway, for the first was operated between Portrush and Grants Causeway in the United Kingdom in 1883. Adelaide was not the first city in the world to have an electric tramway, and why should it be the first city in the world to experiment with dial-a-bus, space capsules and everything else?

Mr. Groth: No wonder we're a backward State.

Mr. BECKER: In 1917, a movement was started by the Glenelg council to have the Adelaide-Glenelg main road developed as a national highway, to be known as Anzac Highway. Work on reconstructing this road, as we know it now, began late in 1937, thanks to the efforts of the then Liberal Premier, the late Sir Richard Butler. The brief history of transportation between Glenelg and the city proves that the authorities moved far too slowly in the past 135 years, and we will now dearly pay for the future development of better transport communications. We were fortunate under previous Liberal Governments to consult an expert body and to have the M.A.T.S. plan brought down. That plan is not

as bad as everyone makes out: it relates to a 20-year proposal, and is subject to review from time to time.

Mr. Simmons: As the costs go up!

Mr. BECKER: Whatever plan is introduced, the costs will increase. Who will pay the cost of experimenting with these space capsules? We can easily see how Adelaide has progressed in the first 135 years of its history, and heaven only knows what will happen in the future if proposals and systems are continually rejected. I maintain that the M.A.T.S. plan is the plan to follow and develop. We must bear in mind that very little has been established regarding the movement of freight. If we are to progress, we must provide easy access from the outer suburbs to the metropolitan area in order to move freight to the main shipping or rail terminals. However, this has not been referred to anywhere by Dr. Breuning or the Government, because the Government just does not know what to do.

I could take up the time allocated to me and go through each matter raised by Dr. Breuning, but I believe that these matters have been amply covered by my colleagues on this side. However, one protest I must make relates to page 22 of the report, namely, action recommendation A-8 "Dial-a-bus demonstration programme". I can think of nothing more ridiculous than introducing dial-a-bus. I can imagine what my constituents would say if they were to dial a bus that had to be re-routed around the Patawalonga or via West Beach and if they had to wait until everyone else who had dialled had been picked up. The trip from Glenelg North to the city, which at present takes 25 to 30 minutes by bus, could take all day if people all along the line expected the dial-a-bus to be diverted via their homes. Dial-a-bus is nothing but a glorified taxi; indeed, it will be a nationalized taxi service. I enter a protest on behalf of all taxi operators and drivers, because this would be an ideal way for the Government to nationalize the taxis.

As I said earlier, the M.A.T.S. Report is subject to review from time to time. I have always made it known that I am a great advocate of the Glenelg tram system. Of course, we would have to improve it because at present if one of the carriages needs repairs or maintenance it must be loaded on to a low-loader at Victoria Square and taken to the Hackney depot. How long will it be before we can get something as simple as

that incorporated into the Victoria Square depot or anything else done? The trams were brought into operation in 1929 and most of the carriages are about that vintage. The line has hardly been touched since then. It is very popular from the tourist point of view but it is a public disgrace as far as the weeds and undergrowth along the line are concerned, but these could easily be cleaned up.

One would have thought that instead of Dr. Breuning's many airy-fairy suggestions he could have come up with a simple suggestion to recommend that perhaps the Glenelg tram-line could be modernized with the use of a mono-rail system. No doubt this would be expensive initially, but it would be a good idea, as it appears that between Glenelg and Victoria Square there are 11 level crossings. If a mono-rail system suspended in the air were used the crossings would be eliminated and the service would be vastly improved. Such a system could be extended from Victoria Square to North Adelaide. It is all right for the Minister to mention Disneyland, but I was the first one to suggest that Dr. Breuning's ideas and opinions on modern and futuristic travel would turn Adelaide into nothing but a Disneyland. Whatever public transport system is adopted, everything will have to run on time. I oppose the motion and support the amendment.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This Government came into office riding on three white horses: one was the M.A.T.S. plan, one was the one about which we heard something today, and the other was in its stable awaiting some action. The Government is in office, notwithstanding what it said when in Opposition or what the Minister underlined in his explanation of the motion. He has the responsibility of looking after the people of this State and for laying the foundations for the future, and the Opposition does not deny him his Ministerial responsibility. We have heard much about Dr. Breuning. How well I remember the debate of August last year. I think the House should commend the Minister for taking the time to make known to the new members some of the background of the matter. From what one has read about Dr. Breuning, he may be acknowledged as an expert in futuristic travel. The last thing I want to do is to dispute this, because we have seen great innovations in technology and we would not be fair to ourselves if we said that capsule travel would not come in the future.

However, I believe also that Dr. Breuning has not had much experience in the overall planning of practical transportation, and that may not be to his discredit; it may be just the way the die has been cast. The Minister in his speech, apart from putting the new members right on what had transpired in the debate last year and giving the reasons for the delay in not having the M.A.T.S. Report printed, then made known to the House his version of why the report had been delayed. The Leader of the Opposition and senior members of the Opposition have filled in the gaps. The Minister in his peroration to that time-honoured speech in which he gave birth to this motion said, talking about Dr. Breuning's recommendations, "They can and will solve Adelaide's problems if we adapt them to our conditions. Furthermore, they will provide a tremendously important industry for South Australia if we get in on the ground floor and that is what we desire to do." Here, an enterprising Minister will get people from A to B and, at the same time, set up an industry that other capital cities will adopt. For such fertile thoughts and ambitions, I give him credit.

When one looks at page 6 of the M.A.T.S. Report which gives the data and analyses of forecasting, one notes that people living in the study area in 1986 would number about 1,241,000, as against 746,000 in 1965, an increase of 66 per cent. It was also estimated that car ownership would more than double—from 198,000 vehicles in 1965 to 443,000 in 1986. This is the practical concept with which the Minister must deal. These are the people that he will have to move from A to B, and written into this is a component that the families of this State might each own two or three vehicles. To order this situation the Minister has to make some direction. We know that he can do this and that he is capable of doing it. If we use Dr. Breuning's report to get the foundations for a recipe, perhaps we will have some appreciation of why we brought this man to Australia to prepare a report that would do this. But there must be some direction. The prognostication in the M.A.T.S. Report of what will happen by 1986 shows that there will be an increased population demanding to get from A to B, and the Minister underlined this in his concluding remarks last Tuesday. He, too, foresees an expanding industry from Dr. Breuning's forecast of the future of these new types of travel. I think we have established that Adelaide's population will increase. I ask the Minister to get up

off his rump and come up with something constructive. After all, he is in charge of all this. I never cease to be amazed at the sarcasm that comes from the opposite side. Dr. Breuning's report has been referred to so many times that we do not want to waste time by going over it again, but I think I should refer to the following, on page 3:

There are some hard questions which should be considered at this time. How much expansion is desired for Adelaide? Is the city willing to go to higher densities to achieve it? Is there some point past which there is no advantage in attracting more industry and more workers for industry?

We have already been told that there will be 1,240,000 souls in Adelaide in the year 1986.

Mr. Payne: That is an estimate.

Mr. RODDA: The report continues:

Does the growth in the standard living attributable to a certain kind of industry level off after a certain point? If so, what kind of upgrading is indicated and how is it achieved?

These are the kinds of questions which we have asked during our stay here. The answers have come from many sources. Metropolitan Adelaide has spoken through its politicians, academicians and civil servants, through the press and other media, through its businessmen, pressure groups and man in the street. We did not conduct opinion polls—the issues are far too complex for that—but we listened and we learned and, in the end, a coherent picture emerges.

I think Dr. Breuning poses the question whether Adelaide should be chopped off. He does not say when, but he poses the question in his report whether we should not build a second centre at some other point. I am a little suspicious of what the Government has in mind on this. Dr. Breuning, on page 5, said:

Although precise numbers are not specified, there is a widespread feeling that growth for its own sake is no longer justified and that the growth curve should at some future date begin to taper off towards an undefined limit. Developments elsewhere in the State may become a natural nucleus for a secondary centre, and the State as a whole would probably benefit from the balance inherent in having more than one city. Adelaide as a city of several millions is an idea with very little appeal, although some limited growth seems inevitable and acceptable.

I do not think that paragraph has been referred to. One must just wonder what has gone on in this long haggle and whether the Government at this point of time has some secondary considerations about another centre. This could be the reason why Dr. Breuning recommends a 10-year wait. When I look at that significant paragraph, I wonder what the Government has in mind. In that respect, we

can perhaps be excused for thinking that that could be the case, although it will be difficult for the Minister to bring this about.

Dr. Breuning dealt at some length with flexibilities and inflexibilities, and I believe that all carried perhaps under-tones and over-tones of instructions that were specifically given to him. I see no reason why anybody should be ashamed of giving the person making these investigations a copy of the Government's policy speech. Let us cast our minds back to 1969 and recall the long debate that took place in this House in August. I remember only too well there were some nasty arguments at that time, and it was just as well the then Speaker was a forceful man. If new members in this place have not read it, they should read the speech of the then Leader of the Opposition, who gave a long dissertation on these things. We remember what the Premier told us in August of that year and the speeches made by the present Minister and the Minister of Education. The election came a little sooner than members opposite expected; they did not expect an election so soon. This is one of the great white horses now in the Minister's stable. The Minister has the responsibility of giving good government to this State and laying the foundations for a system that will get the people of Adelaide from place to place. I was interested in what the Minister had to say about cars and percentages and the backfire and cross-fire from this side. He was quite in order in talking about the new districts that would abound in this fair city and the small ones that would reach out to its perimeter. The gerrymander no longer applies. It is a case of the Government's getting off its tail or it will be thrown out. We want good government for the people. It is no good pulling the wool over people's eyes on a report that is a good report.

There is talk about high-speed corridors and freeways. The Government says, "We will withdraw this horrible enigma." However, the Minister must go on preparing for the future. Dr. Breuning's report does not tell us much, but I hope the Minister will carry on with the job and arrange something for South Australia. I am not knocking the capsule study; that is something for the future and our technicians and technologists have made great advances. Much common sense must be applied to this problem, by both the Government and the Opposition. I cannot support the motion at this point of time.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I support the motion. I congratulate the member for Victoria, because he has just concluded what I think is the best speech I have heard him make. At the end of his speech he lapsed into the error that all speakers from his side have made: he showed that he was confused about the effect of the Breuning report. Although I have read all the speeches and listened to most speeches of Opposition members in this debate, I am still not clear about their general line, and I am sure they are not clear about that line either. They seem to agree that the report is a hoax, but they cannot make up their minds whether the victim is the Minister or whether the victims are the people of South Australia; however, they are sure it is a hoax. They cannot make up their minds whether the Breuning report has replaced the M.A.T.S. Report. If it has replaced the M.A.T.S. Report, they believe that this is a dastardly crime. They are not sure whether the M.A.T.S. Report has merely been shelved for 10 years; if that is the case, that, too, is bad; they say. They do not know whether the Breuning report merely endorses the M.A.T.S. Report. One of the reasons why members opposite cannot make up their minds is that they confuse (and this was shown by the member for Victoria) high-speed corridors and freeways.

I wish to deal with some comments made by the Leader, who was the main speaker, although not the best, of a very poor lot of Opposition speakers. I will refer to his speech because, more than his colleagues did, he spoke about the Breuning report. He picked out those parts of the report that suited him, even stopping in the middle of sentences where that suited his argument. I will follow some of the points he made, perhaps completing sentences in appropriate places. The first tactic indulged in by the Leader was his attempt to denigrate Dr. Breuning. By setting up completely phoney criteria for Dr. Breuning's qualifications, he attempted to discredit him and show that Dr. Breuning did not have the ability to make the survey. The Leader quoted a reply that the Minister had given about Dr. Breuning's academic qualifications, as follows:

A Master of Science in Civil Engineering, obtained from the Technical University, Stuttgart, Germany; and a Doctor of Science in Transportation Engineering with Regional Planning and Business Administration, from Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

For those members not familiar with university degrees, I point out that a Doctor of Science degree is one of the highest qualifications awarded by any university. To obtain a Doctor of Science degree at the Adelaide University, a candidate must furnish satisfactory evidence that he has made an original contribution of distinguished merit adding to the knowledge or understanding of any subject with which the faculty is directly concerned. The degree is awarded primarily on a consideration of such of his published works as the candidate may submit for examination. Obviously, a Doctor of Science degree is not handed out on a farm. When one adds to this the fact that Dr. Breuning received his Doctor of Science degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which is probably the most prestigious institute of applied science in America, one appreciates that this man has outstanding academic qualifications. The Leader either knew or feared that this was the case, so he added a further criterion in the following question:

What major works have been constructed, supervised or planned by Dr. Breuning in the United States of America?

I ask members to note the geographic limitation, which is designed to cast doubt on Dr. Breuning's acceptance in his own country as well as to exclude some of the achievements detailed by the Minister, as follows:

Dr. Breuning has been engaged in a variety of tasks and with many construction and planning organizations after gaining his qualifications. For instance, he was engaged by the Montreal Transportation Commission to work with the Consulting Engineers, DeLeuw, Cather & Company, on the Montreal subway programme, part of which is the Expo express, one of the most advanced automatic rail systems in the world. Dr. Breuning served as a consultant in highway economics on the Canadian Colombo Plan team in Burma.

Is the Montreal project, to which the Minister referred, less worthy than, say one in Minneapolis, which is across the border in the United States, if that city had the good sense to replace its shockingly inadequate bus service with a decent subway system? Apparently the Montreal system, in the designing of which Dr. Breuning took part, does not qualify under the Leader's criteria. Does the Leader believe that DeLeuw, Cather & Company is a worthy associate only when the project being carried out is in the United States or Adelaide and not worthy when the project is in Montreal, because Dr. Breuning worked with that company on the Montreal project?

Apparently his service as a consultant in highway economics on the Canadian Colombo Plan team in Burma is of no value because this work took place outside of the United States. It is obvious that the Leader was hard pressed to deny the practical qualifications of Dr. Breuning. The Leader ignored the contributions Dr. Breuning had made as consultant to the American firms detailed by the Minister. He has ignored the fact that Dr. Breuning is Professor of Civil Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which is one of the most advanced institutes of technology, if not the most advanced institute of technology, in the world.

Having tried to belittle the report by belittling Dr. Breuning, the Leader went on to quote half a sentence from page 2 of the report. He followed this with a remarkable statement which I think was intended as a sneer at Dr. Breuning and the Minister but which only showed the Leader's limitations. The Leader quoted the following part of a sentence on page 2 of the report:

Instead we have considered Adelaide's transportation as part of a continuum . . .

That is as far as the Leader went, but that is not the end of the sentence. After quoting that, the Leader said:

At this stage the doctor began to launch into Americanisms, which permeate this document and which have so impressed the Minister, who obviously does not understand them.

In referring to Americanisms, I do not know whether the Leader was thrown by the word "continuum". If he was, I point out that that word is not an Americanism but is a Latin word which has been in the English language for about 350 years and which means "a continuous series of elements passing into each other". If I include that definition, the full sentence from the report that so upset the Leader is as follows:

Instead we have considered Adelaide's transportation as part of a series of elements passing into each other which includes urban dynamics, industry, technology, education, and governmental organization and administration.

I find that concept quite easy to understand, as I am sure the Minister finds it. If the Leader does not understand it, that is a pity; it should be possible for someone to put him right on it. I think that the trouble is that the Leader, with members opposite, does not appreciate that a transportation problem involves more than one solution being put forward without consideration being given to all aspects of the city and society that the transportation system is intended to serve.

The Leader then spoke about a point that was quite correct: our citizens generally favour suburban life. However, few people would agree with the statement of the member for Alexandra that we do not want high-density living in Adelaide; he said that he did not object to some people living under those conditions, but he did not want that type of housing to be extended too much. It is certain that there will be a big increase in high-density housing in Adelaide, whether we like it or not. For students, single people, elderly couples, childless couples, professional people and many others, high-density housing is much more suitable than a small house on a suburban block.

After quoting with approval Dr. Breuning's observation that, generally speaking, Adelaide people much prefer their own houses on suburban allotments, the Leader of the Opposition again quoted a single sentence out of context. It would have given a balanced picture if he had quoted the statements of Dr. Breuning that followed that sentence, but evidently the Leader considered a half-truth to be better than the whole truth. To set the record straight I shall quote the sentence that the Leader quoted and then quote the sentences that follow; the quotation is as follows:

We have emphasized the need to tailor transportation to shaping and serving the city as people wish it to be.—

bearing in mind that most Adelaide people, but not all, wish to have their own houses on suburban allotments—

Nor is even that enough as we must also strive to find and keep a balance between conflicting needs and desires, both today and under the impact of continued change. Today's conflicting systems are public transport, whether rail or bus, and the automobile. Transit is uncomfortable, inconvenient, inflexible (with respect to both place and time), slow, hard to use when carrying things, and lacks privacy. As for the automobile, one almost apologizes, in 1970, for dragging out the same old litany of air pollution, congestion, safety, excessive use of urban land, etc. Its success individually is balanced by its shortcomings in the aggregate. So, while transit is considered socially desirable but individually unpalatable, the automobile proves individually desirable but socially unacceptable. Nor does any reconciliation seem to be in the offing. In fact, society grows increasingly intolerant of the automobile, while the individual, having grown accustomed to a certain standard of personalized transportation, resists fiercely any attempts towards retrenchment of that standard. If anything, his expectations, in all fields, are geared to an increasing level of comfort, convenience and material well-being, including mobility. Under those circumstances

it becomes evident that merely extending the scope of present inadequacies is no real solution.

Dr. Breuning was referring to inadequacies in both fields. His report continues:

What is called for is the progressive modification of both transportation systems so that each modification erodes one or more objectionable characteristics of the affected system. The strength of such an approach lies precisely in not committing itself to massive, irretrievable developments which future technologies may conveniently by-pass.

That is a reasoned and accurate statement of the situation; it gives a very different impression from the impression one would get by reading only the first sentence, which was the only sentence that the Leader quoted.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you saying that we do not have a traffic problem at present?

Mr. SIMMONS: We do have a traffic problem at present, but it is not of such a nature that it justifies ruining Adelaide and spending \$570,000,000 on what is not a solution.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't think that the Breuning report is a solution to the traffic problem, do you?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It goes a long way.

Mr. SIMMONS: A mass of concrete that is miles long, chains wide and several storeys high allows little opportunity to take advantage of future technology; there is no flexibility in such a system. It is almost as inflexible as the attitude of the Opposition on this question. I must agree with the following statement on page 9 of the Breuning report: Adelaide has not committed itself to massive irreversible developments—

thanks to the election of last May—

... Nor is the situation here so acute as to compel the adoption of whatever measure offers a moment's respite at any price.

That is a fair description of the M.A.T.S. plan. The report continues:

At present the system is coping adequately with the demands placed upon it and it can do so for some time yet. Beyond that, there are and will be marginal improvements which can be made, each one of which represents some incremental gain to the system's performance. Meanwhile, each of these changes, and the overall policy behind them, will be laying the foundations for whatever future new system may emerge and survive to dominate its era.

There is nothing novel about a new system emerging and surviving to dominate its era. One has only to consider the history of the motor car; at first people had to walk along with a flag in front of the car, and the car was restricted to a certain speed.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And people developing the motor car were called crackpots.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes. Dr. Breuning's report continues:

Summarizing the picture, some factors crystallize as crucial requirements to which the transportation system must respond:

1. Enhancing the beauty of the city and its setting.—

the M.A.T.S. Report makes no contribution to that—

2. Minimizing contributions to all forms of pollution.

The M.A.T.S. Report, by encouraging the use of the private automobile, makes no contribution to minimizing pollution of the atmosphere; rather, it increases noise pollution, which is one of the most dangerous kinds of pollution. Implementing the M.A.T.S. Report would certainly pollute the landscape, so that report provides no solution to the problem.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How do you get around the fact that you are proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Have we knocked it out—

The SPEAKER: Order! Only one member may speak at the one time.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am upset that the Opposition seems to be incapable of recognizing the difference between the Breuning report and the M.A.T.S. Report. The Breuning report continues:

3. Providing adequate access and circulation for industry and commerce and their continuing decentralization.

4. Supporting the viability of low-density housing.

5. Providing adequate mobility to non-drivers.

The M.A.T.S. plan makes no contribution to the mobility of non-drivers; in fact, one of the worst aspects of that plan is that it does not cater for people who do not have a motor car.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Obviously, you have not read the M.A.T.S. Report. It provides for public transport.

Mr. SIMMONS: I have read it. The M.A.T.S. Report recommended that about \$100,000,000 be spent on public transport; of that sum \$30,000,000 was to be spent on the underground railway and much of the rest was to be spent on rolling stock.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

H10

Mr. SIMMONS: The M.A.T.S. plan provides for a considerable closing of railway stations in the inner part of the metropolitan area. The Leader had much to say about policy recommendation P-1 in the Breuning report, which is as follows:

Foster public transportation in the central city and the near suburbs.

I have just referred to how the M.A.T.S. plan would not foster public transportation in the central city and the near suburbs by closing down railway stations. Dr. Breuning also states:

Public transportation is efficient in the use of road and parking space. It can help maintain the city compact and accessible. It should be given preference on the streets. Every effort should be made to making transit services more attractive while keeping them economically viable.

The next statement by Dr. Breuning gave the Leader much amusement. This report states:

Full buses make a profit; empty ones lose money. Conventional services at times and into areas where little or no demand exists should, therefore, be changed in such a manner that losses are minimized. Consideration could be given to providing no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs.

It is rather pathetic to hear Opposition members, as I have heard them already in the last few months, complaining about uneconomic railway lines and demanding that they be closed and also to hear the Leader criticizing this statement by Dr. Breuning that we should consider providing no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs. Contrast that, once again, with the M.A.T.S. plan recommendation, which the Leader is seeking to endorse, that no service should be provided, not to future neighbourhoods and suburbs, but to existing ones in the metropolitan area: they would cut out this service.

It is obvious that some control over transport is necessary. The idea of providing transport services will-nilly wherever developers choose to operate is untenable. This applies to both private transport in the form of highway facilities and to public transport facilities. In this connection, I refer to a report in *National Geographic* of September, 1969, in which the author states that one day he sat in the book-lined office of Dr. Paul Cherington, Professor of Transportation at Harvard, another prestigious university in America, and the full report states:

I sat one day in the book-lined office of Dr. Paul Cherington, at that time Professor of Transportation at Harvard and since then named Assistant Secretary of Transportation

for Policy and International Affairs. He gave me some rather startling statistics: "In the United States, we have enough car seats on the road for every man, woman, and child—with enough seats left over to hold the entire population of continental Europe." Dr. Cherington paused for a moment, and the muted noise of city traffic drifted in through the open window as if to under-score his point. "In New York City a truck moves at a slower pace today than a horse-drawn cart did 60 years ago. A fourth of downtown Los Angeles is paved for the use of automobiles. "Actually," he said, "we have been operating on a mistaken principle—that the transportation routes should go where the people are. It's wrong. People tend to go where the transportation is!" As an example, he named a road close to my home—Shirley Highway, feeding cars into downtown Washington and into the vast parking lots of the Pentagon. "Shirley Highway was a terrible old road, with traffic jams every day." And then Dr. Cherington gave me a quizzical smile. "So what did you do? You widened it into six lanes. Then what happened? Developers constructed high-rise apartments all along the new highway, and now five times as many people use the road. And what do you have today? A six-lane traffic jam instead of a two-lane traffic jam. People go where the transportation is."

I proved that by actual experience. About three or four years ago I was going to the Defense Documentation Centre outside Washington, and the traffic jam caused by cars going to the Pentagon was three miles long. That traffic comprised the people going to work each day on one of these highways. The report continues:

There are two basic approaches to the transportation problem: Increase the capacity of the system, or reduce the requirements. Many of the authorities I interviewed favour the latter approach. "The idea," explained architect and city planner William Pereira of Los Angeles, "is to shorten the desire lines of the people. In other words, to provide for almost all their needs in a more concentrated area, so that they have less reason to travel outside their own community."

The member for Mawson has correctly drawn attention to the fact that there are several solutions to the traffic problem other than building concrete highways. If we reduce the distance people want to travel and reduce the amount of travel, we will be making a major contribution to solving the traffic problem, without building a single road. I have referred to the experience in America. In this context, it is worth going on to consider what is happening overseas, and I should like to tell members of developments in other countries. First, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of September 5, 1970, contains a report on the transport system in Calgary, Alberta, which states:

Seeds of rapid transit finding fertile ground: The case for rapid transit is gaining strength in the face of some staggering figures for freeways and expressways. The high cost of catering to the motorist has caused many city officials to wonder whether the city has not got its priorities mixed. Mayor Rod Sykes, for one, has come out strongly in favour of giving priority to rapid transit. He said that if the city is to preserve its environment it must accelerate the completion of rapid transit.

"The freeway and the expressway are a route to disaster in other cities," the mayor said this week. He added that this city is already "too far down the freeway-expressway road for comfort." He said Calgary should put people before cars and develop a first-class transit system. The mayor is not alone. Alderman Roy Farran warned that by pouring more money into major freeways and roads, council is ensuring the early failure of rapid transit. He said rapid transit will only be used to its full effect when driving becomes uncomfortable.

Behind this usually car-conscious city's swing to transit instead of roads are some pretty formidable cost estimates for roadway improvements and expressway and freeway systems. The city recently unveiled a \$1,000,000,000 master plan which anticipates the expenditure of an estimated \$490,000,000 on road programmes during the next 16 years. Compared to this, the plan called for spending only an estimated \$153,000,000 on public transit.

That is rather better than the M.A.T.S. plan for Adelaide, yet in Calgary they are having second thoughts about transport.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you know what happened to the Mayor?

Mr. SIMMONS: No. Does the honourable member know? The next city which is having problems in this connection and which I should like to mention is fairly close in climate, anyhow, to Adelaide, if it is not close geographically. I refer to Edinburgh, and a reference to a report in the *Scotsman* on Thursday, September 24 last, states:

"The restriction of the private car", stated a recent *Scotsman* editorial, "and the development of a fast public transport system are essential to the safeguarding of the city's unique qualities." This is the view of an increasing number of planning experts and a considerable body of lay opinion in Edinburgh. It is not, however, the view of the corporation's traffic consultant, Professor Colin Buchanan, and it is almost certain that his final recommendations will re-state the arguments for new motorway construction, probably in the form of a ring road. To be fair, Professor Buchanan has never concealed his view that the needs of the private motorist must receive major consideration, and that cities must reconcile themselves to massive urban road construction. Rejecting the public transport solution in his report "Traffic in Towns", Professor Buchanan stated: "The commuter

cannot be forced back on to public transport—not, that is to say, in a car-owning democracy. It has to be recognized that once a man has a car . . . he may find it very attractive to use . . . We believe that there is need in this country for a vigorous programme of urban road building.”

I am quoting it in full, because I want to give a balanced view. The report continues:

These arguments, expressed with varying degrees of emphasis, have been the basis of every Buchanan report for every city for which he has acted as consultant. Yet they are ideas which, in the opinion of many experts, are rapidly becoming obsolete. Ten years ago it may just have been possible to believe in the urban motorway as a panacea. Since then, however, there has grown up a younger generation of planners, architects and social scientists who have been trained to see the city in a more positive and creative sense than as a collection of buildings lining a motorway.

This approach is particularly relevant to a city as unusual and irreplaceable as Edinburgh. There is probably no other town in the world which suggests so overwhelmingly that nature and art have been at work together in a subtle partnership. This balance, which took so many decades to achieve, can unfortunately be irrevocably destroyed in a matter of months by the motorway protagonists. This danger is being recognized by an increasing number of citizens.

On his return from America in 1964, the Director of Planning (Mr. Hart) said:

The freeways carry and attract large volumes of traffic and, as each new one is opened, capacity volumes are soon reached creating a demand for more freeways. The congestion on freeways at peak hours and the decline in public transport are causing public concern. Building more freeways is clearly not the most efficient or economic way of meeting the needs of the expanding metropolitan area.

The same point about attracting traffic is made by the Automotive Safety Foundation in *What Freeways Mean to your City*, ending with the frightening conclusion, as follows:

Freeways are often criticized for not solving the traffic problem. This generally overlooks the fact that no city has yet finished its projected and needed freeway system.

The Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Johnke) has stated:

The plan—

referring to M.A.T.S.—

was intended to prevent Adelaide's central area becoming a dead heart.

Against this we have opinions such as that of Professor Emrys Jones of the London School of Economics, who says:

Los Angeles is now overlain with a mass of freeways . . . but in the process the city as we know it has more or less disappeared.

Mr. Hart's 1964 report states:

Those cities which have good public transport, and particularly rail transport, have the most alive central shopping areas.

On October 25, 1970, Mr. Peter Blake (Editor of *Architectural Forum* and *House and Home* magazine; author of *The Master Builders* and *God's Own Junkyard*; practising architect; curator of Architecture and Design, Museum of Modern Art, New York; and Adviser to the United States Government on architectural matters), as the A.B.C. Guest of Honour, said:

The only contribution that I think I might be able to make is to give you some idea of the problems that have risen in the United States, in cities and countryside alike, over the past 15-20 years that might conceivably give you ideas about how you might cope with similar problems in your own country. By and large I would think that cities like Melbourne and Sydney are approximately 10-15 years behind similar cities in the United States, not technologically, not culturally, certainly, but in the rate of development that they are undergoing at present. About 10-15 years ago we in the United States had all the problems of urban renewal, of providing new housing, or rehabilitating old housing, of possibly saving or destroying existing neighbourhoods, of building highways, of building subways and so on, and I think it is fair to say that we made just about every conceivable mistake that man could possibly make in any of those situations. I think that all of you, certainly those of you who live in cities like Melbourne and Sydney, have a chance to learn from the rather horrendous mistakes that we have made in the past and to avoid them and to come up with something infinitely better.

The first thing that we did wrong in the U.S., it seems to me, is to really give in to the highway engineers who invaded American cities, starting about 15-20 years ago, and cut enormous bands through existing cities, built their highways like Chinese walls that divided up cities into communities that had no contact with one another any more at all after that. Highway engineers really had enormous power in the sense of being able to acquire publicly owned or privately owned land, had very little sensitivity for the fabric of the city, with very little sensitivity toward fabric design and city planning . . . Now this has been going on in the U.S. for a great many years and it has done probably more to destroy American cities physically, and socially in some respects, than any other single factor that I can imagine. A second development that I believe has been detrimental to our cities, and might very well turn out to be detrimental to yours, has been the totally independent development of mass-transit, if any. It seems completely irrational to me to attempt to develop a highway network for cities, or suburban areas for that matter, without at the same time developing a mass-transit network which would supplement and mesh with that highway system that the highway engineers are planning to build. The two are intricately

related. They are absolutely essential to one another. They have to be balanced. And I think it is fair to say that the rubber network, the automobile highway network, should probably help pay for the rail network, which by and large helps the less affluent. In the U.S. this was never done.

I think it is about time that it was done in this State. No-one is more disappointed than I am with the financial stringencies which have been forced on us by the Commonwealth Government and which have forced this Government to increase fares on the public transport system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake.

Mr. SIMMONS: Members will know, from questions I have asked the Minister in the last few months, that I am much in favour of lowering the fares on public transport systems. Indeed, I should like to see sufficient funds forthcoming from Canberra in order to provide adequately for a public transport system at a reasonable cost.

Mr. McAnaney: Where does Canberra get its funds from?

Mr. SIMMONS: While the Commonwealth Government hands back an extra \$500 a year to people receiving a net taxable income of \$16,000 when we have to increase public transport fares in Adelaide and while we cannot seal the Eyre Highway or maintain hospitals adequately, it is an absolute disgrace, and it is about time the country realized it. An article in the *National Geographic* magazine states, in part:

Los Angeles's titanic road-building exertions have laced the city with freeways—and paved a fourth of the surface of its downtown area. So incredibly car-oriented are Americans that they own a total of 100,000,000 autos—36 for each mile of paved road. To cope with the proliferation, federal and state governments construct the Interstate Highway System, adding 42,500 miles to a nation whose paving and rights of way now occupy as much land as the state of Kentucky. But new roads often become clogged the instant they open, and proposed freeways threaten park lands and displace city residents. Social planners grow ever more appalled at the auto's insatiable demands and look longingly toward mass-transit systems.

The plan that the Opposition would foist on the people of South Australia is one which is shown in this magazine to be incapable of solving the problem. Although there might be some justification for spending \$570,000,000 odd or more over the next 20 years, if it served the purpose that it is supposed to serve,

I am convinced that establishing such a free-way system would merely encourage private transport to the point where it would be no longer adequate.

In San Francisco they have tried for the first time in 50 years to reverse the cycle. The San Francisco rapid-transit system, which provides for the construction of about 75 miles of electric railway, some underground, some elevated and some on the surface, is due to commence operating in the next year or two. Its history is interesting. Back in the early 1960's the U.S.A. Federal Government offered a grant to the citizens of San Francisco to build a road system around the harbour. Those citizens happen to be as proud of their city as I hope the citizens of Adelaide are of their city. They rejected the offer of funds from the Federal Government and, instead, subscribed to a bond issue of \$792,000,000 to make possible the Bay Area Rapid Transit System to provide for this electric railway. One interesting aspect is that consideration has to be given to feeding the main railway system. A committee has been set up in Berkeley, on the eastern side of the bay, and the preliminary proposals of this transit committee have recently been released. Some of its comments are interesting, particularly those relating to air pollution, noise, and traffic accidents. No doubt much more could be said on this topic, but I think I have given enough examples to show that some oversea countries, particularly America, are turning their backs on the solution offered by the M.A.T.S. Report and turning towards the solution inherent in the Breuning report: that is, that there should be a concentration on public transit systems, particularly on those new systems that are coming shortly. For the benefit of those who sneer at things such as the dial-a-bus, I refer to an interesting advertisement that appears in the *Australian* of February 6, as follows:

The University of Adelaide. General Motors-Holden's special post-graduate scholarship. Applications are invited from graduates with at least an upper second-class Honours degree, preferably in mathematics, who wish to undertake post-graduate work in transportation science under the supervision of Professor R. B. Potts, Professor of Applied Mathematics. It is hoped that the scholar will work on a research project concerning dial-a-bus and other aspects of bus transportation.

Many publications have appeared recently giving accounts of work on the dial-a-bus project. One of the interesting things is that one of the feeder lines suggested for the

B.A.R.T. system in Berkeley is a dial-a-bus system, so they are seriously considering it, at least. It is time we seriously considered something that is coming instead of something that has gone, namely, the mass use of private automobiles and a proliferation of concrete freeways to accommodate them.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): One minute to go.

Mr. SIMMONS: The *National Geographic* of September, 1969, states:

In Washington, D.C., special mini-buses, each capable of carrying as many as 30 people, move through the streets of the downtown business district. For a dime fare, passengers board and depart anywhere along the route. The more personalized commuter service, say planners, may include mini-buses picking up people at the door. One proposal calls for special metal plates, connected to a central computer, installed on utility poles throughout a neighbourhood. When someone rubs a metal plate, it signals the computer, which orders the nearest mini-bus to pick him up.

No telephone is required. These things are not here today, but who would have thought 35 years ago that today there would be jet transports going from here to London in a day.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): We have just gone on an oversea tour with the member for Peake. Now we must come back to realities in South Australia and look at the situation in this State. As a country member (and time is at a premium with a country member because of the amount of work he has to do), I chose the time when I was travelling home by train to study the report we are now discussing. I drove up to the station a little time before my train was due to leave and, as a result, I had completed reading the report before I got out of the metropolitan area. It is significant, therefore, that there is not much in the Breuning report. It did not matter which aspect of the report one looked at in relation to the M.A.T.S. plan: it was only a matter of words, talking around the situation, and saying nothing of consequence.

It was for this reason that I thought my colleagues were a little hard on the Minister last week when he was speaking on this matter. I thought he made a good speech, because he had nothing much to talk about in the first instance. This being the case,

it was a difficult job and, in the circumstances, I thought he made a good job of nothing. This report is a negative one, irrespective of what Dr. Breuning has to say. Aspects of the M.A.T.S. plan are proceeding at present, and will continue to proceed. The M.A.T.S. plan has not been withdrawn. As a country member, I was not particularly taken with the immensity of the M.A.T.S. plan and the spending of about \$600,000,000, but I realize that certain aspects of it must proceed. I consider the fact of having to have it spells out the failure of synchronization in South Australia. If people in the metropolitan area wish to stew in their own pollution, that is their choice. However, I know that a certain amount of development must go on in the metropolitan area, and this will go on irrespective—

Mr. Clark: It's a necessary evil.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. So I suggest that the Minister's motion is just a lot of hogwash and poppycock. It was unfortunate for him that he had to be put on the line regarding the truth of certain statements in connection with handing to Dr. Breuning the Labor Party's policy speech. If this had not been done, we might have got a different reply altogether. It is interesting to compare these two reports with the Maunsell and Fitch reports as regards the next stage of standardization in South Australia. This transpired when the present Opposition was in Government.

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

Mr. VENNING: I have been comparing the Breuning report with the Maunsell and Fitch reports. The Breuning report was tarnished because Dr. Breuning had had the A.L.P. policy speech handed to him on coming to South Australia, before presenting his report. The Fitch report was presented during the reign of the last L.C.L. Government, but it did not hand its policy speech to Mr. Fitch, who was able to make his comments freely on what he thought of the Maunsell report. The fact that Dr. Breuning was given the A.L.P. policy speech is one aspect I do not like very much.

Mr. Clark: Do you support the Fitch report or the Maunsell report?

Mr. VENNING: We are not debating that and we are not comparing the actions of the A.L.P. Government with those of the L.C.L. Government. We do not wish to make these things political issues. I have listened to members opposite. The member for Peake

was talking about the corridors. Did not the M.A.T.S. plan mention the freeways, which is the same thing? The honourable member went on to talk about public transport and said he was concerned because fares were being increased. I assure the member for Peake that, if transport were made free tomorrow, many people still would not use it.

Mr. Clark: Oh, go on!

Mr. VENNING: It is true. Last year I suggested the Railways Department should run excursion fares for people in the country to come to the Royal Show. I remember that idea being discounted and hearing comments in the House that people would not use these services even if they were free.

Mr. Langley: What about the Anzac Day march?

Mr. VENNING: These are some of the comments I noted in the course of this debate. Last week we saw Dr. Breuning's photograph in the newspaper. It is significant that it appeared with that of the Leader of the Opposition. Not knowing Dr. Breuning but having read of some of his work in connection with this report and knowing the Leader of the Opposition, of course, very well, I could not help indulging in some character-reading from these two photographs. The fact that Dr. Breuning was willing to accept the A.L.P. policy speech in connection with preparing his report is one aspect.

Mr. Clark: He would be insulted enough without being compared with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. VENNING: In moving his motion last week, the Minister endeavoured to pull the wool over the eyes of the Opposition about transport.

Mr. Clark: He got you all in.

Mr. VENNING: No, he did not. When the Minister was in trouble last week about the truth of certain aspects of the situation, one thing I noted was the loyalty of the front bench in coming to his aid. It was rather interesting to hear the Minister of Education quote Shakespeare (he referred to Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*) to try to get his colleague off the hook. It is interesting for members on this side to see that the Labor Party does not want to accept the M.A.T.S. plan, because it was introduced while a Liberal Government was in office. The Government is happy to accept a minor report from Dr. Breuning. I do not wish to deal with that report in detail, for many

members have already done that. I oppose the motion. I am not over-keen about some aspects of the M.A.T.S. plan. However, irrespective of whether the Government takes notice of the Breuning report, aspects of the M.A.T.S. plan will continue to be implemented in this State.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In rising to oppose the motion and support the amendment, I could discuss many matters that have already been dealt with. I will try to introduce matters that have not been referred to, and I will deal with one or two contradictory statements made by members opposite. In his report, Dr. Breuning has not considered (I do not know whether this is deliberate) the cost of freighting goods within the community. He has not considered the cost to the community, particularly to primary and secondary industries, of not adopting proposals similar to those included in the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. Coumbe: And commerce.

Mr. EVANS: I will deal with that aspect later. I will show members opposite that they have contradicted each other in asking us to accept the philosophy of action in the Breuning report and to cast aside the M.A.T.S. plan. If proposals in the M.A.T.S. plan are not proceeded with, what will be the cost to a primary producer of transporting sheep or cattle from the southern areas to the abattoirs or of transporting spare parts for his machinery? What will be the effect on the cost of delivering a bottle of milk to the front door if there are no freeways to help users of commercial vehicles to deliver at a faster rate?

The Breuning report refers to high-speed corridors, which the member for Peake says are not the same as freeways or expressways. Do all members opposite share that opinion? Are not expressways and freeways similar to these corridors? Are the corridors not to be built of concrete; will they not be of solid construction? What will they comprise? If they are not to be similar to freeways and expressways, is the Labor Party backing out of promises made in its policy speech? The Labor Party's policy speech states that the Labor Government will withdraw and revise metropolitan Adelaide transport proposals. It states that freeways from north to south (I take it that would be from Salisbury to Port Noarlunga) and from Tea Tree Gully to Port Adelaide and Glenelg will be necessary.

Are we to have transportation corridors from Tea Tree Gully and a freeway? Is that what the member for Peake was telling us about today? Or, are we concerned with cost? We are saying that we will have these freeways and at the same time, as the member for Peake said, \$570,000,000 is involved in the M.A.T.S. plan. He has not told us what will be the cost of Dr. Breuning's proposal—or, rather, philosophy of inaction.

Dr. Breuning recommends one thing that the A.L.P. suggests we should accept—the widening of arterial roads. That suggestion is included in the M.A.T.S. Report, and it will cost \$91,200,000 to acquire the land and widen the roads. Has Dr. Breuning suggested a method of doing this work more cheaply? No! The A.L.P. policy speech suggested that we should build a north-south freeway; it would be 21.4 miles long, according to the M.A.T.S. proposal. I do not know of a much shorter practicable distance between Noarlunga and the Adelaide General Post Office. That project would cost \$92,000,000. The A.L.P. policy speech says we should build a Salisbury freeway; I suppose that could be called a north-south freeway. That is to be 7.9 miles long and is estimated in the M.A.T.S. Report to cost \$23,800,000.

The A.L.P. policy speech deals with the Tea Tree Gully freeway; I take it that the Modbury one would be very similar. As proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan, the freeway would be 13.2 miles long and would cost \$49,900,000. The A.L.P. policy speech suggests that we need a Port Adelaide freeway; it would be 3.9 miles long and its estimated cost is \$15,200,000. The A.L.P. policy speech mentions a Glenelg freeway; I am sorry that the M.A.T.S. proposal does not include such a freeway, but it does have an expressway which is very similar. That expressway is to be 2.1 miles long and its estimated cost is \$1,010,000. The total cost of these proposals is \$273,110,000. That is what the A.L.P. said it would do in its policy speech. The A.L.P. apparently did not consider the Hindmarsh interchange; but I do not know how the A.L.P. plans to join up the freeways if there is to be no interchange. Perhaps the A.L.P. proposes that the freeways should run into the city and that one of the city squares should be used as an interchange! If we have an interchange it will cost about \$29,000,000, according to the M.A.T.S. Report.

The A.L.P. has provided us with double talk and double standards. The member for Peake said that the M.A.T.S. Report did not pay sufficient attention to public transport; he

said that only \$107,000,000 was allocated to it. That amount is directly allocated to public transport, but what will our buses travel on? Surely they will travel at high speeds on the freeways and the improved pavements. Will the commuters use this means of transport?

Mr. Burdon: You tell us.

Mr. EVANS: I think they would, under a Liberal Government, but I do not know what will happen in view of the A.L.P. attitude. The A.L.P. promised to withdraw and revise the M.A.T.S. plan; it brought out a doctor to set up a 30-day wonder—or a shambles! We in our country know our cities better than does a person from another country who comes here and spends about 30 days looking at a report that took three years to compile. I do not know how many hours he spent looking at the report, but he said, "You sit down for 10 years and do nothing, except buy the land that may be needed for freeways, and in the meantime you experiment as much as you can with dial-a-bus or capsule transport, or some other futuristic method of transport." I do not deny that perhaps in future there will be better methods of transport, particularly public transport, than we have today.

Mr. Crimes: Then why sneer at the proposal?

Mr. EVANS: When this man talks of trips and capsules, one wonders what sort of trips he is having, and on what sort of capsule. We do have transport problems. Mr. Speaker, your colleague, the member for Price, asked in this House last week whether something could not be done to alleviate the traffic congestion in his own district, an industrial part of the State that has such traffic congestion as to cause difficulties for the honourable member's constituents and for the State. When the honourable member asked that question, he believed sincerely that there was considerable traffic congestion in this State, yet the Government says it is not going on with freeways. I do not believe that statement: the Government is going on with them, but the Minister, who is supposed to be such a man that he will stand up and apologize, whereas he did not do that when he should have done it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The L.C.L. policy speech in 1970 contained a proposal about freeways. Plans put forward in 1962 for freeways proposed that the total length of freeways be about 90 miles. The M.A.T.S. proposal is

for 61 miles of freeway. The Liberal and Country Party Government of 1968-70 told the people that it was willing to approve 50 miles of the freeways, whereas the Australian Labor Party policy speech promised 48 miles of them. The difference was only two miles.

Mr. Keneally: Why not do the lot? Why only 50 miles?

Mr. EVANS: The member who interjects now—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. EVANS: That honourable member knows that the M.A.T.S. plan was devised for 20 years but was subject to modification, and it was to be developed over a period of time. If there was need for modification during that time, it would be modified, and the Government of the day considered it necessary to have 50 miles of the freeways developed.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And the public didn't.

Mr. EVANS: If the Minister considers that the public voted on one issue, one must accept that his statement today is as stupid as some statements he made last week, when he refused to apologize.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One member speaking at a time is sufficient.

Mr. EVANS: Government members attacked the Leader of the Opposition, saying that he was not concerned with human life, the Leader having referred to the family in the park lands that Dr. Breuning had seen through his motel window and to a father and son kicking a football around the park lands. He asked what this had to do with the matter. Had the freeway proposal referred to in the M.A.T.S. Report been developed by 1986, it was estimated that we would have saved 350 lives in this city. Who is concerned with human life when this many people will be destroyed by inaction?

Mr. Clark: Pure guesswork.

Mr. EVANS: I believe it was the member for Peake who was impressed with the credentials of a certain individual and who said that he had not obtained his degree on a farm. Nevertheless, we have a statement from Mr. A. J. Flint, B.E., Dip.T. and C.P., C.H.T.(Yale), M.I.E. Aust., M.A.P.I., to the effect that between the time the M.A.T.S. proposals were published and 1986, 350 lives would have been saved through freeways. I do not care whether

the Opposition puts the figure at only 50: who is prepared to line up 50 people out on the street and say, "Shoot them"?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The L.C.L. in Vietnam. It does it every day.

Mr. EVANS: This is what is happening through our inaction.

Mr. Clark: You can't advance an argument without producing data.

Mr. EVANS: I have produced the data.

Mr. Clark: It was guesswork.

Mr. EVANS: It contains not as much guesswork as is contained in the statements of Dr. Breuning that the honourable member expects me to accept. Dr. Breuning, with his philosophy of inaction, spends 30 days here—

Mrs. Steele: 25 days.

Mr. EVANS: I will give him five days' grace. He looks at a report that took three years to compile and says, "Leave it for 10 years."

Mr. Langley: What qualifications do you have?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: At least I am prepared to speak on the subject. I am reminded of a letter circularized by the former member for West Torrens, the Minister for Conservation (and I am sorry he is not here). That letter, circulated within the Minister's former district, states:

On our side, nine A.L.P. members participated in the debate and all urged the withdrawal and reassessment of the plan. I leave you to decide if it was a full debate.

If I do not have any qualifications, at least I have debated the issue. The member for Unley has merely sat back and interjected. In his letter, the Minister also said:

The passage of the Government's motion, which approved the principle of establishing freeways, not the route, places all people in the south-western suburbs under a cloud. In simple language, the Noarlunga Freeway can now be built on the route of the M.A.T.S. plan, the route of the 1962 plan, or any other location decided. It also shows quite clearly that the Premier has a far higher regard for himself than he has for the people whose homes and future he has placed in jeopardy.

What is the action of the A.L.P. on it? What influence has the Minister, who was the Opposition Whip, had over his colleagues to get them to decide and say, "This is the route on which we will build the Noarlunga freeway"? Why does the Government not say to the people in that area, "We will remove the cloud"?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Haven't we done that?

Mr. EVANS: No, and the Minister knows that. In the Minister's own area, where he was very active with the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee, he knows that the people have not been told where the route will be. The letter continues:

As quite a deal of the finance for the M.A.T.S. plan must be provided by the Federal Government—

He accepts the fact that the Commonwealth Government will support us on this. At least the Minister was honest when he said that this was the case, even if others were not. The letter continues:

I am quite sure that electors will grasp the opportunity of the forthcoming Federal election to register their disapproval of the Premier's action by voting against all L.C.L. candidates.

I think we won the Federal Senate vote to some degree, because the A.L.P. lost ground. The last section of the letter is apt, and states:

Labor's candidate for the Federal election, Mr. Ralph Jacobi, shares the same concern for the people and their rights as I do. He has consistently assisted me in my efforts to have the whole M.A.T.S. plan withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Office for re-assessment.

Does Mr. Jacobi say to the Government, "You left my people under a cloud. Please remove it"? No, one does not hear a word. Mr. Jacobi has got what he wanted, but only for the time being, because he will get what he deserves later.

The Minister in charge of the motion has asked us to accept the philosophy of inaction. He was a very strong supporter of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee when he was on the Opposition benches. I wonder whether the South Australian people would be aware of the sort of prediction that the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee was making in 1970. In fact, what transpired with the Premier's announcement last week on taxation in this State is directly related to M.A.T.S. A circular was issued headed, "A warning to country people on the costs of the M.A.T.S. plan." It states:

The M.A.T.S. plan proposes to pay for these freeways in Adelaide by heavily taxing all South Australian people—including country people, whether they ever use the city freeways or not.

It does not matter whether or not they use them, although they would be a saving on the transportation of goods once they reached

the distribution centres in the metropolitan area. The circular continues:

The extra taxes upon all South Australian people under the M.A.T.S. plan include—

I want honourable members opposite to listen to the proposed taxes, as suggested by the revision committee. I wonder how much difference there is in these proposals issued by the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee and the proposals brought down by the Premier last week. It continues:

(1) A tax on electricity and on gas bills.

We have not got it on gas bills but it is well on the way with electricity. Then:

(2) A sharp rise in the cost of motor car registrations.

We copped that all right—20 per cent. Then:

(3) The doubling of the present cost of driving licences.

That did not quite happen: it was raised by only 50 per cent. I wonder who was advising the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee?

Mr. Clark: Probably John Gorton!

Mr. EVANS: This circular also states:

Whilst country people are to pay for the city freeways, our city-based Government has not erected a single worthwhile industry in a country town for many years. Every year many school-leaving boys and girls are forced to leave the Murray Bridge area to find jobs in the city. This causes premature splitting of country homes, a stripping of population from the country and an aggravating of the city sprawl.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How long has that been going on?

Mr. EVANS: It has been going on, and it will go on more so if the present Government is not willing to accept that part of the L.C.L.'s policy, enunciated at the last election, gradually to do away with land tax. If we want the country people to stay on the land, we have to make it possible for them to make a living from the land. There are one or two points I should like to raise in connection with the M.A.T.S. Report. It was the intention to widen 240 miles of arterial road. In his report Dr. Breuning has not said, "Yes; I agree with the M.A.T.S. Report"; he merely says, "We should widen arterial roads." Perhaps he did not even see them. We may have been doing that anyway, and we may have been widening our freeways anyway, but at least a group of expert people was set up to examine the overall transportation problems in our city; it was called the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study group. At least it put that effort in, and we should

recognize it; and so should Dr. Breuning. Dr. Breuning did at least agree on one particular aspect.

I refer now to commercial vehicles in the transport industry. This is mentioned in the M.A.T.S. Report, if the member for Elizabeth is prepared to accept that as only guesswork, too. Even the member for Mawson, his own colleague, used estimates in debating the same subject. We cannot get nearer than the figures in the M.A.T.S. Report. Can any honourable member tell us how we can get nearer, and then tell the committee which worked on this report? At page 80 the report states:

On a typical weekday in 1965 there were 79,900 trips by heavy trucks and almost twice as many by lighter trucks such as utilities and panel vans. Over 45 per cent of all truck trips were for the delivery of goods. The trips by all types of trucks amounted to over 20 per cent of total vehicle trips.

This is the transport that is moving within our city area—vehicles that are transporting goods. Let the member for Mawson say it does not matter whether they are held up for an hour instead of a quarter of an hour, because we will force the commuters on to public transport. That is what the honourable member implied in this Chamber. He implied that it did not matter if goods and services were delayed: extra costs to commerce did not matter. Freeways are being built in Melbourne and Sydney. Without freeways, industry in this State will grind to a halt. At page 105, the M.A.T.S. Report states that the number of truck trips will increase about 78 per cent from 230,000 on a weekday in 1965 to about 410,000 in 1986.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Aren't you rather appalled by that figure?

Mr. EVANS: No. I believe that the truck industry in particular is one of the most flexible and versatile industries in the transportation field. Many other people believe this, too. Mr. W. J. Holcroft (and, for the benefit of the member for Peake, who says credentials are the main thing, I point out that Mr. Holcroft has several initials after his name) says that the road transport industry is one of the most unhelped and heavily burdened industries in Australia. I do not think anyone would deny that this industry is unhelped and that everything possible is done to hinder it. If the Government decides not to build freeways, the transport industry will suffer another hindrance, as freeways are needed so that the transport of goods can

be speeded up. If the freeway proposals and the recommendations concerning public transport in the M.A.T.S. Report are proceeded with, the time saved, and thus the money saved, will be astounding. On page 175, under the heading "Highways", the M.A.T.S. Report states:

Estimates of future travel, however, indicate that total vehicle miles of travel in the metropolitan area will more than double, increasing from 4,120,000 vehicle miles on a week day in 1965 to about 9,500,000 in 1986. An extensive system of freeways, expressways and arterial roads will be needed to cater for this increasing demand.

On the same page, under the heading "Time Savings", the report states:

It has been estimated that about 2,500,000 vehicle miles of travel will take place on the freeway system on an average week day in 1986. This number of vehicle miles of travel would take about 45,000 hours longer per day on arterial roads with no control of access. With an average car occupancy of 1.3 persons and value on leisure time of \$1.25 an hour, the corresponding savings to the freeway motorists would amount to about \$25,000,000 a year in 1986.

That does not take into account time/cost savings of bus commuters, whether they use mini-buses, maxi-taxis or the normal service buses. The member for Peake said that mini-buses would pick up passengers on the way; normal buses do that. The only time mini-buses are needed is when the number of passengers is not high enough to warrant the use of a larger service bus. At page 176, the report states:

It has been estimated that operating costs average about 1c a vehicle mile less on urban freeways than on other roads. This will result in a saving to motorists of about \$10,000,000 per annum by 1986. Operators of buses and commercial vehicles will realize substantial savings in operating costs on freeways.

The savings to that industry, whether we think of the private bus operator, the State-controlled Municipal Tramways Trust or private truck contractors, are savings to the community because, in the end, all delivery costs are passed on to the man in the street. Farmers, too, are involved, because the cost of spare parts for agricultural implements is affected by delivery costs. If a part is held up for an hour in the city, the farmer will pay for it. Under the heading, "Overall User Cost Savings" the M.A.T.S. Report states:

For the period between now and 1986, it has been estimated . . . that the average annual equivalent road user savings on the recommended plan will be approximately \$44,000,000.

Under the heading "Movement of Goods" the report states:

The recommended system will greatly improve the movement and delivery of goods by truck throughout the metropolitan area. Much faster travel times will be possible on the freeways and deliveries will be facilitated by the removal of through traffic from local streets. Savings resulting from more efficient goods handling should benefit the entire community.

One could cite other points in the report to prove that the saving to the community of the M.A.T.S. plan by 1990, if we had gone on with it last year in a fair dinkum manner, would have paid for the complete construction and the purchase of land in relation to the plan. Dr. Breuning is asking us to wait until 1980 to see whether there is a better method of public or private transport. I do not know whether by that time we will put jets on our backs and shoot up into the air. Roller skates may be a method. I accept that we may have a more flexible method of public transport in the future, but I do not think we will have it in the foreseeable future. In the past the Minister has been a great supporter of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee. A recommendation in a pamphlet published by that committee is as follows:

Our committees request that the report from the American experts be made public before any action is taken in Parliament and that a six-month review period be granted for public examination of the proposals. We hope you will support this action in your Parliamentary capacity.

The Liberal and Country League did that in connection with the M.A.T.S. Report, and it was condemned by the Labor Party for doing so. When the committee that the Minister supported asked him to do the same thing, he ignored it. If the Minister did not receive the pamphlet I have referred to, he must have had it published himself! Overall, the history of the M.A.T.S. plan has been rough and stormy, but as a Parliamentarian I doubt that any member of this Chamber would deny that the freeways were necessary, essential and vital to the economy of this State. Not one member here can say that the Hills Freeway, even in its present earliest stage of development, has not benefited the tourist industry and the general commerce and financial position of this State. If there is a more urgent project to be developed than the Hills Freeway, it is the metropolitan freeways.

As the Minister knows, that is one reason why it is left out of the recommendations. It is a matter of doing first things first, and his

own members are admitting that there are delays in our community today because of traffic jams and are asking that the position be rectified. While the Ministers on the front bench are saying they will not build freeways, we all know that freeways will be built. We all know that Dr. Breuning condemned the M.A.T.S. Report in a sense.

Those who prepared the M.A.T.S. plan tended to co-ordinate public transport, private transport, and industrial transport (if we can call it that) or the commercial side of our transport system. That is the most up-to-date proposal ever put before this Parliament. The member for Mawson says that in 1923 someone predicted that the population of the metropolitan area would be about 600,000 and that that person was wrong, that he had miscalculated, and that now there are about 800,000 in the metropolitan area, so we should not worry about M.A.T.S.

Mr. Hopgood: I made a few other points.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, the honourable member made points. He picked out areas such as Morphett Vale and said that in 1923 it was predicted that Morphett Vale would not be developed or urbanized. It was also predicted that Adelaide proper would have a much larger population than the population today. However, it has been depopulated and there are fewer people here than was expected. Why is that? Possibly it is because of the motor car more than anything else, because the average South Australian likes to have a little block of land on which he can build his own house. We should not adopt suggestions like the member for Mawson makes when he says that we should not take notice of predictions because they can be out by 20 per cent.

If those who have made predictions have been underestimating, will we be in error with M.A.T.S. to such an extent that we will need more freeways? We cannot be sure. All that we can do is go to the experts and try to draw a plan. The member for Mawson should know this. If he does not, it is up to him to make up his own mind in future, if we are both alive in 1986 or 1990, about who was right and who was wrong. If I pass him on one of our freeways then, I will wave to him.

I think that at least one other point should be mentioned. It was intended that there should be a subway under our city. No-one has said that that should be done away with or that it is not being proceeded with. There are reports that some rubber padding that

was supposed to be placed under our performing arts theatre has not been placed there. Perhaps it has been proved by experts that the pads are not necessary, but they have been purchased. If there is any chance at all that a railway will run under the city, as these rubber pads have been purchased why not install them? If an underground railway is developed in the future and there is a noise problem, I suppose the Parliamentarians of the day will have a bigger noise problem from the community to put up with. Referring to pollution, I wonder how the member for Peake lines up with this matter his thinking that it does not help pollution if traffic is speeded up so that, for instance, it takes vehicles only one hour to get from Salisbury to Port Noarlunga, as may be the case in a few years, travelling at a regular speed and using an even fuel consumption.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has a minute to go.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have been asked to accept a discredited and ambiguous report whose author is not willing to support the M.A.T.S. proposal in any shape or form. The Breuning report recommends that we keep buying land for freeways and then sit down and wait because we might have something better in 10 years' time; if we have not, God help us. Members of the Government front bench will not have to face the music in 10 years' time; they will not have to account for people dying on the roads, because it will not be possible to pinpoint those people who have died.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Let me put the member for Fisher straight right from the outset; I wish he and some of his colleagues had taken the trouble to read the report and the policy statement issued at the time. If they had done so, I do not think they would have made quite so many foolish statements as they have made. Let me read what I said, with the full authority of the Government, when the report was released, namely:

Because it expects better modes of travel to be available within the next 10-year period, the Government will not implement the decisions made by the previous Government to construct the freeways and expressways proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan which are within the built-up areas and where substantial demolition of private property is involved.

Is this what the member for Fisher has been talking about? I think he was referring to the South-Eastern Freeway, but he said we needed the Hills Freeway, which was deleted from the M.A.T.S. plan by the previous Government. I wish those members opposite who decided to speak in this debate had done more homework so that they could have been more constructive instead of introducing some of the vilification that we have heard against the character and integrity of Dr. Breuning. The member for Bragg was very sensitive when some reference was made to his profession, but he was not so sensitive when his Leader, followed by the Deputy Leader and then speaker after speaker, vilified Dr. Breuning. Not one comment was made from the other side in protest, and not one request for a withdrawal. It is all right to vilify a man in America who is not here to defend himself. Is that the idea of fair dinkum play that the member for Fisher talked about? Is that what the Liberal Party thinks?

Mr. Gunn: Get back to the report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the member for Eyre did not contribute to the debate, he should be quiet now. Before replying to the debate, I waited for any member to make a contribution to it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We judged him on the basis of the report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member's Leader judged Dr. Breuning on the reply I gave in this House when I outlined his professional qualifications. The House should listen again because I have further information to give. Members will then realize that they have unjustly vilified a man who is of the highest possible integrity. This man, at 27 years of age, went to Canada and took out citizenship in the United States of America. He migrated to Canada in 1951 and took out citizenship in the U.S.A. in 1968. The fact that he is an American may be sufficient for some Opposition members to detest him, because I know some of them do not like Yanks. Let us follow this man's history through and see whether he is a man of ability, and let any member opposite, if he has more ability than has Dr. Breuning, criticize the plan. In 1951-52, he was the Engineering Assistant, Traffic Study Department, Montreal Transportation Commission; in 1952-57, Research Engineer, Joint Highway Research Project at M.I.T. and, in the summer of 1958, Consultant in Highways Economics on the Canadian Colombo Plan team in Burma. He

got all these jobs because he is the no-hoper that the Leader and other members have said he is! In 1957-59, he was Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Alberta; in 1959-63, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering and Engineering Research, Michigan State University; in 1963-65, Chief, Transport Systems Projects, Institute for Applied Technology, National Bureau of Standards; in the summer of 1965, Guest Professor of Transportation Technical University, Stuttgart, Germany; in 1965-67, Professor of Civil Engineering (Visiting), M.I.T., teaching and research in transport systems analysis and design; and, in 1968-69, Visiting Lecturer in Transportation, Harvard University.

Are members opposite really serious about this man being a clown or a fool, as the Leader described him? Practically all Opposition members followed the very poor line adopted by the Leader. I recall only one member opposite having a decent word to say about Dr. Breuning. It is a disgrace for any group of people to vilify a person on his professional integrity (or lack of it) when he is not here to defend himself. I do not mind if members opposite attack members of this Party or this Government. I do not even mind if they attack me. In fact, I welcome it: I know I am right when I am attacked. But, for heaven's sake, have a streak of decency and do not attack a man when he is not here. I pay a tribute here to the *Advertiser*. I have often criticized it, but it was the *Advertiser* that took the initiative and telephoned Dr. Breuning to try to clear his name. For this, I think the *Advertiser* has earned the undying gratitude of all fair-thinking people. I would not have laboured this point had it not been for the fact that almost every member opposite who spoke vilified Dr. Breuning unjustly.

Mr. Gunn: I didn't.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Had the member for Eyre chosen to speak, I should have liked to know what he would do, but he did not have the courage to get to his feet.

Mr. Goldsworthy: To attack the report is interpreted by you as vilification!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not talking about what is in the report: I am talking about the comments made by members of the Opposition, including the member for Kavel, who vilified Dr. Breuning instead of speaking to the debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You had better read what I said. You are even screwier than I thought you were, and that's pretty screwy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Had the member for Torrens not dwelt on the integrity of Dr. Breuning, it would have made my task much easier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. They must cease. The Minister of Roads and Transport is replying to the debate, and any further interjections will be dealt with immediately. There have been none in the previous debates.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I now refer to the remarks of the Leader, and I am sorry he is not here this evening. I know he has an engagement that he regards as important but I should have liked to think—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Of course, your leader is here, too, isn't he!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did not say anything about my leader; I was trying to make the point—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will disregard these interjections. I will deal with them. I will not keep on calling members to order. The Minister for Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Much time was spent by members opposite, and particularly the Leader, who started it, ridiculing the dial-a-bus system. In fact, I think it was our friend the member for Hanson who said, "Could you think of anything more ridiculous than dial-a-bus?" I wonder whether the honourable member reads the *Advertiser*. If he does, on January 30 of this year he would have read an article entitled "How to dial a bus ride into town". It states:

Adelaide could be among the first cities in the world to institute the futuristic "dial-a-bus" system, designed to prevent large numbers of people from bringing their cars into the city. Professor S. M. Breuning, the American expert, whose report on Adelaide transportation was released yesterday, led a group which devised the "dial-a-bus" and other revolutionary systems. His recommendations are now to be evaluated by the South Australian Government. By the late 1970's shopping trips into town should hold few terrors for housewives living in the suburbs of at least four major United States cities. They will have their own private bus service to pick them up at their front gates and bring them back later in the day. The system (it will be available to commuters and anyone else who prefers to leave his car at home) has been devised by top U.S. traffic experts and is being studied by a Senate committee.

Does that sound like a system about which one could use the words "nothing more ridiculous", as were used by the member for Hanson? Many similar phrases were used by members opposite. Do they know that in Mansfield, Ohio, and Toronto dial-a-bus systems operate? Do they know that such a system is being implemented in Milton Keynes, a new town in England? Only today I received from the United States a letter stating that one of these projects is to be commenced at Haddonfield, New Jersey. Are members opposite still proud of the fact that they ridiculed Dr. Breuning and what the Leader called his "comedy capsules"? Do they still want us to provide the old trains? I know the member for Bragg wants that, but I do not think the public still wants us to provide types of transport that are currently going out of fashion throughout the world.

Perhaps members opposite want us to spend \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 on a freeway system that will choke Adelaide, but I do not believe the people of Adelaide want that, and I think they showed that clearly on May 30 last year. I am amazed at the attitude of some members opposite. I remind them of something said not long ago by an Opposition member. When speaking about another matter, he said:

As this is all-embracing, it gives the Commissioner the opportunity to research these futuristic schemes. I believe this provision is worth while. We are not waiting until the time when to provide for necessary research requires an alteration to the Act but are providing for this now.

He said then that we should be undertaking the planning and research necessary for the futuristic schemes of public transport. That statement was made by the member for Light who, if he is true to the instructions of his Leader, will shortly vote in a way that will express an opposite view to the view he took on that previous occasion.

Dr. Eastick: Put it in context.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that the honourable member look at what he said in that debate. The point has been clearly made that newer forms of transport are available. If we are to fulfil our proper function, we must make sure that we do the best we can for the people of South Australia. Members have been told what is happening in the United States. The member for Peake referred to developments in various countries. I wonder how many people heard the following news item last Sunday:

Trains and buses could be replaced in Sydney by elevated air cushion buses if a plan for the city's transport is accepted. A firm of consulting engineers has devised the plan. An engineer with the firm, Mr. T. Wood, said today the plan envisaged an air cushion corridor between the suburbs of Manly and Mona Vale, a distance of nine miles.

Mr. Nankivell: At least they have a plan.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the very plan that we are debating here tonight—the Breuning plan. The news item continues:

The corridor would support electric-powered buses which floated on air. Mr. Wood said a bus suitable for Sydney's needs had been developed in France. It seated 44 people and had a top speed of 112 miles an hour. The plan had been submitted to the New South Wales Minister for Transport.

Do members opposite want New South Wales to be in advance of South Australia, merely because there is a Liberal Government there and a Labor Government here? Presumably, that is their reason. From my viewpoint, however, I want the reverse. It may interest members opposite, who have so much enjoyed ridiculing Dr. Breuning's suggestions on the newer forms of transport, to know that on August 10 I received correspondence from a Melbourne firm saying that it acts on behalf of the Aero-Train Company of France and is anxious to talk business with us. Yet the member for Fisher asked us to reinstate the M.A.T.S. plan and forget all about these newer forms of transport. Members opposite have advocated that we get as many cars as possible on our roads and pollute the environment; they say that as long as we build the freeways we have done all that can be expected.

Dr. Tonkin: You have not been listening.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not only listened but also suffered the pain of reading the *Hansard* pulls of what the honourable member and other members said. It is no good fooling ourselves: this newer type of transport is here. We have had buses and trains for the last 50 years, but changes in the forms of transport are now occurring. So, let us not continue as though nothing has happened. Changes are occurring, and we not only want these new forms of transport here but also want to become the manufacturing base for Australia. Instead of ridiculing Dr. Breuning's report, members opposite should support it because of the benefit it will bring to this State. If members opposite are still unable to realize what is involved in it, I am

sure there is nothing that I or anyone else can do to make them realize it—short of asking them to sit down quietly for a few years until I, as Minister of Roads and Transport, invite them to the first demonstration of one of these new forms of transport.

Mr. McAnaney: Are you going to run these things on roads?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had his time to speak the other evening.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I must make the further point that I was extremely disappointed when two members opposite asked whether they could have a look at a document from which I was reading. In fact, one member asked whether I would table it. I declined to do that, but I provided a copy of some material for each of those members to share, showing that these forms of transport were in operation. I should have liked to think that this might influence the contribution to the debate that the members made, at least to the extent that they acknowledged that this is not so much hooey, as had been suggested.

I now turn briefly to a question, in five parts, that the Leader challenged me to answer. His first question was, "Why has not the Minister told the public that he has approved the M.A.T.S. freeway route? I ask him that directly as the first question." I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of January 30, 1971, headed "One man will co-ordinate all transport, by Ray Folley" which states:

Corridors envisaged: routes similar to those in the M.A.T.S. plan were envisaged in the report as Adelaide's future "transportation corridors", Mr. Virgo said. He said Dr. Breuning did not and was not expected to consider actual routes, but he agreed that those already outlined would serve. The transport corridors, to be incorporated in the Metropolitan Development Plan and displayed in public soon, are: South: Noarlunga freeway alignment. North-west: Port Adelaide freeway alignment. North: Salisbury freeway alignment. North-East: Modbury freeway alignment. Necessary connections around the west and north of the city.

I do not know how the Leader, echoed by some of his henchmen opposite, could so accuse me when he said, "Why has not the Minister told the public?" Can we get any clearer terms than that? The public has been told and that is the question the Leader challenged me to answer. The answer is in the statement I have just read. Obviously, I have told the public.

The Leader's second question was, "Why is he recommending a dial-a-bus scheme when only 53 per cent of the people have a telephone service?" That is one of the most ridiculous questions I have ever heard. He says these things with a wave of the arm and makes them sound good. I have dealt with the dial-a-bus system and will not waste the time of the House on that. The Leader also asked, "Will he reduce bus services in the newly-developed areas?"

Mrs. Steele: I should like to know that, too.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member does not know, I suggest that she go to the Parliamentary Library and find out whether she can get further information. One of the reasons why we are establishing a planning and development branch is so that that matter can be examined thoroughly by fully qualified people.

Mr. Gunn: Like Dr. Breuning!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether members opposite have listened to the details of the academic qualifications of Dr. Breuning, but if they still desire to ridicule him they deserve pity and scorn. The third question was as follows: "Will he not provide services in developing areas, as suggested in the plan, and will he reduce bus services to newly-developing areas?" If the Leader had paid attention, I do not think he would have asked such a question. Referring to fostering transportation in the central city and inner suburbs, Dr. Breuning goes one stage further and says:

Consideration could be given to providing no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs.

The Leader asked: "Will he reduce bus services in newly-developing areas?" That is a silly question, which does not deserve an answer, because obviously the answer is in the negative. The fourth question was this: "Has he told the public that he plans an initial expenditure from the increased motor vehicle registration taxation . . . of \$5,000,000 a year over five years . . .?" Again, I refer to the *Advertiser* report, which states:

Mr. Virgo said implementation of the report recommendation would cost about \$1,000,000 in the first five years.

Does that sound as though we have hidden behind something and have refused to inform the public? The final question was as follows: "Has the Minister told the public that he has

adopted a 10-year delay in the urgently necessary road programme?" Of course, those members opposite who have been talking about a 10-year delay in the road programme have not read the report. I recall the member for Mitcham saying (and the member for Hanson, like a parrot, repeated it) that for 10 years we would do nothing. I suggest that those members in the next 10 minutes read the report, because that is exactly what it does not say. The report states that it is not necessary to build these freeways in the built-up metropolitan area for 10 years, that this period should be used to develop the newer forms of transportation, and that there should then be an evaluation of what is required. That is vastly different from the half-truths and blatant untruths that some members opposite have tried to convey during this debate. The member for Mitcham said:

It prompted me to remember the fury, which has now fallen on the Minister and the Labor Government, of members of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee. Before the election the Labor Party promised the people who lived in the Minister's district and in the District of Mitchell all sorts of things.

Let us analyse that for a moment. I have here a M.A.T.S. protest letter prepared jointly by the Marion and Darlington M.A.T.S. Revision Committees. This letter was produced just prior to the State election. It was distributed in the Districts of Ascot Park, Mitchell, and Brighton. The revision committee invited me and the former Minister to state our policies so that they could be clearly put before the people. In the letter, I said:

Notwithstanding the Hall Government's approval of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan and their stated intention to implement it, a Labor Government will withdraw the plan because 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. The withdrawal of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan will automatically rescind the instruction given to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee by Transport Minister Hill, requiring them to consider alternative routes for the Noarlunga freeway and accordingly the suggested alternatives currently being considered by this committee will not be proceeded with. In withdrawing the plan we will require the State Planning Authority to re-examine our future needs and they will be assisted by a team of world famous investigators fully experienced in the latest technologies of public urban transport. They will advise how the new technologies can best be incorporated into the development plan of Adelaide and how these new methods can provide a basis for a new industry here. While

Labor considers that a north-south freeway will be necessary, a decision on this can only be made in the light of the examination of the public transit sector previously referred to.

There is then a statement by the former Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. C. M. Hill), who said that, in broad context, the Liberal Government would proceed with the M.A.T.S. plan. How can the member for Mitcham suggest that I had misled the people on the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee? The people in the district knew the position. There has been no misleading at all.

The only other matter relates to a statement by two or three speakers, not the least being the member for Mitcham, who said that there were two weaknesses, and I now deal with the second one. The honourable member said:

I do not believe that as a community we will be able to afford to do the things that he suggests may (not "will") be around the corner.

He said that we could not afford to lead Australia or the world in the newer forms of transport technology. I do not know of a more defeatist attitude that could possibly be expressed than that. We ought to be leading the field. The opportunity is here for us to do so and to have an industry established in this State to lead the way in the forms of transportation the whole of Australia and nearby countries will soon be needing. It is for these reasons that I have moved the motion that the Government endorse the Breuning report. Let me warn members of the alternatives before them. The Leader has moved an amendment providing for the endorsement of the M.A.T.S. plan, as approved by the previous Government. I hope that all members have studied carefully what the M.A.T.S. plan states. I hope that the member for Hanson, if he votes for it, will be willing to go to Glenelg and tell the people there that he voted the Glenelg tram out, because that is what he will be doing—

Mr. Becker: That's according to you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, according to the *Hansard* report of the motion moved in the last Parliament. I hope the member for Mitcham and the member for Bragg will go back to the people in their districts, particularly to the Mitcham council, and tell them that the Hills Freeway, which the previous Government deferred, is now back on the list. I hope members will realize that the Noarlunga Freeway starts and then goes nowhere at all, then starts again and goes nowhere at all, and then starts again. The same thing happens with the

Modbury Freeway. If that is the type of planning the Liberal Party wants, let it support its Leader; if it wants decent planning, let it support the Breuning report.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Carnie, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hall and Millhouse. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan and Lawn.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Carnie, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Lawn. Noes—Messrs. Hall and Millhouse.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

UNFAIR ADVERTISING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 23. Page 3511.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill, which was described as a ham-fisted measure by the Leader of the Opposition. He described it also as a bludgeoning technique by the Government. From my viewpoint, I believe that this is not an action being taken with a bludgeon but it is rather a rapier-like action. I note from my analysis of the Leader's speech that it could be that, if certain amendments were made, he might favour the proposal. I had thought at first that this would be a very controversial measure indeed, judging from some of the correspondence I received.

Mr. Clark: I think the Leader might support the Bill, if his amendments were included.

Mr. McRAE: I should like the opportunity of mentioning those amendments. It could well be that the Attorney-General might be considering, on behalf of the Government, certain of the amendments that were suggested by the Leader. One of the matters that the Leader raised was the question of getting a certificate from the Attorney-General before any prosecution could be launched. I personally favour that idea. I note from the debate on the previous Bill that the mover was not willing to accept this line of reasoning for reasons which he put forward and which had some validity. Nevertheless, my reason for supporting it would be that it would at least stop the scrupulous from being prosecuted by the unscrupulous, and there is a possibility of that without a certificate from the Attorney-General. So, I hope the Government will consider that point.

The Leader also mentioned something that occurs in New South Wales and with which I am to some extent familiar. It is a procedure that I, too, support—the idea of having an intermediary step in these matters. In other words the Leader said, "Let us not go straight into a prosecution: let us have someone such as the Prices Commissioner who can look at the matter in issue and perhaps give a warning." That, too, is a point that the Government might well consider. On my analysis of what the Leader said, I believe that, if those two matters were accepted, there would be some possibility that he would support the Bill. In the interests of the community at large, I should like to see this Bill get through this place with more than just a Party-line majority.

Mr. Mathwin: You are only trying to get the Government off the hook.

Mr. McRAE: It is not a question of getting the Government off the hook. If the honourable member reads the Bill and his Leader's speech, he will see that this is a very important matter. The Leader complained about the definitions in the Bill. It must be conceded that this Bill is drafted in such a way that the definitions and key clauses are closely related and one must turn, in an interlocking way, from one to the other, but I would not concede for a moment that the definitions and phraseology in the Bill are unclear. In fact, I think they are extremely clear, particularly when one compares them with other legislation in the commercial world. Honourable members have

spoken about the Income Tax Act, the Companies Act, and other commercial Acts. To my knowledge, no other Acts are so complicated and so devious as those measures and, contrasting them with the simple drafting of this Bill, one can well see that this legislation should not put the commercial community at a disadvantage.

For some reason, it is assumed that inevitable members on this side are opposed to people in commerce and industry. That is not so at all. What we are opposed to is that minority (and, of course, it is a minority) in the commercial world that is taking an unfair advantage of the public. Members would have received a circular sent out by an organization that describes itself as the Australian Association of National Advertisers. This circular, which was dated January 18, 1971, urged all members to oppose the legislation before the House and, in support of that recommendation to members, the association made certain points.

The comment I want to make is that, if ever there was an example of misleading material, this document is a classic. If one looks at the document and then at the factual situations, contrasting what is stated in the document with the facts, one sees just how misleading the circular is. For instance, paragraph 1 states that in 1969 the legislation introduced then was not proceeded with. In fact, the Bill was defeated in the Upper House, so that statement is wrong.

Paragraph 3 deals with the question of regulatory codes (that is, codes within an industry) and I think that, in many circumstances, these codes can be useful but, of course, members who follow these things will know that, in many commercial organizations, the codes are good until we reach the stage where one participating person is dissatisfied. He then breaks the code and it is no longer of any use. Similarly, if we look at other parts of the circular, we see many misleading comments. For example, on page 3, we find a statement as follows:

We can only assume that this means—referring back to the definition — that, if only one person of limited intellectual capacity has been misled by an advertisement, a prosecution must succeed.

Of course, nothing is further from the case, because we take it that the normal rules of statutory interpretation will apply and that the test will be, "What would a reasonable person, or a reasonable member of a class involved, think or do in a given situation?"

Therefore, that submission by the association is also misleading. The next sentence states:

Are we further to assume that, if one child with limited education is misled, the same situation would apply?

Once again, that is a ridiculous statement to make, because, on the normal principles of statutory interpretation, we take the reasonable child as well as the reasonable man. It is stated in paragraph 6 that the proposed legislation makes it difficult, even impossible, for an advertiser to put up any form of defence. This Bill has been drafted at great pains to ensure that those who have little or no control over the content of the advertising are given a complete defence. Those who have the direct control are given an onus; it is a reversal of an onus of proof, something which I do not normally like and which the legal profession as a whole does not normally like. But the reversal of the onus is not a difficult one: it does not put the same onus on an advertiser as, for example, the Income Tax Act puts on a taxpayer or as, for example, the Companies Act—

Dr. Tonkin: Rubbish!

Mr. McRAE: I suggest that if the member for Bragg looks at the Income Tax Act he may well find that strong onuses are put on the taxpayer. The Bill, although an onus is there, gives the opportunity to any defendant to say he believed on reasonable grounds that the statement or representation was not unfair. All that he has to do (and in one way I can see that this is perhaps a defence counsel's paradise) is get a person of sufficient reputation to say that he believed it on reasonable grounds, and we have then thrown away completely that area of genuine people who make a small mistake. My line of reasoning, therefore, is that if there is the protection of the Attorney-General's certificate, that deals with the unscrupulous competitor; if the Prices Commissioner is there as a sort of watchdog or intermediary, that does away with the unnecessary prosecution of a once-only offender; and if, in addition, there is an exemption clause (a defence clause such as this) so stated that the reputable man putting up a reasonable case can avoid any prosecution, even after those two steps, we are left with a small fraction of the industry indeed. Therefore, the legislation is not quite so unreasonable as we were led to believe.

Returning to the circular, we are told that the 1969 legislation provided for a fine of \$200 (and this was objected to as being unduly high) and that the proposed legislation provides

for a fine of \$1,000. Fines generally have been increased in this area from a maximum of about \$200 or \$250 to the range of between \$500 and \$1,000. If, once again (since we are in a commercial area), we take a comparison between this legislation and, for example, the Companies Act or the Income Tax Act, one will find that this fine is by no means greater than the usual average fine in regard to the commercial community. Let us bear in mind that the commercial community under this type of legislation is presumed to be of fairly reasonable substance.

We are not dealing here with people on limited incomes: we are dealing with people who are sufficiently sophisticated and advanced and, we hope (though often this is not true), sufficiently capitalized to be able to get into this area of large-scale media advertising. So that, too, is a wrong statement. This penalty is not unrealistic or abnormally large. I ask honourable members to look also at the passage on page 3 which, to my mind, is a complete distortion. That passage states:

. . . a completely unrealistic and abnormally large fine to be imposed by a magistrate on a matter of personal opinion.

I take it from that that the Bill is entitling the magistrate to vary his fine or conviction on his own personal opinion. Neither matter is true. In the first place, the magistrate cannot record a conviction without complying with the normal processes of statutory interpretation, and in the second place, any fine he imposed after conviction would have to be within the normal range of fines for that type of offence and, if it was not, it could be appealed against. Page 3 refers to a defence that was offered in 1969, but it is not offered in the Bill. The defence offered in 1969 was that an advertisement not intended to deceive or mislead or was of such a trivial nature that no reasonable person would rely on it would be sufficient to take an apparent offence away from the ambit of the legislation. What it does not say is this: if one looks at the whole context of the 1969 Bill, it is far wider than the current Bill, which has been pruned down in ambit, and there has been a much greater degree of care in limiting this Bill to the sort of people against whom it should be enforced.

Again on page 3, I find a remarkable statement from the association. The association says that it would appear that proceedings are to be disposed of summarily before a magistrate, and that no provision is made for an advertiser to have his case tried before

a jury of ordinary men and women. The magistrate will be the only one to decide whether the whole community has been harmed by the advertisement. Will there be any appeal from the magistrate's ruling that the proposed legislation does not provide for? Of course, the proposed legislation does not provide for it because, as honourable members know, the Justices Act already provides for it. So that statement is again misleading.

Then I come to a truly remarkable paragraph—a further danger, which is not in the public interest, is that proceedings in respect of offences against this Act shall be disposed of summarily. In South Australia, this could mean that an ordinary magistrate could hear a case. Stipendiary or police magistrates would no doubt, in the normal course of events, be legally trained, but if the same situation applies in South Australia as it does in other States, cases could be heard by honorary magistrates who might, in fact, be merely justices of the peace. As members know (all of them being justices of the peace), this state of affairs is again quite wrong. We have indeed a panel of justices who deal, very properly, with a certain area of cases, but they never take a contested matter under legislation of this kind nor do they take even a plea of guilty under this kind of legislation. So that statement is misleading.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think the circular is misleading?

Mr. McRAE: When I reach the point of summing up on this circular, I will have to suggest something of that kind, but it could be that the people who sent out this circular had in mind that the situation in South Australia might be like that in Sydney and Melbourne, where there are non-legally trained magistrates who hear cases of this kind.

I must sum up on this remarkable document. It is put out by an association of advertisers with a view to convincing members of Parliament in relation to a Bill dealing with misleading advertising. Therefore, *ipso facto* it gives misleading information. I challenge anybody to characterize this document as being other than a piece of misleading and unfair advertising itself. However, the analysis of the case put forward by the industry itself is not really the keynote to the legislation. As the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation, what we should be doing is going back to the Rogerson report, upon which all this is based, and looking at what the members of that committee had to say. The

Rogerson report was obtained on behalf of the Attorneys-General of all the States and the Commonwealth. It comprised Professor Rogerson, the then Bonython Professor of Laws at the Adelaide University; Mr. M. J. Detmold, a Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Adelaide; and Mr. M. J. Trebilcock, also a Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Adelaide. The report was forwarded on February 25, 1969. It was prepared in great detail after the committee had heard much evidence and had looked carefully into the whole context of consumer credit. In looking at misleading advertising, I suggest that the value of the report lies in the fact that it is part of a general study of the whole area of consumer credit and in the fact that, whatever members opposite may say about some Government committees, this clearly was an impartial committee appointed by a number of Governments throughout the Commonwealth. Clearly, I do not think that honourable members would challenge the academic qualifications of the members of that committee. Chapter V of the report deals with misleading advertising. It states:

In several sections of this report we mention problems which do or may arise from misleading advertising practices. We are aware that legislation exists in several States which proscribes particular practices, but there are nevertheless a good many undesirable advertising practices which fall outside these proscriptions and which seem to us to require regulation.

The Committee then refers to the Nova Scotia Consumer Protection Act, 1966, and the Unfair Trading Practices Bill that was introduced into this House in 1967. The next paragraph deals with the proscriptions on advertising that apply in the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The Association of National Advertisers is in great difficulties because what it has not told honourable members is that the counterpart organization in the United Kingdom from which it has copied its code of ethics (with one exception which is carefully left out and which I will deal with later) is governed by legislation far stricter than this Bill; that is easy to establish, not because of what I say but by reference to the Rogerson report and other documents. The Rogerson report refers to the United Kingdom Trade Descriptions Act, 1968, and the U.S. Federal Trade Restriction Act, 1914, and the regulations made under that Act. It states:

We would not wish to see such a provision confined to advertisements relating to credit because some of the advertising practices we have referred to in our report, for example the advertising of bogus trade-in allowances,

go beyond this. The generality of the provision in the South Australian Unfair Trading Practices Bill seems to us to be necessary. It may be objected that a provision such as this is too sweeping and imprecise to be an effective way of dealing with misleading advertising practices. We do not see why this should be so. In other fields the law has proved itself capable of solving comparable problems and able to identify mis-statements of fact and misleading half-truths, and capable of distinguishing these from mere puffs or padding which cannot be expected to attract liability. There seems no reason to us why this task should, in the case of misleading advertising, be harder than it is in other fields.

Without dealing with all of the report, I ask members to consider page 24, which deals with inflated trade-in allowances and which states:

We have already mentioned the practice of inflating trade-in values, and the difficulties of combating this. Of course, if our recommendations in relation to minimum deposits are adopted, this practice will no longer pose problems in one respect. But apart from the evasion of minimum deposit requirements, another undesirable consequence of inflating trade-in values is the element of deception often present, to which we should draw attention even though it is not strictly relevant in this context. To suggest or imply to a consumer that he is receiving a special "bonus" on his trade-in when, without the consumer's knowledge, this bonus has been added to the price he is being asked to pay for the goods on which the trade-in is made, is simply to deceive him. He is led to believe that he is being offered some specially advantageous deal on his trade-in when this is not at all the case. Also, the buyer who is not aware of this practice, as many immigrants are not, and who is therefore unaware that the so-called "cash" price advertised contains a large component as an area for manoeuvre with trade-in allowances, may be duped into paying the full advertised price. Where he is buying on credit, the consequence of paying an unrealistically high price is compounded by the fact that much higher interest charges will also be payable. If a retailer wishes to offer genuinely more advantageous terms than his competitors, he is always free directly to reduce the price he is asking for his goods, and to advertise these lower prices.

I ask members to consider that simple statement. I pose this question to those who sent the circular: if you want to put out a genuine advertisement offering a lower price, why do you not do what reputable companies do? Why do you not say, "We have cut our price by a certain percentage in order to get your trade and custom. We will not give a set of bogus figures to mislead you into trading with us"? The member for Torrens, a former Minister in this area, will well know what reputable commercial organizations and institutions do: that is the way they keep their

business and reputation. They will not have a bar of the sort of activity I have described. The Rogerson committee goes on to say what the Attorney-General has told this House.

Mr. Venning: Are you going to read the whole report?

Mr. McRAE: The report is of inestimable value to members. Incidentally, it is Parliamentary Paper No. 74 of 1969. The report continues:

We believe that the practice of advertising inflated trade-in allowances should incur prosecution under the measures we have recommended elsewhere in this report for dealing with misleading or deceptive advertising. Inducing a person to enter into a consumer credit transaction by means of an inflated trade-in allowance should be made a specific offence. Because of factors mentioned earlier, such as the difficulty of establishing the true value of a trade-in, only the more blatant cases are likely to be caught by these proposals, but nevertheless even this seems a worthwhile objective, and it may have at least some effect on those pursuing the practice in less extreme forms. Short of price control, we feel this is the most that can be done about this practice.

I was at some pains, to the discomfort of some members opposite, to read from that report because the Leader of the Opposition suggested that the brevity of the Attorney-General's second reading explanation indicated a lack of preparedness or a lack of background for the legislation. However, there is every background and justification both in terms of the Rogerson report and also in terms of the practical experience of every member. What is more, the case that has been put to us by the Australian Association of National Advertisers is grossly misleading and wrong, and it should not influence any member to vote against the Bill.

In addition to the Rogerson report, I should like to refer to one or two specific instances of advertisements that I consider to be grossly misleading. I shall refer to them because they have appeared regularly. I do not want to suggest that I picked two organizations as though those two were the only guilty parties in this field, for there are far more than two guilty parties. In the *News* of Wednesday, February 10, 1971, we see an advertisement by Radio Rentals. The advertisement refers to a "Whale of a sale". It says, "Up to three years free service. Interest-free terms! No deposit! No H.P." and then it says, "Wilkins Servis washers in your laundry for only \$1.55 weekly." We are told everything there, except what the price is. We do not need to be too bright to calculate for ourselves that this organi-

zation has very carefully worked out, in advance, a price that will take into account all the charges, all the interest, and all those other things that our reputable companies must bear and then has put forward this ghastly document as a means of hiding what, in fact, is the truth.

I will also refer to another example in the area of used cars. Many persons, unfortunately, indulge in this sort of advertisement. It is unfortunate that one cannot cover the whole field in the time available, but I consider that, in all honesty, I ought to give one or two examples about this. Honourable members may care to look at the *News* of Thursday, December 10 last, where we see that an individual named "Big Bob Francis" tells us that Para Motors has a mighty sale, with a 100 per cent guarantee, four brand new tyres fitted and included in the price, a brand new car radio, and an advance of \$440 for any old car. The word "any" is in block type, so that there can be no doubt about it. In addition, "Big Bob Francis" is quoted as stating:

I gave one customer \$440 for a '60 Simca station sedan and I've got dozens of other examples.

Members may care to turn back one page in that same newspaper and look at the Readers' Car Mart. There we have numerous examples of sales of Simca cars. I will not read—

Mr. McAnaney: You're not allowed to read the newspaper.

Mr. McRAE: I invite honourable members to look at the newspaper and see the advertisement of a Simca sedan, 1963, in exceptional condition, good motor, for \$195, and if honourable members are also prepared to look further at that same newspaper they will find a 1960 Simca sedan advertised.

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Speaker, I understand that honourable members are not permitted to read from a newspaper. That is your ruling.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is quoting examples from a newspaper. I have not the paper before me to know, but he has illustrated and is quoting examples, as contained in the newspaper.

Mr. McRAE: I was not flourishing the newspaper. I was trying to be very discreet.

Mr. McAnaney: One rule for one member and another rule for another.

Mr. McRAE: I must take exception to that remark, which is a reflection on the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not reflect on the Chair. I have ruled that the member for Playford was quoting examples from the newspaper. He is looking at a newspaper and quoting examples. He is not reading the paper, and I rule that he is in order.

Mr. McRAE: I do not want to annoy members opposite, because I do not think this is the sort of measure on which we should become too heated. I think we should look at the value to the community. I wanted to cite examples to show that, if one looks at the paper (and honourable members can verify this) one will see advertisements for a 1963 Simca, the price given being \$195, and for a 1960 Simca, the price given being \$129. Other 1963 Simca cars are advertised for \$195 and \$163. There is a great deal of difference between Big Bob Francis giving \$440 for a 1960 Simca and the Reader's Car Mart prices I have just read out. Of course, we can say that everything "Big Bob Francis" has said on behalf of Paramotors is quite true, but we would have to be exceptionally gullible, because we have to accept that the firm is giving double the market price; that it is throwing in five brand new tyres, which to my knowledge on current market value would be in excess of \$100; and also, Lord help us, that it is offering a 100 per cent guarantee.

Members opposite, like members on this side, have taken part in reputable organizations and would never have been a party to that sort of bogus advertising that makes the most misleading and ridiculous statements that one could make. I suppose one can answer this by saying that it is so stupid and such an extravaganza that it is a sort of come-on (a gimmick), but a large percentage of our population consists of migrants, as pointed out in the Rogerson report, and a large percentage of our population is (because our whole system has brought up people this way) prepared to believe that the other guy will give us a decent go. That is why we find that people who think they will get a decent go deal with an establishment such as this. They get a price quoted which has already been carefully checked; they are told they will get their five new tyres and \$440, but they do not know that the resulting \$550 will be added on to the already checked price. They do not know that, on top of that, they will be required to enter into a contract

for finance with a finance company at a flat rate of interest, and they do not know what is the true rate of interest.

The Rogerson report refers to all sorts of complex ways of working out the true rate of interest, but a friend of mine happened to give me a simple means of working out the true rate of a flat rate of interest, and it works out as follows: 6½ per cent flat per annum equals 12 per cent; 7½ per cent flat per annum equals 14 per cent; 8 per cent flat per annum equals 15 per cent; and 9 per cent flat per annum equals 17 per cent. We can take it further than that, because usually, in addition to all the factors to which I have referred, the person concerned is required to enter into insurance and to pay service charges and, if these things are added in as well, we find that the effective rate of interest that the poor deceived and misled customer is paying can be as high as 25 per cent to 30 per cent. If that sort of situation does not call for a remedy, I do not know what does.

Members can look at the same newspaper (the *News* of Thursday, December 10) and see that an organization known as Rick Hosking Motors, of O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, is making certain offers. Members may care to note that the number plates on each vehicle advertised have been obscured, so that the customer cannot raise the legal point that he has requested to purchase the vehicle that has been advertised to him. That argument has been deliberately taken away from him. In the advertisement in question, Rick Hosking, apart from inviting his customers to wake up Christmas morning with a present included in the discount price of every car sold, provides an example of one of his trade-ins. It states "No fuss finance". But members who look at the paper can judge for themselves. It also states, "Trade price, \$800, less H.P. payoff (assuming the person is getting rid of another vehicle) \$500, balance, \$300, deposit, \$50, cash to you \$250."

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute to go.

Mr. McRAE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that I have been able to produce some background for the necessity, both in terms of the Rogerson report and of practical experience, for this legislation to come into effect. I ask members to study the book produced by Harris and Seldon, dealing with advertising in Britain, and to compare the ethical code of the equivalent organization in Britain with the

one circularized to us, and in particular to note that our organization permits the use of hyperbole and frank exaggeration primarily intended to amuse or direct attention, whereas the English organization does not, and I ask members to draw their own conclusions. The conclusion I draw is that the organization that has contacted us—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This Bill is well-intentioned, and no doubt some Opposition members would agree with some of the points made by the member for Playford. He seemed to have a chip on his shoulder, and I think he expected violent opposition. The Opposition does not oppose without much thought. I cannot support the Bill in its present form unreservedly. The member for Playford said that the document circulated by the Australian Association of National Advertisers was a grossly misleading document, or words to that effect. This, in itself, points up how easy it is to take a any document or submission and go through it word by word and paragraph by paragraph and, if it does not agree with one's own point of view, to call it a misleading document. The Bill is intended to restrict unfair advertising, that is, anything that is likely to deceive or mislead the persons to whom the advertisement is directed. We are told that the definition of "unfair statement" is the key to the measure. It is the opinion of Owen David Sperling, who is the Deputy Chairman of the Australian Consumers Association (the publishers of *Choice*) that the word "unfair" in itself, as applied to the Bill and in the definition, is undesirable. He said:

If it retains its present connotation of unfair then it is reasonable to expect magistrates to (psychologically, at any rate) require evidence of intention to cheat or defraud before convicting. Perhaps a name like "Misleading Advertising (Consumer Protection) Act" would be better.

I tend to agree with him, for this tends to pre-judge the situation a little. I just put that forward for the Attorney-General's consideration.

Mr. Clark: There's not a great deal of difference.

Dr. TONKIN: With respect, I think there is, and I think the Attorney-General will see this. Regarding the reversal of the onus of proof, with which the member for Playford has dealt (he seems to have a fixation about the Taxation Department and its machinations),

I am not entirely happy with this, and I do not think that many members of the legal profession are, either. It is undesirable to have a reversal of the onus of proof. The onus is thrown back on to the person or organization that is to profit from the sale of the product; but I think that, if this Bill is to succeed in its good intent to protect the public, somewhere along the line an intent to defraud must be established before a prosecution for misleading or unfair advertising (call it what you will) can succeed. This is where the Bill is not practical because this is a delightfully misleading and vague term: how on earth can a court or anyone else find what are the true motives of an advertiser? What was his intention? Was it a straightout intention to defraud or was it an intention to push his product as vigorously as possible?

This raises the question that was dealt with in an article in the *Bulletin* not so long ago that asked "How credible is advertising anyway?" With various products all becoming more and more like each other, what is there left to say about the merits of one product as against another? I think there is no doubt (and we will all agree) that some marketers and advertisers do set out to mislead or at least to confuse the customers. But there is a difference. The lie direct, the untrue statement, can be tracked down and disproved but, when we try to find out what is misleading and unfair, the motives of the advertisers must be examined; I believe that only a thought-reader can find out what they have in mind.

In defining "misleading" it is necessary to define who is to be misled. Who is the average man in the street; who is the ordinary buyer; who is the reasonable man that I think the Attorney-General talked about? It is necessary to establish an intent to defraud. The Australian Association of National Advertisers has said straight out that it believes that the best way to police this sort of thing is through the organizations themselves.

Before I leave the subject of the A.A.N.A., I understand that the Attorney-General has had correspondence with another group, the Australian Association of Advertising Agencies (the A.A.A.A., a title difference which makes life very difficult). In reply to a query that I addressed to that association, it said that it had been in contact with the Attorney-General and the Premier and had pointed to specific points in the Bill that had caused it concern. It went on to say that it

was entirely happy with the Bill as it was tabled in the House. That letter was dated January 28, 1971. By special messenger and registered letter, I received another letter from that association on February 17, stating that it thought the intent was good, the specific points in the Bill had been dealt with, and the final wording was acceptable to it, however. The final paragraph states:

You will appreciate from our previous letter that the association is supporting the Bill because our members are stongly devoted to the principle of truth in advertising. However, we would also like you to know that we do not want our support of, and belief in, this principle to prejudice in any way the often expressed view of the association that misleading or unfair advertising is best controlled by the advertising industry itself.

We have heard a lot and much has been written about what motivates people to buy consumer goods. In an interesting book entitled *Hidden Persuaders*, Vance Packard deals with this matter well. We are told of market research organizations that come up with completely fallacious results (and I believe market research organizations tend to come up with fallacious results when it comes to political forecasts, too). The case that comes to mind is that of light dinner ale and the standard beer brewed at the one brewery. The status advertising was directed towards the light dinner ale and, in a public opinion survey, most people said that they consumed the light dinner ale, when the brewing company knew well that it was brewing far more regular beer than light dinner ale.

This is a matter of motivation. People want and expect to be misled, if that is what is called "misleading advertising", and I do not think it is. Is it misleading to associate status with a certain class of product? If that is so, then much of our advertising campaigning will go down the drain. Someone once said that cars were sold on anything but the mechanical virtues of the vehicle, and I think that is correct. Once again, cars are a tremendous status symbol. Much of the problem is that people do not check carefully the goods they buy or the things said about the things they buy. They believe what they want to believe. I took much advice about this matter from various people in the advertising world. In particular, I received information that I value highly from one of the leading firms in South Australia. A representative said that, while approving the principle of honesty in advertising, the firm doubts very much whether the Bill will have the effect

of curbing unfair and misleading advertising, because the firm believes it is far too loosely drafted, with many loopholes for unscrupulous advertisers. The fact is that the Bill is aimed at unscrupulous advertisers, whom we would all like to curb. This firm approves of the idea of placing a curb on unscrupulous advertisers, but the Bill does not appear capable of doing this.

The Hon. L. J. King: Which organization is this?

Dr. TONKIN: It is a South Australian firm of advertising consultants. The firm believes that the Bill could lead to a spate of frivolous prosecutions. Perhaps we can deal with that problem by requiring a certificate, although I have not heard the Attorney-General's view on this. Nevertheless, the firm points out that it is necessary to know at which section of business the Bill is aimed. Is it intended to be completely general? Who will be responsible for policing the legislation? Will it be policed by the Prices Branch or by a consumer protection body? If it is to be policed, it is important to consider who will monitor all advertising. Will we have another Government department in which someone will do nothing but read newspapers and other publications to see exactly what is misleading and what is not? Will this person take action when he considers a breach of the regulations has been committed? Although I do not know the Attorney-General's point of view yet, I must deal with this because, if prosecutions can develop from complaints submitted by consumers, cranks are likely to complain about everything. Advertisers will complain about one another to score off one another. It has been said that 9 per cent of the population is dissatisfied with any one thing at any one time. Of course, it is not always the same 9 per cent that is dissatisfied with everything. What a wonderful way of getting one's own back, if a person can launch prosecutions under the terms of this Bill against anything that does not take his fancy. Much advertising is based on juxtaposition and variations in emphasis, and it could well be said to be misleading without being malevolent or having any intention to defraud. One is allowed to say that one has the best product in the world. This is called "puffing". I am not sure of the derivation of the term.

We have only to look at real estate advertisements where houses are described in glowing terms. The most fatuous remarks are made, but the extravagance of these advertisements is

taken as a matter of course, and I am sure that people are not misled by the sweeping statements made. This seems to have been accepted by the public. I do not know whether it is a good thing or not. There was an estate agent who a year or so ago shocked everyone by describing the real state of a house. He might have been in the Elizabeth District. He did not last long before he went back to the usual extravagant method of advertising. I still believe that, under this definition, it may be extremely difficult to prove what is misleading, what is false, what seriously intends to defraud, and what comes under the heading of common business practice. Let me give an example of a current advertisement for a certain brand of lemonade that says, "Who put the flavour back in lemonade?"

Mr. Hopgood: Sing it for us.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot remember the tune. The answer to the question is that Cottees put the flavour back in lemonade. Is that advertisement false or misleading? Surely, by definition, it must be false or misleading, because it presumes that somebody had taken the flavour out of lemonade to start with. I must agree with the member for Playford that one or two (not a great number, as he said) of the advertisements by motor car firms are a little dubious.

Mr. Clark: Ninety per cent.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not agree.

Mr. Jennings: Ninety-nine per cent.

Dr. TONKIN: No. Many men in the used car business honestly try to do a good job.

Mr. Jennings: They must be at Oodnadatta.

Dr. TONKIN: Some remarks made are patently untrue. The statement made by one firm that it is giving away \$3,000 is very questionable, but the company would argue that it expects to sell 30 motor cars, on each of which it will give a discount of \$100. Therefore, it is giving away \$3,000. This defence might well be accepted by a court of law. Finance companies regularly advertise on the basis of loans of up to \$2,000 without security. I would like to find them, but I have not done so yet. I think that a bank manager trying to work on those lines would smartly run his bank into bankruptcy. However, if someone seeks to borrow \$2,000 and is offered only \$20, this is not misleading advertising in terms of this Bill, because the advertisements stated "up to," or it was "\$20 to \$2,000." If a person is offered \$20, it is

within the terms of the Bill and is not misleading. That also applies to advertising a product and saying that it will last for 50 years.

Mr. Mathwin: Like the present Government!

Dr. TONKIN: I sincerely hope that the present Government does not last for 50 years. Heaven help South Australia if it does! South Australia will not exist if a Labor Government stays in office for that length of time. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I know that I am out of order in answering an interjection.

Mr. Clark: And what you're saying is unfair advertising.

Dr. TONKIN: Of course, an article may last for 50 years if one locks it up and uses it only once a year, but will this be covered under the terms of this Bill? No, it will not, because it is not false and misleading, under the terms of the Bill. A Kellogg's cornflakes advertisement tells us that a plate of Kellogg's cornflakes, with milk and sugar, provides one-third of the nutriment that the body needs each day. We all know that it is not the cornflakes that provide the nutriment: it is the milk and sugar. However, is the advertisement misleading? I ask that because the statement itself is correct.

Mr. Clark: Have you tried Coco Pops?

Dr. TONKIN: The calorific value of that is higher. At least they have put into the product something that will add to the calorific value. We have dealt with the rental of washing machines. We are also told that it is possible to rent television for \$1 a week, but the advertisement does not state that this is on the basis of a six-year contract and a second-hand set. It is extremely hard to see how this can be challenged as being misleading under this Bill.

We have the old story of the new television set and \$70 in cash for the old set, but the advertiser does not say that he builds the value of the trade-in into the inflated price of the new set and that a person pays for it in the long run, anyway, and has all the additional charges that go with it. However, once again, is this false and misleading advertising? I do not consider that it is, certainly not under the terms of this Bill. I have been told that much of the philosophy of retail selling is based on selling up. This is based on advertising one or two lines and, when people get to the store, they find that there were only one or two items available and they have to buy something else.

Mr. Clark: And they were never there.

Dr. TONKIN: That is right. I agree with the member for Elizabeth, for the first time in this debate. The only requirement under the Prices Act is that the retailer must have one of the line advertised, and the fact that it is defective or not what the customer expected is not really an offence, provided that the advertisement is worded correctly. Once again, advertisements of this kind are not misleading advertising. There is nothing ethically wrong with this: it is a commonly accepted practice, but I consider that it is in some ways misleading, but not misleading under the terms of the Bill.

Of course, there is the odd sort of statement that a certain brand of soap can make you a little lovelier every day. I am not speaking of you personally, Mr. Speaker, but the wording of the advertisement is that the soap will make a person a little lovelier every day. Once again, this is obviously misleading but the consumer, the average woman, wants to feel a little lovelier every day and she will happily buy the soap and use it, not believing that that will happen, but as part of the daydream, hoping that it may happen. The point is as follows: is this misleading advertising, unfair advertising? It may be misleading. I defer to the member for Davenport and the member for Tea Tree Gully in this matter. Such advertising may be misleading, but I do not think it is unfair in terms of this legislation. In fact, I think women would be unhappy if this sort of advertising were dropped, for it would take away some of the glamour and lift that they need every day.

Mr. Clark: I can tell you where you can get some cheap razor blades.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: In this case, I think they are definitely out of order, and it would certainly be out of order if I replied to them, although I am sorely tempted to do so. I think another item deserves investigation: a thing called a "black box" is on sale in South Australia, having all sorts of interesting currents and circuits in it, and it cures almost anything, I understand, depending on the way in which the current is applied. It is said to cure rheumatism, arthritis and kidney stones; you name it, Mr. Speaker, and this black box will cure it. No-one advertises this machine: it simply comes out with a little booklet of extracts from testimonials, saying what a wonderful black box it is. Is this unfair advertising under the legislation? It

is probably quite legitimate. The letters are there to be read, and it says that the originals can be inspected. Can this legislation get at those people who are selling the black box at great profit?

Mr. Clark: Is it any good?

Dr. TONKIN: Many people will sometimes turn to these methods, and in most cases they are sadly misled; they pay much money, and this causes hardship. Indeed, many people lose time in obtaining medical attention when, in fact, that wasted time might have resulted in a cure. This is a serious matter, and that is why we as a profession do not like this sort of thing. I think it is fairly obvious to all members that I am not really convinced that this legislation will work. It will require the wisdom of Solomon (without the carpets) to decide whether or not something is false and misleading, whether it is a slight exaggeration, or whether it is normal advertising licence. I doubt whether magistrates (in courts of summary jurisdiction certainly) would have the knowledge or experience, no matter how much they wished, to adjudicate fairly.

If the legislation is carried to its logical conclusion, think of the complete shambles that would arise if a gardener, who advertised in a suburban newspaper that he would cut lawns for \$3, charged \$4, saying that the job, when he got there, was a little bigger than the usual. Under the Prices Act, the customer may complain to the Prices Commissioner and possibly recover the extra \$1 if he wishes to observe the letter of the law but under this legislation, if the gardener charged \$4 instead of the \$3 that he said he would charge, he would be liable for a summary fine of \$1,000! The member for Playford said that \$1,000 is nothing to a business concern. Although I cannot remember his exact words, I think he said this was not too large for the business community. Of course, that is one point of view, but will this legislation apply only to large business concerns, or will it apply to all members of the community? I presume it will apply to all. If someone inadvertently puts an advertisement in the paper for the private sale of a car or household goods and by some mischance misstates a detail, is he liable for a fine of \$1,000? This is where I think we must have an assurance from the Attorney-General that prosecutions will be launched only on his certificate. I think we should go further. I think he should have an advisory committee to turn

to in cases where there is any doubt about the interpretation of what has been done. I do not seriously believe that the average man will be fined \$1,000, at least I hope not, and I do not think that that is the Bill's intention. The legislation, which is full of good intentions, is aimed at stopping people who advertise with intent to defraud. From that point of view, I think the intent is good, but it is far too loosely drafted and will not pick up every possible case. Many people in the advertising media already police this matter very well; they have high ethical standards, but one or two doubtful instances slide through.

The Attorney may remember my asking a question on royal jelly earlier in this session, and there was an assurance from the newspaper concerned that it had slipped through and would not occur again. This was an unintentional error. Will the newspaper be liable for that sort of thing? We have been told that this will not be the case. I hope, too, that the agents will not be liable. Perhaps they should say to the advertiser, "No, we cannot accept that." It would certainly be part of their good relations. I think that most advertising agencies discourage their clients from indulging in unfair advertising, as most reputable agencies have a fine reputation which they wish to keep. There is already a built-in protection in the present state of affairs. Of course, there is the advertiser who does not make his product fully known to the agent and once again he could be in trouble. The Bill should be tightened up and worded more adequately. It should ensure that the deposit and the weekly commitments are spelt out, and the advertisement should state the total price of the goods, not only the weekly payments. If there are less than a certain number of goods in stock, the advertiser should be required to state that there are only 10 or two, or whatever the number may be.

Gift offers should be qualified with a statement from where the gift has come and how it has been arrived at. There should be some reference not only to the way advertisements are worded but are put down on paper. A great deal depends on the size of the type and the lay-out. The weekly payment could be set out as "50c weekly" in 72-point type, and the interest, the total cost, etc., set out in five-point type, which is the kind of type usually found at the bottom of contracts, where people find it difficult to read easily. Much consideration could be given to this aspect of the Bill. I think an advisory com-

mittee, consisting of representatives of the advertising agencies, perhaps the media, and representatives of the public, should be appointed to advise the Attorney-General. I know he does not often need advice and I give him full credit for being able to determine points of law; but certainly under the Act there will be so many difficulties in interpretation that he will need help in many cases.

I have already said that magistrates could find the whole problem difficult, and have covered the ground of who lays the prosecution. I, and members of the advertising industry in this State, think that the phrasing of the Bill is fatuous and is inspired by a sense of do-gooding, but I am the last person who would run down the Rogerson report. I believe that that report was prepared by people who wanted to do some good, but the whole thing has got out of touch with reality. I agree with what the A.A.N.A. has said in its submission and with the A.A.A., the association that agrees with the Attorney and the Premier that the Bill is a good thing. I remind honourable members of what it said:

Although our members are strongly devoted to the principle of truth in advertising, we would have you know that our support of, and belief in, this principle does not prejudice in any way the often expressed view of the association that misleading or unfair advertising is best controlled by the advertising industry itself.

The Attorney would do this House and the people of South Australia a great service if he withdrew the Bill, had another look at it and re-presented it in a more acceptable form. I am not opposed to the principle (I think consumers must be protected) but I do not like this Bill. It has been drawn up perhaps rapidly and certainly without any deep thought being given to the objects it is allegedly setting out to achieve.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): It is a great pleasure to hear the member for Bragg conclude his address. It was most unusual on this occasion to hear him muttering in his beard. We have seen him muttering in his beard before he had a beard. It is much more in character now that he has a beard to mutter into. There has been a fair amount of wavering, because this legislation at one stage was too tight and at another time too loose. It alternated from one to the other all the way through the honourable member's speech. However, it is not the member for Bragg that I want to talk about tonight: I want to talk about the Bill itself, which I support because, as its title

suggests, it is designed to prohibit or discourage unfair advertising. It is with great relish that I support the measure.

The advertising that we see today is more offensive than we are told *Oh! Calcutta!* is. It is blatantly unfair and more inflationary than Gorton. In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the code of ethics that was mentioned considerably by the member for Playford. I shall have something to say about that later. The Leader said that the legislation was insulting to businessmen who were quite capable of conducting their own affairs in advertising. He then referred to a circular, which we have all received and which the member for Playford and the member for Bragg have referred to, from the Australian Association of National Advertisers. The contents of the letter were as insulting to our intelligence as the advertisements in the newspapers and on radio and television are insulting to the consuming public. Let us examine the commodities which must surely be amongst the most highly advertised, and I refer, fairly obviously, to detergents. When I began inquiring about the number available, I thought that probably 25 would be the outside limit, but I am told by an authority on the subject that there are continuously on the market in South Australia no fewer than 40 to 50 brands. My authority cannot give an accurate figure, because at any time some brands are fading away and others are coming on to the market.

Mr. Clark: Some are the same thing.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course, they are the same thing under a different name. There is 25,000cwt. used each year in South Australia, all but 1 per cent of which is bought from other States in bulk. In some cases additives are blended, the product is packaged under various names, and sold perhaps at different prices, in each case with a costly advertising build-up. One of my colleagues says that in some cases lemons are added and I suppose that would make the product a little dearer. Some firms do not even bother to add lemons, as they have a little ante-room which is near the laundry and which is full of lemons; these lemons break out of the door. This costly advertising is built up to persuade the consumer that one product is better than another, although all products are virtually the same.

Mr. Clark: It's all paid for by the consumer.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and it adds about 7 per cent direct to the cost of the product.

Mr. Coumbe: They all finish up in the same place.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, down the drain. It is the petrol issue all over again. Petrol comes here in the same tanker, perhaps has some additives blended, and is sold under various brand names. Of the 99 per cent of the detergents used in South Australia that are imported, Unilever Australia Proprietary Limited owns 45 per cent, Colgate Palmolive Proprietary Limited owns 45 per cent, Imperial Chemical Industries owns 5 per cent, and the other companies own 4 per cent between them.

Mr. Clark: They're all whiter than white.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and some are brighter. One of the most astonishing things in history is that all these brands, which are perfect when they originate, keep on being constantly improved. This is the only case where improvement can continue to be made to perfection. Something is added, or some scientific name is introduced—"X7" or "intensified". In fact, we are now seeing the war of the enzymes. A short while ago everything had to have enzymes in it. Now, in the United States of America enzymes are not so respectable as was at first thought, and a couple of detergent manufacturers are already advertising that their products do not contain enzymes. It will not be long now before none of them has enzymes.

This enzyme problem arose in the United Kingdom at least 18 months ago, when it was found that enzymes had a deleterious effect. However, presumably there were too many packages of soap powder with "enzymes" stamped on them, so the deleterious effect of enzymes was hidden; but, now that the stocks are running out, we find from the U.S.A. that enzymes are not as popular as they used to be. We had the same problem with chlorophyll some time ago. One toothpaste manufacturer started off with chlorophyll, then another used it, and it was not too long before every brand of toothpaste had chlorophyll in it. Later, one manufacturer became a little tired of the sameness of all this; he started advertising that his product did not have chlorophyll in it, and it was not too long before every toothpaste was advertised as not containing chlorophyll, something which a few months before was claimed to be essential if a person wanted to get his teeth clean.

Mr. Coumbe: Was that unfair advertising?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, since we had to pay an extra 7 per cent for it. Now, we read about a toothpaste that has cleansing

particles in the foam with rounded edges so that, when a person brushes his teeth with the foam, the cleansing particles, being rounded, will not abrade the tooth enamel. All I can say is, "Thank the Lord for fluoride." One advertisement says that people can wash clothes as efficiently in cold water as in hot water, which is something that every bachelor knew years ago. However, after one detergent manufacturer broke through the barrier of washing in cold water, it was not too long (after a little bit of skirmishing and a few family squabbles with the husband talking about grey shirts that should have been white) before this was accepted. Now we are told that every kind of soap powder will wash as well and as effectively in hot water and cold water alike. Then, there is another one, the good old Velvet. The dear old lady comes on television and tells us how she always uses Velvet soap "because it does not have any of those detergents in it".

Before our friend the member for Bragg leaves the Chamber, I think he should find out what the ethics of the medical profession are about what I am about to say. The announcer then comes on and says, "More doctors recommend Velvet than any other soap." Now, we know very well that no doctor recommends any soap, any detergent, or anything of this kind, so that, Sir, is definitely misleading advertising, but this Australian Association of National Advertisers does not mention that in the circular it has sent us. I suppose that if the Speaker or the officers at the table are wearing their ceremonial gloves, which become them so well, and they drop one in the mud or take it home to do some gardening in it, they only have to use Ajax 2. It must be Ajax 2, mind you; of course, I do not think there is any Ajax 1, but if one uses Ajax 2 on the dirty gloves one can turn up here at the next opening of Parliament in those ceremonial gloves and one would not know which one had been dropped in the mud.

Talking about the code of ethics (I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition would know anything about ethics), the member for Bragg was talking a short time ago about ethics according to the circular that we received from the Australian Association of National Advertisers, which stated that it could control its own industry much more effectively than could any legislation. Let me remind the House that only recently the Chamber of Automotive Industries of South Australia promulgated a code of ethics for the advertising and selling of secondhand cars. For the benefit of the

House, I will read a few of the instructions that the chamber would like its members to adhere to when they are advertising second-hand cars. The code contains instructions, including the following:

Under-selling claims are viewed as not in the public interest and should not be used, because it is obvious that no advertiser can be fully informed about every competitor's prices at all times. This pertains to such statements as "Our prices are guaranteed lower than elsewhere"; "Money refunded if you can duplicate our values"; "We will give \$300 more in trade than any other dealer."

These are the claims that we see every day in the press, and these are the ethics that the chamber wants its members to subscribe to. However, we know that they have not subscribed to them; they have not even given lip service to them. Another instruction relates to the statement "Name your own deal" and is as follows:

Statements such as "Write your own deal"; "Name your own price"; "Name your own monthly payments"; etc., are obviously deceptive, impossible of fulfilment and must not be used.

Another instruction is as follows:

Competitive claims: Advertisers engaged in the sale of automobiles shall advertise their cars and service on merit and refrain from attacking or disparaging competitors. Disparagement invites retaliation and its ultimate effect is to reflect unfavourably on the entire industry. Disparaging comparisons with other advertisers' services, quality, price, produce, or business methods shall not be used.

Mr. Harrison: It can't have too many members taking notice of those instructions.

Mr. JENNINGS: Obviously, its members are not taking notice of the instructions.

Mr. Clark: This is an example of how well it can police these things.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is an example of how well general advertising would be policed if we left it to this circular that we have all received. The instructions continue:

Layout: The layout, headlines, illustrations and/or type size of an advertisement shall not convey nor permit an erroneous impression as to which automobile or automobiles are offered at featured prices or terms. When prices, terms, down payments, trade-in allowances, cash differences, savings claims, etc., are featured such other amounts, qualifications and phrases as are necessary to disclose the true nature of the offer shall also appear.

Further on it says:

Such statements as "As low as", "From", etc., should not be used in connection with a price unless an automobile or automobiles are available for each of the years, makes, models

and types named in conjunction with "As low as" price quoted. Such statements as "At cost", "Below cost", "Below invoice", etc., shall be construed literally; that is "cost" being the actual cost to the advertiser for the automobile or automobiles offered.

Then there is an instruction on "Down payment" as follows:

The amount of the down payment shall not be stated in such a manner as to permit the impression it is the selling price of the automobile. The statement "No deposit" or other of similar import shall mean that the advertiser will deliver the automobiles so described to the purchaser without payment of any nature or without a trade-in.

That code of ethics was produced as late as June, 1970, yet we see a full page of advertising in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, February 24, as follows:

Big Bob's Bathtub Bonanza! Save \$100 for any old bathtub as a trade-in whether you trade in a car as well or not.

How does that fit in with the code of ethics that I have read? There is another one, a full page advertisement in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, February 13—the same gentleman who, I understand, is prominent in local television and radio performances, although I have not had the pleasure of his acquaintance. The advertisement states:

I'm putting on a birthday party. Free drinks, barbecue, merry-go-round, fairy floss, balloons, cakes, etc.

Later on, we found that there were cars there as well. The advertisement also states, "A car for mum as well!". An advertisement in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, February 6, states:

Wild West week finishes today at Para Motors. Me heap big chief last day. This is your last chance. I have got \$200, \$300, and even more off prices just for the day. If you wantum big good deal, you getum today. Free steaks, sausages, cakes and cool drinks, and I have a bit of fire-water for dad, too. Pony rides for papooses. Have a pow wow over the barbecue.

Surely this is offensive to anyone's intelligence, and surely the cost of this advertising is added to the cost of the product intended to be purchased—or which otherwise would have been purchased. The Leader of the Opposition

claimed that there was no demand for this type of legislation. However, it is a peculiar thing that the very week he made his speech Queensland started a Consumer Affairs Branch and it had 460 complaints in the first two days. Many of those complaints were investigated and found to be genuine, and as a result many people had their problems rectified.

This legislation is necessary because it will help provide much fairer advertising in this State. As a consequence, it will reduce unnecessary inflation of the nature of the Gorton Budget, which brought in direct price increases. It will mean that people will go along and buy what is advertised without being misled, as they frequently are today. It is foolish for the member for Bragg to say, as he did say, that many people who read advertisements accept the extravagances as something they expect. I have had come to me many people who have bought cars or, in some cases, houses from companies that advertise frequently, and they have been completely taken down. They have said to me, "We did not think that this company would take us down, because it advertises so much." One person bought a car from Ellers. He was a migrant of the type of the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: A good type!

Mr. JENNINGS: He was better than most, anyway. He said, "I did not think that Ellers would take me down; they advertise so much." I replied, "What! They are even more crooked than the Liberal Party." He said, "Surely they could not be that bad." I replied, "Perhaps not quite that bad, but they are bad enough." Such people do take notice of extensive advertising. This Bill is one way in which we can protect them, to some extent anyway.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 3, at 2 p.m.