HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PETITION: NARACOORTE ABATTOIR

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 10 residents of Naracoorte and district. The petitioners prayed that the Government would direct the Minister of Agriculture to grant a licence to South-East Meats Australia Proprietary Limited to enable an export abattoir to be established at Naracoorte and to allow a reasonable proportion of the meat processed at such abattoir to be sent to the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

GROWTH TAX

Mr. HALL: Is the Treasurer aware of what the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer may have in mind in connection with reports that a growth tax may be offered to the State Administrations in Australia? If he is aware of this, is he also aware of the implications that this may have regarding the smaller States? Following the appointment of a new Prime Minister and a reshuffle in Cabinet ranks, there have been consistent reports that a growth tax may be offered to the States to help them in their present financial problems. If the States are offered a growth tax based on some resource within their own borders, it will affect the inherent advantage built into the present financial reimbursement scheme, whereby the smaller States receive a much larger per capita share of Australia's resources disbursed in this way, and this type of subsidy will not be available to the smaller States if they begin to rely increasingly on a growth tax of their own. In regard to that part of the States' revenue based on a growth tax, they would have an in-built subsidy, in effect, from the larger States (Victoria and New South Wales). At previous discussions between the smaller States, it has always been a matter of great concern that the Commonwealth Government may offer a growth tax, without there being an in-built subsidy in respect of the smaller States.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been told officially or, indeed, unofficially what is to be proposed in Canberra next Monday. I have heard rumours, but they are only rumours and, in consequence, I do not want to detail or comment on them. Concerning the Leader's question about the implication to the smaller States of the growth tax, I am well aware of the in-built advantages to the smaller States. This has been a lessening advantage in recent times to South Australia because of alterations in the formula; but it is still an in-built advantage to the smaller States of the reimbursement formula. If we are to rely on our own tax base, this in itself means some lessening of advantage to us and to similar smaller States. However, we are now a claimant State on the Grants Commission and, in fact, an advantage from the growth tax based on New South Wales and Victoria is, concerning the Grants Commission, likely to give significant advantages to South Australia and Tasmania. Therefore, at this stage of proceedings, if the States are offered a growth tax, I am not going to look a growth tax in the mouth (if, Mr. Speaker, you will excuse my mixed metaphor). The effects on the revenue of the State of any of the conceivable proposals of the Commonwealth Government have been looked at in some detail by the State Government in order to see where our greatest advantage lies. I can assure the Leader that the Under Treasurer has been working on this score over a considerable period, reports having already been made to Cabinet about the prospects South Australia could face on several alternative bases.

SPECIAL MAGISTRATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether he or the Government has come to any conclusion in the last couple of weeks about the status of the magistrates with regard to their being taken out of the Public Service? About two weeks ago I asked the Attorney-General a question about the matter, telling him, as I expect he knew, that when we were in office the question of taking the magistrates out of the Public Service was broached and I considered it, although I made no recommendation to Cabinet. I know the matter has been raised again by the magistrates, and I referred to that also in asking the Attorney my question. In his reply, he said that there was some division

of opinion among the magistrates. Since his reply has become known to the magistrates, I have been informed from two separate sources within the magistracy that this is quite inaccurate and that the unanimous wish of the magistrates, expressed I think at a meeting of magistrates, was that this change should take place. When the Attorney answered my earlier question, he said that the matter was being considered. I ask him whether since then he has been able to come to any conclusion, having had conveyed to him, I have no doubt, that the unanimous wish of magistrates is that this change should take place.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The observation I made in answering the honourable member's question a fortnight ago as to opinions entertained by magistrates was based on opinions that had been expressed to me in times past by certain magistrates. Since answering that question, I have had from the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate a communication from which I gather that there is now no difference of opinion among magistrates on this question. At least that resolves one of the problems associated with the matter. No decision has yet been made.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Local Government give me information about the Government's policy with regard to the Local Government Act? During the next session, will the Minister bring in a Bill to amend the Local Government Act to give effect to those matters, other than the franchise question, that were contained in the previous Bill, which was rejected by another place? Will the Minister give this information without going over the same ground that he dealt with at some length yesterday? In other words, is he prepared to bring in a Bill next session that will include matters, other than the franchise provisions, which were contained in the Bill previously introduced and which were recommended by the Local Government Act Revision Committee?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has thrown me into some confusion because he has referred to matters recommended by the Local Government Act Revision Committee in its report. One of these matters was that local government should have the power to choose, electors having the right to require a poll to determine whether compulsory or voluntary voting would apply in the council area. Secondly, the committee stated that the existing multiple voting system for companies was unfair and recommended that it be reduced. Thirdly, the committee recommended that the existing franchise was far too restrictive and should be extended, at least to the wives of persons who rent properties. All these matters were included in the Bill, together with many others, some of which I referred to yesterday. I repeat that I regret sincerely that the Legislative Council rejected out of hand the opportunity for local government to enter the welfare field.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry that the member for Torrens cannot hear me because of the interjections by his colleague the member for Mitcham, and I hope that, out of respect for his colleague, the member for Mitcham will restrain himself. I regret sincerely that, in particular, councils have been denied the opportunity to enter the welfare field. I cannot say why the Legislative Council rejected the Bill. All I know is that the Council rejected the Bill in its entirety.

Mr. Millhouse: And therefore—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Bill was capable of being amended, had the Legislative Council sought to do so, because, as the Leader of the Opposition in the other place said, some provisions were important and deserved serious consideration. He said that, or words to that effect. Unfortunately, the Council, in its wisdom, chose to throw out the whole Bill. I repeat my statement of Friday and yesterday that, if the Government can get an assurance that the Legislative Council is willing to give proper consideration to the Bill and that the Bill has a reasonable chance of being carried (I do not want an unqualified assurance that the Council will carry the Bill: it has the constitutional right to consider it), I shall be willing to discuss with Cabinet—

Mr. Coumbe: Would you introduce a Bill without the franchise provisions?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought I had made plain that the Legislative Council did not throw out only the franchise provisions. It did not throw the Bill out merely because of that (if it did, it did not say so). The Council threw out the whole Bill. Until I know what the Council's attitude will be in future, I can do little. However, if members opposite are willing to use their good offices with their colleagues in the other place and give us some form of assurance that a Bill, if

reintroduced, would be given proper consideration, I shall be willing to discuss the matter with Cabinet from the point of view of again introducing a Bill to amend the Local Government Act.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister say directly whether he will introduce a Bill dealing with those matters relating to social welfare and local councils? I ask leave—

The SPEAKER: Order! As the question is similar to the one asked by the member for Torrens, it is not in order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although this question may have been asked, certain facts were not raised in the explanation on which I should now like to elaborate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot permit the same question to be asked twice, because it is not permissible.

STRATHALBYN RAILWAY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about freight and passengers carried on the Strathalbyn railway line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have details of the freight and passengers carried on the Adelaide to Strathalbyn line, as requested by the honourable member, but, as the information comprises many figures, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

STRATHALBYN RAILWAY STATISTICS

Goods Traffic

	Eight months period from July 1, 1969, to February 28, 1970		Eight months period from July 1, 1970, to February 28, 1971	
	Tons	Revenue	Tons	Revenue
		$		$
Inward	2,439	6,977	*3,735	*15,568
Outward	4,112	17,235	5,890	18,221

* Increase in revenue in comparison with corresponding period of previous financial year is due to the fact that Laucke flour mills obtained grain for milling purposes from long-haul points in the Murray Mallee area.

The month of February figures for the current financial year are not yet available and the above-listed tonnage and revenue in respect of the period from July 1, 1970, to February 28, 1971, were arrived at as follows:

	Inward available figures for seven months from July 1, 1970, to January 31, 1971		Outward available figures for seven months from July 1, 1970, to January 31, 1971	
	Tons	Revenue	Tons	Revenue
		$		$
	3,268	13,622	5,154	15,943
Plus monthly average	467	1,946	736	2,278
Eight months total	3,735	15,568	5,890	18,221

Passenger Journeys and Revenue Account, Strathalbyn

	Eight months period from July 1, 1969, to February 28, 1970 Journeys	Eight months period from July 1, 1970, to February 28, 1971 Journeys	Total Revenue $
Inward	886	902	1,475
Outward	847	821	1,638

Special Trains, Strathalbyn Line, including Victor Harbour

	Number of special trains
Financial year July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970	44
Eight months from July 1, 1969, to February 28, 1970	38
Eight months from July 1, 1970, to February 28, 1971	39

MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made about plans for open-space teaching units at the Murray Bridge Primary School? Over two years ago plans were drawn up and it was expected that building would commence, but the plans were then withdrawn because it was decided that an open-space unit would probably be more desirable to meet the situation. I believe that these plans have been redrawn, and discussed on the site by school staff and departmental officers at least once if not twice, but, as some time has elapsed and no progress has been made, I ask the Minister to obtain a report.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I imagine that either a four-teacher unit or a six-teacher unit will be used at this school, I cannot say what is the position concerning this project. I will investigate this matter and obtain a report for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether it is intended, in the case of industrial development which requires and which would benefit from an adequate road system, that liaison can be expected between the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department and the Highways Department? From time to time industrial development projects in relatively remote country areas would be hampered by an inadequate road system. Although the Premier has indicated that he desires to see industrial development take place, proper development would be enhanced by making special funds available to construct adequate roads to some of these remote sites.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Co-ordination does exist. As it is considered that the provision of roads is an essential condition of industrial development, the necessary contact is made with the Highways Department, and discussions ensue on the way roads may be provided. In some cases, we find this possible, and in other cases we do not; it just depends on the circumstances. However, I assure the honourable member that, if any question of providing roads arises in relation to industrial development (or providing railways for that matter), it is immediately taken up with the appropriate department. We have been able in relation to several cases of industrial development to provide both roads and railways.

STIRLING EAST SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education say when a meeting between an officer of the Education Department and members of the Stirling East Primary School Committee will be held to discuss the problems at that school, and will he also inform me of the result of that meeting? Today I received a letter dated March 30, stating that Mr. Kearney of the Education Department had requested a meeting between the committee and an officer of his department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it was made clear in the letter that the school committee was expected to contact the department and to fix a date and time for the meeting. The honourable member may not be aware that Mr. Kearney is overseas for two or three months, and that is the reason why any meeting would have to be between the school committee and an officer other than Mr. Kearney. I will check on the details for the honourable member and ensure that he is kept informed on the matter.

STRATHMONT CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ascertain why His Worship the Mayor of Enfield was not invited to join the official party at the recent opening of the Strathmont Centre? Although first citizen of the Enfield district, in which the Strathmont Centre is situated, His Worship was not included either on the stage or in the official party at the opening ceremony, and I submit that his exclusion was a definite breach of etiquette.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to the Chief Secretary and obtain a reply.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. BECKER: Following the reported success of negotiations initiated by the previous Liberal Government concerning the sale to N.S.W. of natural gas produced in South Australia, I ask the Premier whether the sale contract has been completed, whether he has details of the price to be paid by New South Wales, how the price compares with that paid in South Australia and Victoria, and whether he has any other information that may be of interest to members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I presume that the honourable member was joking when he said that these negotiations were initiated by the previous Government, because they were not. In fact, negotiations had commenced in relation to some sale of gas, and had then been completely suspended.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What he said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The negotiations were suspended, simply because at that time there were no reserves which could be proved and which could form a basis of a supply to New South Wales. That was clear, and no negotiations were taking place at the time this Government took office.

Mr. Millhouse: The implication—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Negotiations, which commenced after this Government took office and after the proving of additional supplies, proceeded on an entirely new basis. Although the contract has not yet been concluded, the main heads have been agreed on. I cannot reveal to the honourable member anything more about the price than has already been publicly revealed, simply because that is a matter between the producers and the consumers. I assure the honourable member that the price to South Australian consumers will remain lower than the price anywhere else in Australia and that the price of supply from South Australia to New South Wales is significantly lower than the price quoted for gas supplied from Victoria.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SITTINGS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement about the sittings of the House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because of the state of the Notice Paper and the fact that we have much business to get through before the end of the session, I ask members to make themselves available for a sitting of the House tomorrow evening.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VOTING AGE)

(Continued from March 30. Page 4462.)

At 2.31 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 7.57 p.m. The recommendations were as follows:

As to amendment No. 1:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist thereon.

As to amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 2, page 1, line 11—Leave out the words "a day to be fixed by proclamation." and insert in lieu thereof the words "the thirtieth day of June, 1972, or such earlier day as is fixed by proclamation after the Governor is satisfied that legislation has been enacted by the Parliament of the Commonwealth providing that the age at which persons shall become entitled to vote at elections for the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth shall be eighteen years, and that legislation is in operation."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist thereon.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

Two substantial amendments proposed by the Legislative Council were disagreed to by this Chamber and insisted on by the Legislative Council. One amendment made the voting age of 18 years dependent upon a similar provision being passed by the Commonwealth Parliament regarding elections for the House of Representatives, and the second provided for voluntary voting for electors between the ages of 18 years and 21 years. At the conference the managers for the Legislative Council agreed not to insist on the voluntary voting provision, and a compromise was reached on the other amendment on the basis that the voting age of 18 years would come into operation on June 30, 1972, or on such earlier date as the Commonwealth Parliament might provide for a voting age of 18 years for House of Representative elections.

The thinking behind the compromise shows that the Council placed great emphasis upon the desirability of uniformity, and the managers for this Chamber, acting upon what I think was the majority view of this Chamber, placed great emphasis not only on the desirability of having a voting age of 18 years but also on the fact that this was a matter of South Australian law, that it was to apply to South Australian elections, and, therefore, that it should be determined by the South Australian Parliament and should not depend upon what was enacted in the Commonwealth Parliament relating to Commonwealth elections. The compromise arrived at conceded something to both points of view, as it provided more than 12 months for the Commonwealth Parliament to have the opportunity to enact the legislation

so that, if it is done in that time, there will be uniformity when it comes into operation in South Australia. On the other hand, the compromise has ensured that, on the assumption that the present State Parliament runs its normal course, the new voting age will be operative for the next State election.

Motion carried.

BUILDING BILL

(Continued from March 30. Page 4461.)

At 2.31 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 7.58 p.m. The recommendations were as follows:

As to amendments Nos. 1, 2 and 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 5, page 2—After line 34 insert new subsection as follows:

(2*a*) Where a council by which a petition may be presented under this subsection presents a petition to the Governor that a proclamation be made modifying the operation of this Act under subsection (2) of this section in a manner specified in the petition, a proclamation shall be made modifying the operation of this Act in accordance with the petition of the council.

(2*b*) A petition may be presented under subsection (2*a*) of this section by a council to the area of which, or any portion of the area of which, the repealed Act did not, immediately before the commencement of this Act, apply.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 4, 5 and 8:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

As to amendments Nos. 10 and 11:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 9, page 7—Lines 4 to 7—Leave out all words in subclause (7) after the word "refusal' in line 4.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 16 and 17:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments and make the following further amendment to clause 13 of the Bill:

Clause 13, page 8—After line 28 insert subclauses as follows:

(1*a*) The council may assign to any building erected before the commencement of this Act a classification that conforms with the regulations.

(1*b*) Where the council assigns a classification under subsection (1*a*) of this section, the council shall give notice in writing to the owner of the building to which the classification has been assigned, of the classification assigned to the building.

(1*c*) A classification shall not be assigned to a building erected before the commencement of this Act if as a result of the classification being assigned to the building, the building could not continue to be used for a purpose for which it was lawfully being used before assignment of the classification.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 20 and 25:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to amendment No. 24:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendment but make the following further amendment to clause 27 of the Bill:

Clause 27, page 13, line 18—Leave out "heard and".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 37:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendment but make the following amendment to the Bill:

Page 22—The following clause is inserted after line 34—

51. (1) Except as provided in this section, this Act does not bind the Crown.

(2) Where a building is to be erected by or on behalf of the Crown in the area of a council, a notice shall, before the erection of the building is commenced, be sent to the council notifying the council of the fact that the building is to be erected.

(3) The council shall, in addition, be supplied with a plan delineating the site of the proposed building and the position of the building in relation to the site.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The eight separate matters that had been in dispute between this Chamber and the Legislative Council were resolved to the satisfaction of the managers for both places. Unless honourable members desire me to deal with the amendments again, I will not do more than express the appreciation to the managers for this Chamber for their co-operation during the meeting with the managers of the Legislative Council.

Mr. COUMBE: I believe that the result of the conference is satisfactory not only to both Chambers but also particularly to the people of this State. In respect of the first amendment, concerning which the Legislative Council insisted on its disagreement, a compromise was reached, so that councils part of whose areas are not covered by the Building Act will have a right to petition the Government and to initiate matters themselves. In respect

of amendment No. 37, which was an interesting amendment, councils will now benefit to the extent that, where a building is to be erected by or on behalf of the Crown, a notice shall be sent to the council concerned notifying it of that fact, and the council, in addition, will be supplied with plans giving details of the siting of the proposed building. As I have said, I believe the outcome of the conference is satisfactory, and I commend the managers for their work.

Motion carried.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the several sums for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government for expenditure during the year ending June 30, 1971.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I take this opportunity to speak for only a few minutes about a matter that is of great concern to me: I refer to the credibility of the statements that Ministers are making and the reflection that that makes upon the Ministers. This House and the public are becoming used to statements emanating from the Government front bench that are either not correct or framed in such a way as to mislead the public, even though the statements may be technically correct.

In this regard, I will mention three or four items. Yesterday I finalized some questions about expenditure on education and the increase in that expenditure this year compared to expenditure last year. My questions concerned the percentage increase in relation to statements by Ministers, and I want to draw attention to conflicting statements by two Ministers. I refer to the Treasurer's letter addressed, "Dear Friend." I do not know how many dear friends he has written to but I understand that the letter has circulated fairly widely in South Australia. I hasten to add that it has been distributed at the Treasurer's own expense, not at the expense of the Government.

The Treasurer claimed in that letter that a 15 per cent increase in education expenditure had been budgeted by this Government. His words were, "A 15 per cent increase in education expenditure." The figure happens to be correct, and I compliment the Treasurer on using a correct figure at least in that item in his letter to his dear friend. However, yesterday I drew attention to a circular dated February 27 which was sent by the Attorney-General to his constituents and which was headed "Parliament House, North Terrace, Adelaide." In that circular the Attorney-General mentioned a different figure; he said:

The Labor Government's Budget provided for an increase of 23 per cent over last year's provision for education.

He claimed a figure of 23 per cent, which was 8 per cent more than the Treasurer had claimed as the increased expenditure in education; in other words, half as much again. The Attorney-General has been quite clever about this, and members of the public who have a limited knowledge of Government budgeting procedures are easily misled when they are given such figures as these, which are technically correct but actually wrong. Let us consider what the Attorney-General did. I know that the Deputy Premier is quibbling about my words, but if he listens he will find out what I am speaking about. Last year, which was the last year of the Liberal and Country League Government's term of office, a figure was budgeted for education that was greatly exceeded: the budgeted amount for education in total, which includes the various votes under the education system, was $76,900,000, and the actual expenditure was $82,100,000. For the specific line "Education", the budgeted figure was $60,700,000 and the expenditure $65,100,000. The budgeted increase was 10.8 per cent, although the actual increase was 18.9 per cent on that line. However, in the lines that counted, the percentage increase was 18.9 per cent for "Education" and 14.5 per cent for "Miscellaneous". The Attorney-General has taken this limited two-line comparison, which is totally inadequate to explain the complications of a Budget, and, therefore, one must assume that he is trying to give an overall picture to the community of the increase planned to be spent this year over what was spent last year. His claim was that there had been an increase of 23 per cent, but he has taken the budgeted figure for this year's increase by the Government and applied it to the budgeted increase last year, ignoring last year's actual expenditure. From this simple explanation the public would think that the Labor Government this year would spend 23 per cent more than the

Liberal and Country League Government spent last year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That would be right.

Mr. HALL: It is completely wrong. Yesterday the Minister gave me figures indicating that the increase could be as much as 19 per cent this year—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, 22 per cent.

Mr. HALL: —on known figures. The Minister is not telling the truth.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am.

Mr. HALL: All known increases this year add up to a figure that does not exceed 19 per cent, and the Minister knows that the comparisons with which we are dealing do not include the figures that bring it to 19 per cent. The Attorney-General was dealing with figures available as at February 27, and this comparison has nothing to do with the figures supplied by the Minister of Education. The ploy I am exposing is that the Attorney-General is using—the Treasurer need not laugh, because he was not smart enough to use it, so that he need not feel so pleased about it. His figure was 15 per cent.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you admitting he is smart?

Mr. HALL: The Attorney-General is smarter than the Treasurer, and he has demonstrated this by producing an increase of 23 per cent, but ignoring the actual expenditure last year. These are the comparisons: the entire education list, comprising "Minister of Education", "Education", "Libraries", "Museum", "Art Gallery", and "Miscellaneous", shows an increase over the proposed expenditure of 24.1 per cent, whilst the increase over the actual expenditure was 16.2 per cent. That 16.2 per cent applies also to the two categories "Education" and "Miscellaneous", which were selected by the Attorney-General, in which the increase over the proposed expenditure was 24.2 per cent and the increase over the actual expenditure was 16.2 per cent. It was the 16.2 per cent figure that the Attorney should have used if he intended to give factual information to the public. The three lines "Minister of Education", "Education", and "Miscellaneous" also had a 16.2 per cent increase in actual expenditure and a 24.8 increase in proposed expenditure, and the "Education" line plus tertiary grants only from the "Miscellaneous" column give a figure of 23.7 per cent and an actual increase of 16.8 per cent. If one includes the Loan Estimates, the expenditure in those Estimates on education has increased from $15,500,000 to $16,500,000, representing an increase of 6.5 per cent on the previous year. The corresponding increase in the last year of the Liberal and Country League Government's term was from $13,269,000 to $15,500,000, or a 16.8 per cent increase on the previous year's actual expenditure.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are fiddling it to suit your own purpose.

Mr. HALL: I am not.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Of course you are.

Mr. HALL: The Minister knows that, if any fiddling of figures has been done, it has been done by his colleague. The Minister knows that my figures have not been fiddled by adding the Loan Estimate figures to the total. The Minister of Education is well known for his continual interjections and for trying to ridicule any argument for which he has no reply.

Mr. Clark: Wait and see.

Mr. HALL: By adding the Loan Estimate figure to the Budget total under the "Education" vote we calculate that the Labor Government expenditure increased from $97,650,000 to $112,000,000, or 14.7 per cent. The last year of the Liberal and Country League Government saw an increase of 17.8 per cent. It may well be (and it will be) that the actual increase for this year will be greater than the 15 per cent used by the Premier, because these are the budgeted amounts in comparison with last year's actual expenditure, but they will not reach 23 per cent. Therefore, the Attorney has taken the budgeted figure for this year and compared it to the budgeted figure for last year, but he has ignored the additional $5,000,000 spent last year. Members know the circumstances that produced the additional expenditure last year, and I do not quibble that the final expenditure will exceed 15 per cent, but this will not be the figure used by the Attorney, who was not using those comparisons at that time.

The Attorney has misled the public in his district by saying that the Labor Government's Budget provided for an increase of 23 per cent over last year's provision for education. What would anyone in his community think who read his comparison? Would they assume that the Labor Government had increased expenditure on education by 23 per cent? Of course they would: what other figure could they take, and what other conclusion could they draw? Could they look at the complexities of budgeting and understand it otherwise? Of course not. The Attorney can easily get up here and bend his figures in making a

comparison between figures that are not relevant to the sums spent from year to year. What must be compared is the actual expenditure, not the type of percentage that gives an utterly false picture of the performance of the two Governments. Another Minister to whom I wish to refer is the Minister of Roads and Transport, who, time and time again, has said that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn but who has proceeded to go ahead with its construction. We have just been given by the State Planning Authority a supplementary development plan No. 1, and I thank the Minister for the information that he gave me about this.

Mr. Harrison: He has nothing to hide.

Mr. HALL: I hope that no Minister would try to hide it. Too much is involved in the effect of decisions of this House on the community to hide it. I read an excerpt from the report as follows:

The Metropolitan Development Plan is the general guide to the future growth of metropolitan Adelaide up to 1991. It has been endorsed by Parliament on three occasions, by legislation in 1963 and 1967 and by resolution in 1969. The Metropolitan Development Plan incorporates the transportation proposals recommended by the Town Planning Committee. The report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study published in 1968 contained a detailed analysis of the transportation proposals of the metropolitan development plan and suggested various amendments. The report on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was made available for public scrutiny, but the report has no legal status. A further report on transportation improvements for metropolitan Adelaide was obtained in 1970. The State Planning Authority considers that the metropolitan development plan should now be amended to give legal recognition to the amended transportation routes proposed.

Later the report states:

The authority is satisfied that, generally, the assessment of future growth and the form and direction of expansion outlined in the metropolitan development plan continue to provide a suitable basis for guiding Adelaide's growth up to 1991 . . . The authority has examined the recommended traffic and transport proposals and has concluded that some modifications are necessary. The planning period adopted is 20 years, and it is possible that within this period there will be changes in transport technology. It is considered unlikely, however, that within this period there will be any radical departure from the use of individual vehicles. The authority is confident of the need to act now to reserve land for new rights of way in addition to the existing road and rail networks. This will ensure that future needs for transport will be met and that social disturbances associated with the development of the routes will be kept to a minimum.

The report then states:

The routes of freeways proposed in the metropolitan development plan are amended as follows—

This is the withdrawn M.A.T.S. plan: the plan that was withdrawn with such vehemence and criticism by the Minister is being amended, and the Minister will approve these proposals.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know better than that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Apparently, he does not know what words mean when they are spoken by other people.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When are you going to change your name by deed poll to Hans Christian Andersen?

Mr. HALL: The Minister may be an affable fellow, but he need not try to divert this debate by uttering such inanities as that. I do not happen to be clowning at the moment: I am quoting the proposals of the supplementary development plan No. 1, which states:

The routes of freeways proposed in the metropolitan development plan are amended as follows:

Central North-South Freeway: Those parts of the route comprising the section between Gawler and Port Wakefield Road, and the section south of Noarlunga across Pedlar Creek, are deleted. That part of the route between Islington and O'Halloran Hill is varied as shown on the plan accompanying this report.

City of Adelaide to Modbury Freeway: That part of the route between Grand Junction Road and the district centre at Modbury is deleted. The route is extended north from Grand Junction Road to Hillbank as shown on the plan accompanying this report.

Modbury to Port Adelaide Freeway: That part of the route between the district centre at Modbury and the Main North Road at the Levels is deleted.

Construction Programme: It is anticipated that, despite the planned improvements to public transport and arterial roads, traffic congestion will warrant the construction of some new facilities on the routes proposed within the next 10 years. The most urgent requirement is to cater for the north-south movement of people and goods on the western side of the city of Adelaide and north to Dry Creek and the Levels.

So the plan that is being deferred is confirmed here, apart from these alterations by the State Planning Authority. There is no suggestion that the plan affecting the city of Hindmarsh will be scrapped. However, there is an indication from the Commissioner of Highways that the M.A.T.S. plan will proceed. This indication appears in a letter from the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Local Government Association, and the relevant part of that letter states:

Funds available within the next five years are not expected to allow for any significant construction works on this road, such as over-passes.

This refers to the road between Gepps Cross and Gawler. The letter continues:

It is, however, proposed to commence in 1975-76 the widening of the section between Gepps Cross and Hogarth Road to provide for six lanes of traffic. Also scheduled for commencement in 1975-76 is the construction of an entirely new road to connect with Salisbury Highway, passing on the western side of Port Wakefield Road to meet with Grand Junction Road and Regency Road in the vicinity of the old Islington sewage farm. It is expected that the development of this route will draw a considerable volume of traffic from the Elizabeth area which would otherwise use the Main North Road.

When one looks at the plan of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, one finds that this is the original freeway route, and the Commissioner has indicated that work on it will commence in 1975-76.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: When did he say that?

Mr. HALL: He said it on March 8.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This year?

Mr. HALL: Yes. So we have this plan which has been withdrawn but on which $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 is being spent this year, and we have acknowledgements by the Commissioner of Highways that within four years there will be a start on another major aspect of M.A.T.S. The State Planning Authority has submitted as its contribution to the amended plan for the development of metropolitan Adelaide the major extent of the freeway proposals, yet the Minister persists with the myth that M.A.T.S. is being withdrawn, and it is nothing but a myth. The Minister of Roads and Transport, in reply to a question asked yesterday, said:

The various councils concerned, including the Hindmarsh council, have been informed of the State Planning Authority's proposals, and they have been invited, as have all members of the public, to make written submissions within two months. Those submissions will be considered before the State Planning Authority takes the necessary action to finalize the amended 1962 development plan.

So we are going to have M.A.T.S. What are we going to call it? This seems to be the Government's main problem at present. What are we going to call M.A.T.S. now that it has been accepted in an amended form by the State Planning Authority as the proper freeway route development for Adelaide? What are we going to call it now that the authority has said that we will need important aspects of M.A.T.S. within 10 years and that within 20 years there will be little departure from the single-unit type of transportation that we have today? The Minister made great play of the M.A.T.S. proposals during his time in Opposition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Now you're trying to emulate me, and you're doing a bad job.

Mr. HALL: He has misled the House deliberately, by saying that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn yet, at the same time, proceeding with it. I congratulate the Minister on proceeding with it; make no mistake about that. He has my support and, I am sure, the support of all members on this side in proceeding with this plan at a sensible speed of construction related to the needs of the community. I commend the State Planning Authority for its report, and I commend the Minister for accepting it. However, I do not commend the Minister for trying to mislead the public into believing that this plan is not proceeding, when all the evidence now freely available shows that this plan is proceeding. That is the second Minister to whom I wish to refer, and he has misled the public far more significantly than has the Attorney-General, who has misled the public only for local political advantage within his own district. That will have almost no effect one way or the other on the future life of South Australia. However, the Minister of Roads and Transport will have a tremendous effect on the future life of this State if he continues to mislead his department and the public in this fashion.

The third item to which I want to refer concerns the administration of the Minister of Works. I am especially concerned at the matter raised in this House yesterday by the member for Fisher. I ask the Minister to be far more careful in future of the way in which he handles news releases concerning the activities of his department. Statements were made in the press about the Government's plans to consolidate the watershed in the Happy Valley reservoir area. This matter was dealt with fairly comprehensively yesterday by the member for Fisher. Shortly, the situation was that last January the Government announced the purchase of a significant and costly area of land in the watershed area of the Happy Valley reservoir. This announcement received much publicity on page 3 of the *Advertiser* and was significantly headlined in the *News*. The only conclusion one can draw from the report is that the Government purchased the land for the entirely admirable

purpose of protecting the quality of water in that reservoir.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you say that it was a news release from me?

Mr. HALL: From your department.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Was it?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read out whom it is written by.

Mr. HALL: This information was obtained from the Minister's department.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Whom was it written by?

Mr. HALL: Was it ever denied or put right? The Minister knows the procedure in relation to news releases and the contact that a Minister has with news reporters.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Come on, be honest. I was asked one question.

Mr. HALL: The Minister has never corrected this information that has been put to the public.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who wrote the article?

Mr. HALL: That is irrelevant.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Tell the truth. You know it was not a news release from my department, don't you?

Mr. HALL: This article, which appeared in the *News* on January 27, extolled the purchase of this land, and the Government never denied that this was a statement of fact about how the land was purchased.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Government purchased the land, didn't it?

Mr. HALL: Yes, and the Minister knows when it was purchased.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of course I do, and I gave the answer in the House last night.

Mr. HALL: The Minister gave the answer in the House a long time after the report appeared in the newspaper. This report led to an editorial stating that the announcement of the Government's purchase of 320 acres of land at Happy Valley reservoir was another positive step in the fight against pollution in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Whence did you get that? Did I say that?

Mr. HALL: Of course the Minister did not say it. This editorial was written as a result of a news report that appeared in that newspaper.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who wrote it?

Mr. HALL: By his attitude the Minister is admitting that the information is not correct.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who wrote the report?

Mr. HALL: As the member for Fisher said, the article was especially misleading to many people in the area who knew that the 320 acres of land had been purchased between 1965 and 1968 and that the present Government had not purchased any of this land. This land was purchased in 1968.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I never said that it wasn't.

Mr. HALL: The Minister did not attempt to say publicly in any way, except in this House under questioning by the member for the area, that this land was purchased before he came into office.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You point to where I said that this Government did purchase it.

Mr. Millhouse: There is the clear implication.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The member for Fisher dealt with this matter yesterday at some length. I am sure that the Minister owes an explanation why he allowed people to continue to believe that the Government had purchased this land (he did not deny this until questioned in the House) when he knew that a previous Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) had announced in 1965 that residential development south of Adelaide had forced the Government to buy about 300 acres of farm land near Happy Valley reservoir for $600,000. The attitude of the present Minister is not good enough for a person who occupies such a responsible position. That is the third point I make about Ministers misleading the public of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you maintaining that I made that statement?

Mr. HALL: It is no good for the Minister to blame the Opposition for this: the Opposition cannot make this type of statement. It is up to the Minister to deny a statement such as this, whether it has come from his department or from outside.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you maintain that I made that statement?

Mr. HALL: The point is that the Minister owes the public—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I don't owe the public anything. Do you or do you not maintain that I made that statement?

Mr. HALL: The Minister has the responsibility to the public of providing proper information about his department's activities. If a statement such as this appears in the news media, he should correct it if it is wrong.

Mr. Clark: It isn't wrong.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member says that, and yet this evening the Minister said that the information was not correct. The Minister is obviously feeling guilty about this great lapse. Because the Minister did not correct this statement until he was questioned in the House, the impression has been created that his Government has been involved in a major land purchase to protect the watershed area of Happy Valley reservoir.

I will refer to the fourth item briefly. In answer to a question, the Premier said today that, when he came to office, negotiations for sale of gas to New South Wales were completely suspended and that nothing was doing. That is not so. This matter has a long history. as the Premier knows. The Playford and Walsh Governments, the previous Dunstan Government, the previous Liberal and Country League Government and the present Government have been involved in developing South Australia's gas field. There has been a long history of searching for supply and resource so that sales could be made on the basis of that resource. Initially, the supply of gas to industries in South Australia depended on finding sufficient resource, and this took a long time. At last it was proven to a degree that allowed a pipeline to be built and necessary contracts let to supply the metropolitan area and any area *en route* that may want the gas, except for the northern gulf area, which is not close to the pipeline.

When I came to office, there was a real suspension of significant negotiations in relation to the sale of this gas to New South Wales. There were several bases for this practical suspension, one being, as the Premier has said, that it was an unknown resource area: it was not known whether sufficient gas resource was available in the field to supply Sydney. Secondly, the producers could not agree on the terms that should be offered to New South Wales and, as the months passed, it became evident that Victoria was the prime bidder in the sale of gas to New South Wales, to such an extent that a decision in Victoria's favour was expected within a few weeks or a few months. When I took up this matter with the producers, they considered it almost a hopeless task to head off Victoria in the sale of gas to New South Wales. I got the producers into the Premier's office, and we had a long discussion on this matter. From that conference began the real stimulation of activity in relation to the sale of gas to New South Wales.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: Perhaps that is funny to Ministers on the front bench opposite.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It's not true and you know it!

Mr. HALL: It is the truth. The Premier might like to twist the truth, as his colleagues have done in relation to news releases issued by their departments. From the conference to which I have referred stemmed the real negotiations to obtain a contract for the sale of gas to New South Wales. I then contacted Mr. Pettingell of the Australian Gas Light Company (the Sydney supply company) and I personally contacted both the Premier and the Minister of Mines (Mr. Fife) in New South Wales. I also kept in constant touch with the local producers and their negotiating representatives. From then, the real substance of the agreement began to be worked out. However, it still depended on our obtaining a sufficient resource to enable us viably to pipe and sell it to New South Wales. When the present Premier came to office, the search for the resource was still proceeding, and the New South Wales interests had taken up farm-out arrangements; the producing group (Delhi-Santos) had also worked out exploration areas not far from a suggested pipeline route to Sydney. Therefore, it had a dual interest in relation to the supply of gas to Sydney from South Australia. These arrangements finally led to today's favourable situation, which the Premier inherited, and to the price and other arrangements which I hope will be finalized soon.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You fixed it!

Mr. HALL: If the Minister of Works has any doubts about this, let him talk to Mr. Fife next time he visits Sydney.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You know what the truth is.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to prejudice any negotiations but, if the Minister wants to confirm or deny this, or if he is at all concerned about the facts of these negotiations, let him talk to the New South Wales Minister of Mines or to the New South Wales Premier. This is the correct situation. I compliment the Government on following up this matter. In this respect it has my complete support; indeed, I would have been disappointed had its attitude been different. I realize that such a valuable sale and contract for South Australia would obviously have been pursued, and the Premier did this State a great disservice when he gave the distinct impression today that the subject was completely dead when he came to office

and that no real work had been done before then. That was a completely false impression to convey.

Mr. Millhouse: But that's the sort of thing he loves to do.

Mr. HALL: I have outlined tonight four areas in which the South Australian public has been distinctly misled, and, in doing so, I have tried not to be too personal in the sense of charging that lies have been told. I have merely said that the public has been misled. The public was misled in a small way by the Attorney-General in relation to his claim regarding educational expenditure this year. Secondly, the public has been misled by the Minister of Roads and Transport, who still maintains the myth that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn and is not being proceeded with, even though his heads of departments have announced parts of the M.A.T.S. plan piecemeal and the State Planning Authority has issued an amended plan adopting the M.A.T.S. plan with small variations. Thirdly, the Minister of Works has failed to deny publicly, until questioned closely in this House, a story attributing to his department and the Government a large new purchase of land. Finally, the Premier has tried to have the public believe this evening that until he came to office no useful work had been done in relation to the sale of gas to New South Wales.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I didn't say that. I said negotiations had been suspended, and that is the truth.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's exactly what he said.

Mr. HALL: I am charging the Government with misleading the public, and I am saying how it has done so. The Premier gave the distinct impression today, whether he likes it or not, that no work had been done in relation to the sale of gas before he assumed office. That is the distinct impression he gave and, if he meant otherwise, let him say so now. He gave the distinct impression that no useful work had been done until he entered office.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I didn't say that at all.

Mr. HALL: I should be pleased if the Premier did not mean it, but let him get up and say that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you take what I have said in relation to your own explanations?

Mr. HALL: It is obvious to Opposition members that the Government has misled the public in the way I have referred to. The Government had therefore better be more careful in its representations to the public than it is being at present.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): After hearing the Leader of the Opposition beating his breast, which was preceded by the usual fictional farrago of nonsense that he puts before the House and the South Australian public, it is a little difficult for me to know where to begin. However, I should like first to defend the Premier against the two-pronged attack by the Leader. First, the Leader attacked the Premier for being conservative in under-estimating the extent of the increase in education expenditure this year, when the Premier said there had been a 15 per cent increase. The Leader, by implication, accused the Premier of being grossly conservative in his estimates of increased educational expenditure. Then to the contrary, he accused the Premier of exaggerating the true position, saying that the only good that had ever been done for South Australia had been done under the previous L.C.L. Government led by himself. Members know, of course, that the Leader of the Opposition has to rely on the Leader of the Opposition for praise for the previous L.C.L. Government, as none of his back-benchers will ever praise it. However, we are used to that now. The Leader of the Opposition should be consistent in the way he approaches the Premier in this matter. Traditionally, the Premier has tended to under-state percentage increases and changes in expenditures, and that has occurred once more in this case.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't believe that!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The facts of the matter are as follows: If one compares Budget provision with Budget provision, the increase in education expenditure for the Education Department is about 23 per cent; however, if one compares actual expenditure with likely actual expenditure, the increase for the department is about 22 per cent. It is not possible for one to give a completely accurate figure of actual education expenditure, because that will depend on the award to be made by the Teachers Salaries Board. Certainly, however, that award will mean that the increase in the actual Education Department expenditure this year over actual expenditure last year will be between 21 per cent and 24 per cent. As even the Leader has pointed out, the Budget provision this year was more than 23 per cent above the Budget provision at the same time in the previous year.

The Leader has made great play on these percentage figures. I point out that, although the percentage figures indicate the kind of effort that the Government is willing to make (and the effort this year has certainly been greater than it was last year), they do not tell the full story. The critical question is one of the real improvements in educational standards each year, and one must deflate the percentage increase in education expenditure year by year by the amount of any inflation in prices or increase in the general level of wage or salary rates. As members know, in the last two years the increase in these rates has been substantial.

In my reply to the Leader yesterday I said that, ignoring the prospective award, the increase in actual Education Department expenditure this year over last year was 19.2 per cent. I said that the likely increase in actual expenditure this year over that for the last financial year, considering the prospective award, would probably be about 22 per cent.

The Leader wants to complain about the discrepancy between what the Attorney-General has said on the change in education expenditure and what the Premier has said. The Premier was conservative and did not compare actual with actual or Budget with Budget. He compared actual expenditure last year with Budget expenditure this year and arrived at a figure of 15 per cent, and in doing that he has been conservative. The basis of the Leader's complaint is that the Premier has been conservative. That is all there is to it.

Indeed, if members cared to, they could get different percentage changes by widening the section of education expenditure they took. They could include the miscellaneous provision in the department with those items directly affecting education, such as State Government aid to independent schools, and expenditure by the universities and the Institute of Technology, maintenance expenditure on schools, Public Buildings Department expenditure, and capital expenditure under the Loan programme.

The Leader has ignored the fact that the Government has increased the school-building programme from $16,500,000, which was provided for in the last Loan Estimates, to $17,000,000. If one wanted to make a total comparison of the effort in education expenditure one year against the next, one would need to total Education Department expenditure by taking expenditure in respect of the universities and the Institute of Technology, as well as State Government payments to independent schools, capital works programmes, and expenditure on the maintenance of schools. Having done that, one should compare actual expenditure in one year with that in another year, or compare Budget expenditure proposed in one year with that proposed for the following year. In other words, one should compare like with like. If one does that, one gets an answer of about 22 per cent or 23 per cent increase this year.

Mr. Coumbe: Your comments have changed greatly since you were in Opposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My comments in Opposition related to the fact that the previous Government, ostrich-like, refused to recognize the kinds of problem and difficulty being experienced in our education system. That Government was on the kind of line which the Victorian Liberal Government has followed and which led to the disgraceful episode in Victoria this week when that Government tried to bring the teachers into line by taking away their long service leave entitlements.

Mrs. Steele: Aren't you reflecting on the departmental officers?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not saying anything about the departmental officers. All I am saying is that the Leader of the Opposition, when in Government, only wanted to crow that there was nothing wrong with education in South Australia, that we had the best system in Australia and, probably, in the world.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He said that teachers were denigrating the system.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, he carried on in this way.

Mrs. Steele: Who said this?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable Leader did. The members for Davenport and Torrens, when Ministers of Education, would not detail in public what was wrong and what needed to be done.

Mrs. Steele: We set up the Karmel committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I congratulate the member for Davenport on the appointment of that committee. A national survey of educational needs was commissioned, but when the teachers in this State wanted the support of the members for Davenport and Torrens and of the former Premier in saying what was wrong and pointing the finger at the need for additional aid from the Commonwealth Government, there was no response.

The Leader of the Opposition, when in Government, wanted to do nothing more than beat his breast about standards in education and ignore the problems being experienced. The Leader adopted the kind of attitude that

led to the disgraceful episode in Victoria this week, when the Victorian Government, over a few days, tried to take away long service leave entitlements from teachers who had the effrontery to go on strike because of any objection they had taken! Fortunately for the future of education in Victoria, the Government there has had second thoughts and has revoked those regulations.

Mr. Coumbe: You aren't suggesting that we—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am suggesting that the members for Davenport and Torrens were led by the present Leader of the Opposition in the kind of line that he wanted to put over about education in South Australia, and I have great sympathy with those members about the kind of leadership they got on that matter.

Mr. Coumbe: We were very happy, anyway.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable members may have been: there are none so happy as the blind. However, if that kind of leadership had continued to be given, we could well have had the kind of degeneration that has occurred in Victoria under the Bolte Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You did your best to stir it up here.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Had we been guilty of the same stupidity as the Bolte Government has been, it would have made the member for Kavel purr with pleasure.

Mr. Coumbe: Fortunately, we have a responsible leader.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members opposite have irresponsible colleagues in the Liberal Party in Victoria. In Victoria this week the Bolte Government made a complete botch and had to admit it was wrong. Fortunately, it had the sense to admit that what it had attempted to do was disgraceful, and it revoked the regulations that were designed to impose penalties that have never been contemplated by any Commonwealth Liberal Government or by any Arbitration Commission.

Mr. Coumbe: Or by us.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member says that he has not considered introducing such regulations, but his Liberal colleagues in Victoria did. If one wishes to compare education expenditure in one year with the next year one should compare like with like. One does not compare the Budget provision with the actual expenditure: one compares Budget with Budget and actual expenditure with actual expenditure. If that is done the Attorney-General made a correct anticipation of the position. The Premier was mistaken in that, as usual, he was too conservative in the way he used figures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, have a few matters about which I shall complain, as this will be my last chance to do so in the present session. Before I do that, however, there are a few things I have to say about the Minister of Education's little effort during the last few minutes, and about some of the interjections made by the Minister of Works. First, dealing with the Minister of Education, I have never heard him weaker than he was just now. The only way he could refute what had been said by the Leader of the Opposition was to look at Victoria. In order to take our eyes completely off South Australia, he tried to attack the Victorian Government for something that is completely different from the situation in South Australia, bears no relationship to it, and is utterly irrelevant.

Mr. Coumbe: A complete red herring.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Obviously, that was the only argument the Minister of Education could think of to refute what had been said. Earlier in his speech he had said that the only person who praised the Government led by the Leader of the Opposition was the Leader of the Opposition. He then went on to congratulate the member for Davenport on establishing the committee that produced the Karmel report. The Minister of Education knows as well as I know (and as well as every member knows) that the origin of the Karmel report was in the policy speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition in February, 1968. There was never any suggestion whatever that our Government (that is, those on this side) was satisfied with the educational system in South Australia and believed that it could not be improved. We deliberately set about instituting an inquiry to ascertain how best it could be improved, and the result, which has come in the life of the present Government, is the Karmel report. Let us in all fairness give credit where credit is due. The origin of that report was in the policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Let the Minister of Education not deny that or try to avoid acknowledging that in future.

I now refer to the Minister of Works and to what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the purchase of land in the Onkaparinga catchment area. The Leader quoted from a *News* report on January

27 of this year, and said what is perfectly true: that the implication behind that newspaper report was that this work and these purchases had been done by the present Government. He was challenged by the Minister of Works to say whether he, the Minister of Works, had made this statement. I have a copy of the *Advertiser* of the following morning, and this is how the first few paragraphs on page 3, under the heading "Survey of Hills Watershed About to Start" read:

Australia's most comprehensive and ambitious watershed pollution survey is about to start in the Onkaparinga catchment area. It will provide vital basic information for future Government planning and will set South Australia ahead of other States in catchment pollution control. Detailed information, never before available to the State's water supply planners, will come from a network of sophisticated gauging and sample stations.

So far so good: this is to be in the future. The report continues:

Plans for the survey were revealed yesterday by the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran).

Let the Minister deny he had a hand in this. The article continues:

He also announced completion of a 320-acre, $750,000 land purchase to extend the pollution buffer zone around the Happy Valley reservoir.

He announced the completion of it on January 28, 1971, whereas figures that he supplied in this House yesterday—

Mr. Hall: Not yesterday.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—(I beg his pardon: on March 9, a couple of weeks ago) show that the latest of these purchases took place on June 12, 1968. Now does the Minister still say that he did not put out this story? Does he still deny that he took the kudos (and wanted to take the kudos) for these purchases? It is impossible to deny these things. He tried to do it a few minutes ago, because he hoped that we would not have the newspaper reports and that we would not be able to compare what he said in the newspaper on the day following the report referred to by the Leader with the information that he gave to this House a couple of weeks ago. If that was not an example of deception, I do not know what is. It merely confirms what the Leader said when speaking in this debate.

I now turn to a couple of other matters. First, I wish to say something about the Minister of Roads and Transport and the route of the Noarlunga Freeway, or rapid transit line, or whatever it is to be called. I forget what it is being called now.

Mr. Carnie: High-speed corridor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a high-speed corridor, as my colleague tells me, and it is no longer a freeway.

Mr. Mathwin: What's the difference?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We know there is no difference, and the Minister knows there is no difference.

Mr. Hopgood: You haven't read the Breuning report.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He hasn't read many things.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One thing I will read now is a photostat copy of the petition that the Minister (as member for Edwardstown) presented to this House on September 19, 1968, on this point. Let the Minister not say that I have not read this, because this is what it states:

The humble petition of the undersigned electors showeth. That the adoption of the recommendations of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, in so far as they refer to the building of the Noarlunga Freeway and the Goodwood to Edwardstown rail rapid transit are opposed by a majority of citizens whose properties would be acquired and/or affected. Your petitioners therefore pray—

I shall now read in full the first of three paragraphs, because this is the most relevant. It states:

That the Government immediately reject the M.A.T.S. recommendation to build the Noarlunga Freeway on the ground that its building would, by the acquisition of properties, be an unwarranted intrusion into the peaceful living of citizens.

It was not that we should call it a high-speed corridor instead of a freeway but that the acquisition of the properties along the route of it would be "an unwarranted intrusion into the peaceful living of the citizens". That is the first paragraph of the petition presented by the Minister on that day which contained, according to the notation above his own signature, 5,679 signatures.

It may be said that members are obliged to present petitions if they are requested to do so, whether or not they happen to believe the prayer in the petition and the information set out in the petition supporting the prayer, and that is so. Members do this frequently, and during that session of Parliament we saw many examples of it on the abortion issue. But that is not the case concerning the then member for Edwardstown, because in speeches in this House and in writings outside it he constantly put that point of view. When moving a motion on October 9, 1968, in connection with the transportation study, the then member for Edwardstown is reported in *Hansard* as saying:

As members opposite know—

he was talking, therefore, to us—

a few weeks ago I presented to this House a petition signed by 5,679 people. Since then I have received additional petition forms which I have not yet presented to Parliament. These people just cannot be thrust aside. They have a right of existence and they have a right to be heard. I speak on behalf of all of them this afternoon and plead with the Government to use a little compassion and take away from these people the burden it has placed on them needlessly as a result of the report.

We do not hear the Minister speaking like that, now that he is in office as the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You will in a few moments, as soon as you sit down.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall be glad to hear the Minister's explanation. He went on to say:

I have told the Premier that there are alternatives to this proposed scheme. I could draw a line for the Noarlunga Freeway from the North Adelaide connecter to Darlington, the route of which would require demolishing about 20 houses. It is as simple as that.

He then goes on to disparage the M.A.T.S. authority. That is what the Minister said on October 9, 1968, when he was a back-bencher representing this area. Last week, I put on notice a series of questions on this topic, and the first question I asked of the Minister's colleague, the Minister for Conservation who is now in charge of the administration of the Planning and Development Act, was as follows:

Were the views of the 5,679 electors who signed the petition praying the Government *inter alia* immediately to reject the M.A.T.S. recommendations to build the Noarlunga Freeway presented to the House (etc.) taken into consideration by the State Planning Authority in making the recently announced decision on the route of this freeway?

The reply was as follows:

The State Planning Authority is currently amending the 1962 metropolitan development plan in accordance with Government policy arising from the report of Dr. S. Breuning.

The pearl is the next sentence, namely:

As the Government's policy is not inconsistent with either the prayer of the petition—

which I have read out—

or the speech of the then member for Edwardstown in support of the petition referred to by the member for Mitcham, no useful purpose would have been served to require the State Planning Authority to take the petition's views into account.

That is the reply given by the Government yesterday in this House. How on earth the Minister can reconcile his speech in support of the petition he presented, saying that these people could not be brushed aside, with the answer given by his colleague yesterday (no doubt after due consideration), I do not know. I have no doubt that the Government hoped, when that reply was given yesterday, that we on this side would not have had a look at the petition and at the assertions and prayer in the petition. No-one can reconcile the position taken by the then member for Edwardstown in 1968 with the view that he and the Government, of which he is a part, take today. In spite of everything that has been said in an attempt to show that it can be done, no-one accepts that.

I regret that the Attorney-General is not here, because I wish to refer to matters that especially concern him. They are matters in which I have had a special interest because, I suppose, of the portfolios that I held in the previous Government. This is the first opportunity I have had to say anything in this place, except by way of question, about the controversy that has developed in this State over the proposed staging of the play *Oh! Calcutta!* Much has been said in the community about this, and questions have been asked, but we have not had an opportunity in the House to debate the issue. I do not intend to debate it at length, but in my view the Attorney-General is wrong in his attitude to this production. I will not go as far as to say that he has a legal duty, but I believe he has a moral duty pursuant to section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act to take action in this matter, and under that section he certainly has the power to take action, because the relevant part of the section provides:

The Minister, whenever he is of opinion that it is fitting for the preservation of public morality, good manners, or decorum, or to prevent a breach of the peace or danger to any performer or other person, so to do, may, notwithstanding the terms of any licence, make a determination prohibiting the holding of any public entertainment, or any specified part or time of any public entertainment.

My view is that we have here a play which, from reports and from a reading of the script, is thoroughly bad and disgusting.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've read the script?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have not read the script.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How do you know?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going on what has been said by the Minister himself, by the Premier and many other people. Whether the Minister of Roads and Transport would deny that, I do not know. Whether he thinks that they are not a good enough authority for me to rely on, either—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't make up my mind on what I'm going to see.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do not be so offensive and interject all the time. I am finished with you.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Bad luck!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From all reports, it is a bad play; it is obscene and objectionable, and it has been described in similar terms by many people, including a Supreme Court judge in Victoria.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You don't go by his standards; you let *Boys in the Band* come here, but he banned it in Victoria.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes, but he got the sneak preview; that's what he likes. This is what he wants with *Oh! Calcutta!*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government is apparently pretty sensitive on this. We have had interjections from the Minister of Roads and Transport and from the Premier.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't answer either of them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are not worth answering: they are made simply to put me off, and that is why interjections are made in this House, as we all know. However, I have not finished developing the point I am making. We have this bad play, and the Attorney-General has this power under the Act. What he should do is see the play himself, as I saw *Boys in the Band,* and then make up his mind whether to exercise the powers he has. I understand that this has been put to him publicly on television by the Leader; it has certainly been suggested by many people. As far as I can see, the only excuse he can give for not taking that course of action is that the promoters of this show may be so dishonest as to show him one version and then change it on subsequent nights; therefore, he could not rely on what he saw as being what the public would see.

I have never heard such an absurd argument. Whatever his other failings may be, the Attorney is intelligent and he knows that is absurd; no-one with an ounce of intelligence would swallow it. First, it assumes dishonesty by the promoters in that they would mislead him by giving him a special showing which would be altered later. Secondly, it ignores the practical aspect that all he has to do, if he is afraid this will happen, is have one other person present at every performance to check it.

The Hon. L. J. King: The Leader suggested on television that I should go in disguise. Do you agree with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that, and I am not concerned to argue about it. Now the Attorney is interjecting to divert me.

The Hon. L. J. King: Not at all: I am giving you an opportunity to develop the point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not care to do so; that is utterly irrelevant to the argument I am putting. Instead of doing what is his duty under the Act, the Attorney is prepared to hide behind police officers and say that if they believe there is something wrong in any showing they can take action. I believe that is a thoroughly reprehensible attitude to take. I acknowledge freely, as was said by His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh the other day, that censorship is a most difficult problem.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He said that he didn't believe in censorship.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should not introduce the Duke's name into the debate. I ask him, as a former Attorney-General, to refrain from doing so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I notice that you were prompted to take that point by the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has no right to make such an accusation. The honourable Premier did nothing of the sort.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I withdraw that; I think I made a mistake. I ask you whether you are ruling under Standing Order 149, which states:

> No member shall use Her Majesty's name or the name of the Governor irreverently in a debate or for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations.

If you are, I submit with great respect that that does not include the Consort.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that the name of a member of the Royal Family should not be used in this House for the purpose of influencing debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I accept the ruling. I point out that I used his name merely as an aside. Had you not said anything about it, I would have passed on and it would not have been emphasized. I certainly did not introduce it for the purpose of influencing debate. As we all know (I think even you, Sir, know this), this is a most difficult problem. I feel some sympathy for the Attorney because he has, on the one hand, what I believe are his own natural inclinations springing from his own background on this matter; on the other hand, he has the views of the Premier, the

Leader of his Party, which have been expressed many times. It would not be easy for anyone to tread the path between those two.

Mr. Clark: I am afraid you're belittling the Attorney; he is a bigger man than that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will take the honourable member's assurance of that, but I did not belittle him; I merely said that I feel sympathy for him in the path he has to tread between what I believe are two conflicting considerations. However, I feel sympathy for him.

Mr. Clark: I do not think you will after he has spoken.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will he speak?

Mr. Clark: I think so. You don't mind, do you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I led the honourable member on because I hoped that this would oblige the Attorney to speak. I have a couple of other things to say about him. Whether or not I feel sorry for him, I believe he has taken the wrong course in this matter and has shirked his responsibility. Even now it is not too late for him to accept the responsibility which is his by virtue of his office.

Yesterday I asked a Question on Notice of the Minister of Social Welfare whether the Government intended to introduce amendments to the Social Welfare Act this session and, if it did, when. The answer I received was that the Government did not intend to introduce those amendments to the Act. That is a most disappointing and surprising answer to receive in view of the claims and pretensions of this Government to care about social welfare. The only conclusion I can draw is that the present Minister is, like one of his predecessors (the present Treasurer), full of talk but capable of very little action to follow. That was precisely what we saw when the Treasurer was Minister between 1965 and 1968.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the Premier has forgotten the public controversy into which he fell with a social worker on the state of public relief payments in South Australia. That controversy raged on the front page of the *Sunday Mail* over a couple of issues. It was left to us when we came to office substantially and significantly to increase public relief payments in South Australia. I have spoken about that merely to draw a parallel between the words and deeds of the Premier, when he was Minister, and those of the present Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You forgot to add the words "this session" to the answer you said he gave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Government intend to introduce amendments to the Act this session?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You didn't say "this session".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I did not, I meant to do so. Damn it all, it was my question: I drafted it and put it on notice.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And deliberately misread it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not. I deliberately put in those words when I drafted the question.

Mr. Clark: And left them out when you quoted it a few moments ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not mean to, but it makes no difference. I thought I said it. I meant to do so, and it is entirely consistent with the point I am putting.

Mr. Clark: That is the very thing that you and your Leader accuse others of doing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the honourable member not accept my explanation?

Mr. Clark: No, I will not; I entirely reject it, because I know you. I have watched you in action for many years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For 16 years, actually.

Mr. Clark: And I know your type of argument.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should speak to the motion and not engage in a discourse across the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In December, 1969, the Liberal Government asked the Social Welfare Advisory Council to report on, broadly, questions of social welfare. That report was received by the Liberal Government in May, 1970, only 10 months ago; it was made public immediately; it was in the hands of the then Opposition before the election; and I went on television with the present Minister in the week before the election, when we both agreed that that report contained much valuable information and that, whichever of us was in office after the election, we would act on it. Therefore, before the election the present Minister said he would act on the report. One would have expected, if he were genuine in what he said, and if he had a genuine concern for this State's social services, that some action would have been forthcoming during the first session of this Parliament (the session which is now ending), and yet we get the answer that the Government does not intend to introduce amendments during this session. That is entirely unacceptable in the circumstances as I

have sketched them, and I hope that no member opposite will try to deny the circumstances, and I object to it.

The report was not only there waiting for the Minister when he came into office: he had it before he came to office and said he would act on it. What possible excuse can the Government give for not getting on with the job during its 10 months of office? Because there is no answer to that question, I can only say that, had the Liberal Government remained in office, it would have got on with the job. Of course, in the social welfare field the Minister has only built on the foundations that the Liberal Government laid during its term of office: the amalgamation of the two departments and the plan for the appointment of a Director (or, as he is to be called in the future, the Director-General of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs), plans which had not come to fruition when the Liberal Government entered office and for which the present Government has been only too glad to take all the credit. However, this Government has merely completed what had been begun during the term of office of the former Liberal Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I challenge the Minister to show that what I have said is inaccurate. There are many other matters I could raise, but that is enough. I hope we will hear an answer from both the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Attorney-General in relation to these matters. I hope that, when next we have a debate of this nature, it will not be necessary to raise these points again, because I hope to have obtained answers to the questions I have asked.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I remind members that during my maiden speech I said that, if the Premier did not balance the State Budget, he could expect some criticism from me. I believe that most people in this State are disappointed that he has not balanced the Budget. This is the first time we have not heard the cry that the Government has a mandate to do something: there was certainly no mandate to have a deficit Budget in this State, and there was no mandate to introduce various taxation increases to try to balance that Budget. The seven tax increases will not reduce the deficit much this year and, indeed, it is doubtful whether next year the deficit that is carried over will be reduced by much. I remind members of the tax increases announced by the Treasurer on February 23, one of which was the 3 per cent surcharge on the gross revenue of the Electricity Trust. The trust's profit in the financial year ended June 30, 1969, and, indeed, for the following year would not have been sufficient to absorb the 3 per cent increase. The trust would have shown a substantial loss if the surcharge had been applied. It is therefore reasonable to assume that electricity charges in this State will be increased. Although I hope they will not be increased by more than 3 per cent, I have the horrible feeling that they will be. The House has already dealt with the increase in motor vehicle registration fees in a Bill that also included a provision relating to the construction of the Kangaroo Island ferry. As I assess the sums of money to be raised by these taxes and the sums of money to be spent, it is apparent that next year, instead of the State's deficit being reduced by $3,000,000, it will be increased by $1,750,000.

The poor old bookmakers have found that they will have to absorb the additional .2 per cent imposition placed on their turnover. This increase makes South Australia's racing turnover tax the highest in Australia, so those who support racing in this State are paying more than anyone else in this country. The House is also currently dealing with the 7½ per cent tax on admissions to entertainments. Once more the racing, sporting and social organizations will be severely hit. Tram and rail fares, as well as freight charges, have also been increased; water and sewerage valuations, rates and prices will also probably be increased in the next 12 months. It is, therefore, a matter of how much the average person in South Australia, and particularly the 52 per cent of the people in this State who elected the present Government, can afford to absorb these increases.

It is all very well for one to say that the workers in this State, in common with those in other States, received the 6 per cent national wage increase. However, the people of South Australia cannot continue to absorb the sorts of tax being introduced by the State Government. While the Government is introducing these taxes to cover up its poor handling of the State's finances, inflationary trends in this country are becoming more apparent. Withdrawing money from the people will not curb inflation or resolve the position. We will have a rundown in public confidence in the management of our financial affairs, and this could be a calamity. Between 1965 and 1968, when the first Labor Government for a long time was in office, we experienced these conditions. The people of South Australia are

again paying for their folly. No-one can deny them the right to vote for either political Party but, although the Government may enjoy a 52 per cent vote now, I do not think it will hold it for long.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson cannot indulge in private conversation. If he wants to speak, he must address the Chair.

Mr. BECKER: The people of South Australia will not forget the Government's poor handling of financial affairs. I also wish to refer to pollution. I asked the Minister for Conservation a question about pollution of the air by jet aircraft, thinking that South Australia could perhaps introduce a law to curb pollution within the State boundaries, even though pollution generally is a Commonwealth matter. I was pleased to find, before getting a reply from the Minister, that Trans-Australian Airlines and Ansett Airlines of Australia would spend $600,000 to convert jet burners in their aircraft and that the work would be completed by 1972.

I also should like to know what has happened about the provision of a trash rack in the Sturt creek, near the Patawalonga basin. Although this was to be completed this year, all that has happened is that some trucks and a front-end loader have been cleaning out the sewer. The Government's action regarding pollution is good, but not much is being done in my district. Beach erosion could well cost the Government a large sum of money. In the next Budget it must make a large provision for protection of our beaches. The Culver report has cost the State Government and seaside councils $60,000, but the cost to the Government and the councils of restoring our beaches could be between $800,000 and $1,000,000. The money must be found for this. We will have to tighten the belt and have more careful financial management so that we can protect our beaches in future.

I do not agree with the Premier's statement in the *News* of October 15 last year that South Australian firms lacked drive and initiative. I am also disappointed that the Agent-General elect has decided to jump on the band waggon and make a similar statement. I could be cruel to the new Agent-General, but I do not think he has the experience to criticize South Australian firms. The Commonwealth Department of Trade is doing a far better job than the State authority has done or is likely to do, and many firms in this State are proud of the assistance they have received from the Commonwealth department.

One company has been successful in supplying automated machinery to the baking trade, having recently sent equipment to the United Kingdom on consignment, with assistance from the Commonwealth Department of Trade. That company got little assistance from the State Government. When the Minister of Agriculture represented the Premier at a demonstration of the company's products, the Minister many times misnamed the company. This is how the State Government recognizes South Australian companies and their achievements. Someone made an awful mistake, and the Minister should be ashamed that he went to an inspection without knowing the name of the company concerned.

This has not been a good financial year in South Australia. The Premier hopes to get assistance from the Grants Commission, and probably we can expect something from that source. I shall not be surprised if the Treasurer balances the Budget, because there could be secret ways of cooking it up. What would otherwise be a State deficit could be balanced. The growth and expansion of South Australia must be restored, and it is time the Government showed its interest in doing something. It had better do that in the next Budget. We can condemn the Government because the Adelaide Childrens Hospital will not be able to receive a Government subsidy to continue the building programme. Other provisions must be made in the next financial year to encourage more indoor sports.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: As honourable members are laughing, I point out that I am speaking about gymnasiums, not about other things advertised in the "Miscellaneous" columns of the *Advertiser*. I remind the Minister of Education that some years ago one song popular with teenagers was named "Twist and Shout". That is how I sum up the Minister's views on education. He twisted this evening.

Mr. Langley: Tell us where he went wrong.

Mr. BECKER: The Estimates make a further provision of $70,000 for the Institute of Technology. I was surprised to learn the other day that, although there was a quota of 45 students for the science technician certificate course, there were 130 applicants. I think it is reasonable to assume that this would apply to every course. We will have to examine more closely the moneys made available to the institute to ensure that this does not happen in the future. In my district is

an area of land that could be developed to provide better facilities for the institute. I remind the Minister of Education that within the next 24 hours he will receive a letter in which I am asking him to support the Teachers Institute in having removed an anomaly in respect of teachers' superannuation.

Mr. Jennings: Don't you think we've all got that?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, but at least I have done something about it. If members opposite have not done anything about it, they should be ashamed of themselves. I was interested to hear the Premier's reply this afternoon regarding the supply of natural gas to New South Wales and to hear the explanation made by our Leader tonight to put the record straight. I do not know whether members are aware of the long campaign that has been going on in the newspapers in New South Wales, hailing Don Dunstan as their hero because the people of that State will receive cheap gas. Of course, I think this is part of the Premier's campaign: we know what he has in mind. It is part of the campaign for Dunstan as Prime Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I am disappointed that we have not been able to assist in respect of police pensions. I remind the House that there are 19 retired commissioned police officers, one of whom receives a fortnightly pension of $53 after having given a lifetime of service to the community. I do not think that is a sufficient pension; indeed, it is a miserable pension. I thought the Premier was sincere when he said late last year, when introducing certain superannuation measures, that we would have an opportunity to increase police pensions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And so you will.

Mr. BECKER: But the Premier said he was hoping to introduce the measure by the end of this session. We will not get the measure this session; we will have to wait much later. In addition, any increases in the pension will be retrospective to May 1, whereas the Premier gave the impression initially that they would be retrospective to January 1. Police pensioners are not being given a fair go, and it is about time the Premier did something about it. I strongly condemn him for the delay. I reiterate that we should help these retired commissioned officers and adopt the 24 per cent increase granted last year by the Victorian Government. I estimate that this would cost the State about $8,500 in a full year. That provision should at least be made in the next Budget. As a new member, I am not over-impressed with certain things that have happened in this House, including the rush of legislation we have received towards the end of the session. I think the time has come when more sitting days, rather than longer sitting days, will have to be considered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I consider that I cannot allow to go unanswered the rather untrue charges made first by the Leader and then by the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham just could not resist the opportunity to follow his normal practice of telling half-truths. I think that probably a fellow whom I do not know but who goes under the name of Onlooker suddenly stirred the Opposition into thinking that here was a chance to attack Virgo on something, and so over the last three or four weeks the Opposition has tried rather belatedly and pathetically to drag something up to justify what the then Premier said in 1968 about the 18-year plan that was so exciting and controversial. It was so exciting and controversial that even the member for Mitcham has referred to it this evening (I think another member referred to it a few days ago) and has quoted from a petition presented in this House.

It was so exciting and controversial that the then Government refused to do anything about the matter! The Attorney-General found out the member for Mitcham, who told a deliberate untruth. The member for Mitcham went to the trouble of reading the prayer of the petition that I presented in this House, and he made a great play of the 5,000-odd signatures. I think he suggested mine was on the petition.

Mr. Millhouse: Your signature was on it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What the member for Mitcham forgot to do, though, in his usual filthy way, was read all of the petition. For his benefit, I will now read the two remaining paragraphs that he so conveniently overlooked. Although I agree that the second paragraph has little application, I intend to read it. It states:

That the Government immediately reject the M.A.T.S. recommendation to resite the railway from Goodwood to Edwardstown, on the ground that resiting would, by the acquisition of properties, be an unwarranted intrusion into the peaceful living of citizens.

That is not important, but the third paragraph, about which the honourable member so conveniently forgot, states:

That the Government immediately cause investigations to be made to determine a more

suitable and practicable plan for the development of metropolitan Adelaide, consistent with the rights of citizens living a peaceful existence, and within the financial means available to the State.

Why did he not read that out? He has not the guts to state a proper case; he can only come in here telling half-truths and lies to try to stir up trouble, and that is exactly what he has done this evening. The member for Mitcham tried to quote from *Hansard*, but what he did not do was tell the House about the motion moved by the then Leader, which motion I seconded. That motion was as follows:

(*a*) that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report does not make adequate provisions for the development of transport movement in metropolitan Adelaide;

(*b*) that the plan should be withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Authority for reassessment to ensure:

(i) a properly integrated plan for roads and public transport development;

(ii) that any plan is financially feasible;

(iii) that the destruction of homes and other properties is minimized;

(*c*) that the Government should proceed forthwith to amend legislation on compulsory acquisition of land so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the proposals.

We did not get that this evening. What we got (and the member for Alexandra can get this into his head, too) was a selection of phrases and sentences used out of context to try to paint a deliberately untrue picture. What the Government has done is completely and consistently in line with the prayer of that petition and with that motion. Not one member can stand in this place with a Bible in his hand and say that that is untrue. The Government has acted entirely in accordance with that. I am sorry to say that the Leader does not have the courage to admit that what we have done is to try to make something decent out of the mess he created in August, 1968. We now have a flexible transport system.

Mr. Hall: Ha, ha!

Mr. Millhouse: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader and his Deputy can laugh: that is typical of their infantile minds. The situation is simply that in other parts of the world the new forms of transport are realities. These little people living in their little conclave are not aware of what is happening.

Mr. Venning: Speak up a little.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can shut up instead of speaking up. One day members opposite will be laughing right on the other side of their faces. The Government has acted completely in accordance with what was said on the occasions to which I have referred and what the Premier said before the last election. We have carried out every one of the proposals which we made at the election and for which we got a 52 per cent vote. Unlike previous L.C.L. Governments, we will be able to go back to the people and tell them that we have carried out the charter of promises on which we were elected.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Each time he speaks the Minister amazes me more. He should spend a few hours this evening working out what he is doing, and tomorrow he should make a Ministerial statement about who will be deprived of their houses in the next 10 years. He says we have a flexible transport system. He must have acquired some land or be about to acquire land so that that system can operate. Our Government had the flexible M.A.T.S. plan, which was subject to changes according to the requirements of the time. This alternative system must still take a certain route. Within 10 years or so, there will be a road through various parts of Adelaide, Edwardstown and so on. It is completely untrue to say that people will not be disturbed as this corridor (instead of the freeway in the M.A.T.S. plan) is put through. It is about time the Minister told people that they will lose their properties, whether one scheme or the other is implemented.

The Minister gets abusive. He should stop being a hypocrite and face up to the facts. The whole history of this Government has been tragic. Before the election, the Premier said that his Government would negotiate and have the Dartmouth dam situation fixed up within a week or two. That statement appeared in newspapers along with the claim that we had to have an election then because, with the credit squeeze and the weaknesses and mistakes of the Commonwealth Government, there would be a depression in South Australia within a few months. Despite poor government in South Australia since then, that has not happened. Because of the efforts of the Commonwealth Government to keep a balanced economy, we have more or less full employment. It is frightening to think that what happened in 1965 could happen again. There is a lack of confidence in South Australia at present.

Unless the Government acts responsibly in financial matters, although we hope it will not happen, history will repeat itself. I am glad that, in the member for Hanson, there is another member in the House with a background in accountancy; that is what we need if we are to have good government in South Australia. At present, we have an alternative scheme to the M.A.T.S. plan and an unbalanced Budget. In the late 1930's, under a Labor Government, there was an unbalanced Budget. The Auditor-General's Report shows that we are still paying interest on the debts incurred in the 1930's.

Mr. Hopgood: Can you name any State Government that did not have debts in those years?

Mr. McANANEY: The little pipsqueak is on to this subject again. We must run our own State. If we can have good, responsible government, by people with some experience in accountancy, we can run the State successfully. The last three Labor Governments have run us into debt. What is overspent in the Budget must be cut out in Loan works. Providing services of a productive nature will improve living standards in South Australia; we must not pay out money on unproductive enterprises. No-one who has ever studied economics or had similar training would have budgeted for a $5,000,000 deficit at the beginning of this financial year. Under the previous Government, there was confidence in the State, and South Australia had full employment as a result of sound government. No sound economist would budget for a $5,000,000 deficit under those conditions. When Sir Thomas Playford was Treasurer for many years, he put money in reserve when things were booming so that when things were not so good he had something up his sleeve. By this means, South Australia had a lower rate of unemployment than had the other States.

The Government has budgeted for a $5,000,000 deficit. This means, therefore, that it will not be able to spend $5,000,000 on Loan works, which would have been of more lasting benefit to this State. A deficit of only $5,000,000 in a Budget of $371,000,000 is not very much: indeed, it is a little more than 1 per cent and, if the Government was able to achieve its present estimated deficit of $11,000,000, the Budget deficit would amount to only 2½ per cent or 3 per cent of total expenditure. Therefore, with careful management and by not wasting money on frivolous things, as this Government has done in the past, the Government would be able to reduce its expenditure by 3 per cent. Indeed, this should have been done years ago in relation to the Education Department, which should have its own maintenance gangs and architects to ensure that it can build schools of a satisfactory standard and at a reasonable cost, instead of spending too much on them, as is happening at present.

I recently inspected one school, which had a room to spare. Despite this, two flexible classrooms were added to it. I am not saying that those classrooms should not have been built if the Government had the necessary resources. However, that is not the present position and, as those rooms were not absolutely required, they should not have been built. I could take members to a school that is like a Heath Robinson organization, where people are running about not knowing where various things are. Pipes are being dug up or laid in the wrong places, and so on. Surely, if local people rather than these experts (and I readily admit that they are experts) were called in, expenditure could be reduced overnight without much difficulty. One must do the same sort of thing in running one's own budget. I have been lucky in this world and have worked for what I have achieved. However, one must work to a budget. We should remember Micawber's attitude: if one has $10 and spends only $9.99 of it, one is happy and contented with what one has got, whereas if one spends more than the $10 one is in trouble.

It has been suggested that the imposition of a payroll tax will be introduced in the various States. Whether such a provision is introduced by a Liberal Government or by any other Government, I will strongly oppose it. Australia is already experiencing a grave inflationary trend, and the primary producers and secondary industries that export goods are being overburdened with costs that they cannot carry. If the payment of a payroll tax is foisted on them, harmful increases throughout industry will occur. What benefit is obtained by imposing such a tax? If such a tax is introduced, Government expenditure on everything it purchases will increase: the cost of schools will rise, and one will be able to buy less with the same sum. Therefore, inflation will occur again. The only benefit might be that the age pension might not be increased for a week or two.

Mr. Langley: Isn't that a Commonwealth matter?

Mr. McANANEY: I am speaking not as a politician but as a statesman. We should take

cognizance of these things and act accordingly, rather than on the spur of the moment. It has been suggested that we cannot afford to pay more income tax. However, if the public sector is going to spend more money, there is only one way for the Government to obtain additional revenue—by income tax. Although this might reduce incentive for those people who produce goods, it is the only way in which a Government can obtain money to spend at the public level, and the sooner members grow up and face up to this, the better it will be for all concerned.

I received a telephone call from one of my constituents today regarding the difficulties facing people in the Hills in relation to pollution. My constituent's son, who was called up for national service for two years, has returned to his property, and he wants to increase the number of pigs on his property. However, he has been told he cannot do so, despite his being a sound farmer who does not graze his pigs until the ground becomes bare and the water runs off of it, and who leaves his areas well grassed. Cases such as this should be judged not generally but on their individual merits. He should not be stopped from doing what he desires merely because someone says generally that he might be causing pollution. Although this provision has some value, it must be policed fairly; otherwise, many injustices will occur.

The Government should be condemned for many of the things it has done or failed to do. I refer first to the construction of the Dartmouth and Chowilla dams. Had it not been for the delay of the Labor Government in 1965 and for the 1967 drought, South Australia might have had additional water by now. It was obvious then that Chowilla would not be a successful dam for collecting water. Had work on that dam been further advanced when this became apparent to those who knew the Murray River, when the people at Mildura so strongly opposed the construction of the Chowilla dam, and had it not been for the 1967 drought, the Chowilla dam might have been a reality now. However, now that we realize Chowilla is not the best proposition, it is time for us to get on with the construction of another dam, and, at this stage, that dam must be Dartmouth. Indeed, I will stick my neck out and say that I do not think a dam will ever be built at Chowilla unless it be a smaller dam built with South Australian money. I say that, because no other State will help us build such a dam, as no other State will derive any benefit therefrom.

The Government should also be condemned for continuing with the M.A.T.S. plan when it is saying that it is not doing so. The Government has overspent, without showing any real improvement in the services provided in this State. It has increased taxes generally, and there was much upset over the increase in land taxes. However, this is nothing to what will happen as a result of increased rural valuations, which will in turn increase water rates. A farmer has to pay so many cents an acre on the value at which his land is assessed and, in cases where assessments have been doubled, farmers will have to pay nearly double the price for their water. Although land tax rates have been reduced, water rates have not been reduced. Admittedly, some farmers whose properties were previously valued highly will have to pay little or no increase. Unfortunately, however, people in dry areas whose land was previously assessed at a lower rate will be hit to leg by the increased water charges. These people cannot pay their way now, and it is ridiculous for one to give them help from a rural reconstruction scheme and then to impose increased charges on them. This situation must be examined. We can speak about many actions taken by this Government while in office. It is following the same trail as that which was followed by the Labor Government between 1965 and 1968 and which led to tragedy. I hope that conditions do not get as bad as that, but there is every omen that they will.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I do not intend to delay the business of this House any longer than it has already been delayed by Opposition members who have used the time that should have been devoted to the proper business of the State to make a series of utterly unfounded allegations against Ministers.

Mr. Hall: Nonsense.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Leader of Opposition may say my statement is nonsense, but he led off his attack with the suggestion that I, in a pamphlet distributed to my constituents, had misled those constituents about this Government's expenditure on education in relation to expenditure by the previous Government. The Minister of Education has already shown the House just how unfounded that charge was, how the figures were accurately based on a comparison of Budget figures with Budget figures, and how they were equally valid on a comparison of actual figures with actual figures. The whole charge was completely unfounded and was introduced by the Leader to try to mislead the public into

doubting the credibility of Ministers. That was the pattern of his attack and he continued it in relation to both the Minister of Works and the Minister of Roads and Transport.

He was followed by his Deputy, the member for Mitcham, who saw fit to make two quotations. One concerned the Minister of Roads and Transport, but the honourable member conveniently omitted the two relevant paragraphs from what he read. He then saw fit to base an attack upon me on a question which he had asked and which I replied to, but he omitted the two most relevant words in the question, namely, "this session".

Mr. Millhouse: That's absolutely untrue.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Does the honourable member say that that is absolutely untrue? The honourable member omitted the words "this session" from what he read. The actual words reported in the *Hansard* proof that I have are as follows:

Does the Government intend to introduce amendments to the Social Welfare Act this session?

Mr. Millhouse: That's right.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member also said, "If so, when?" and the reply was, "No."

Mr. Millhouse: All my remarks were directed to that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, they were not. The honourable member's remarks were directed to a suggestion that the Government had somehow gone back on what I had said in relation to social welfare and juvenile delinquents and it was only by interjection that I compelled the honourable member to acknowledge that his question contained the words "this session".

Mr. Clark: He questioned your sincerity.

The Hon. L. J. KING: He did, and he questioned my courage when he suggested I was shirking an issue. He followed faithfully in the tracks of his Leader, who had questioned my credibility in relation to a statement. However, the member for Mitcham, in making his attack, showed his own lack of credibility by quoting only part of his question without reading the relevant words.

Mr. Millhouse: If you have any defence at all—

The Hon. L. J. KING: In addition, the member for Mitcham turned to the matter of *Oh! Calcutta!* and suggested that I was shirking my responsibility, apparently, by not attending, I suppose, the first staging of this show. He compared the course that I have indicated with the practice he adopted on at least one occasion in relation to the play *Boys in the Band.*

There are two fatal objections to a Minister's putting himself in the position of viewing a live show. First, he finds himself in the position of having to re-write the script, which is just the position in which the honourable member found himself in relation to the play *Boys in the Band.* He has found himself in the position of deleting a word or words that he personally found objectionable and leaving in a word or words that many other people might have found more objectionable.

What sort of practice is that? Surely the responsibility is on people who produce plays to show that those plays comply with the law of South Australia. It is no business of the Attorney-General (and it was no business of the member for Mitcham when he was Attorney-General) to put himself in the position of editing a script for the benefit of those who produce the show and thereby imposing his own personal judgment as to taste and decorum on other members of the community.

Mr. Millhouse: Why haven't you deleted that section from the Act?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The law remains as it is. I will come back to that in a moment. The second fatal objection to the pre-viewing of a live show is the one to which the member for Mitcham himself has referred: namely, that there is absolutely no way of knowing whether a performance will be repeated in the same way. To view a show and find that it does not offend against the law and therefore take no action offers no guarantee that the show will be performed in the same way and that the law will not be broken subsequently. No-one charged with the responsibility of administering the law is entitled to say, "I assume that all people are trustworthy and I will therefore act on that assumption". What sort of law enforcement agency would we have if the police acted on the assumption that everyone in the community was honest and trustworthy?

Mr. Millhouse: That is the law, isn't it: that a man is innocent until proved guilty?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham does not take notice when I rise to my feet and keep order, I shall not hesitate to name him. He has made his speech and the Attorney-General is replying, and I will insist that the Attorney-General be heard in silence.

The Hon. L. J. KING: When I put this point to the Leader of the Opposition during

the television debate or encounter to which the honourable member has referred, the Leader offered the helpful suggestion that perhaps the Attorney should go in disguise and thereby overcome the difficulty. I do not know whether the member for Mitcham can improve on that suggestion but, if he has any improvements on it, I shall be pleased to hear them. I was not over-impressed by that suggestion.

The member for Mitcham went on to allege that the Attorney-General was further shirking his responsibility by saying, "Let the police do it. If the police feel there is something wrong, they may take action." I do not know what anyone else may have said anywhere else in the world, but certainly I have never suggested that that is the appropriate course. The police have the responsibility to take action if they detect an offence. They also have the right to seek the guidance and advice of the Attorney-General on whether an offence is being committed and, if they seek my advice (and I have no doubt that they will, following any observations of this performance that they make), they will certainly be given the benefit of my advice and that of the Solicitor-General on whether offences have been committed and, on the basis of those observations made on whether offences have been committed, a decision will be made on whether a prosecution is to be instituted. Then the police will institute prosecutions, doubtless, on the advice of the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General on whether breaches of the law have occurred.

However, the police have a perfect right under the law to launch prosecutions on their own responsibility if that course commends itself to them. It is entirely for the police but I assume that police officers will attend. I have discussed the matter fully with senior police officers and this course has been approved by the Commissioner of Police. Members of the Police Force will attend and provide reports, and on these reports it will be possible to determine whether offences are being committed on stage. If they are, prosecutions will be instituted. If it seems that the continuance of the performances will involve continuing offences against the law, the powers conferred on me by section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act will be exercised and further performances will be prohibited. That is the proper way in which section 25 should be administered, and it is a pity that the member for Mitcham, when Attorney-General, did not set the appropriate precedent and act in the same way, and not put himself in the ridiculous situation of viewing a performance and then getting out a blue pencil and drawing lines through parts of the script. I do not intend to put myself in that position.

It is not the business of the Attorney-General or of the Government to impose personal standards of taste, decorum, or private moral judgment on other members of the community. All citizens in a free society must do this for themselves, but all of us, whatever our differing standards of taste, decorum and moral judgment, must abide by the law that preserves public decency for the benefit of all. That is the only true objective standard to be applied in these matters, and it is the standard I will apply. The honourable member made some pitiful attempt to suggest that I was walking some sort of tightrope between my supposed convictions and the views that he attributed to the Premier.

The policy of the Government on this matter is perfectly clear, and has been so frequently expressed that the honourable member has no valid excuse for misunderstanding it. It is as I have already stated this evening: the Government does not intend to use legal powers to impose arbitrarily standards of taste, decorum and private moral judgment on the citizens of the State. That is not the purpose for which political power is conferred by citizens on those who govern in a free society. However, we intend to ensure that the laws relating to public decency are observed. When evidence is produced, if it is produced, that offences are committed on stage in relation to this or any other show, the law will be enforced for the protection of public decency.

I now pass on to the question of the Social Welfare Act to which the member for Mitcham referred. The honourable member has seen fit to misquote a question and reply, and on this he has based an argument—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: His true form!

Mr. Millhouse: I do not think—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to call members to order. The member for Mitcham had his chance, and the Attorney-General is rightly replying to the points the honourable member tried to make, and he must be heard in silence.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Mitcham referred to a report of the Social Welfare Advisory Council that came into his hands shortly before the last State election. He also referred to an interview on television, in which he and I participated, on the subject

of juvenile delinquency and the steps that should be taken. True, as he said on that occasion both he and I expressed the view that there was much in that report that was worth while, and we both indicated that, if given the chance, we hoped we would be able to implement the valuable aspects of it. Since this Government took office the subject of juvenile delinquency has been given most assiduous attention by me and by the department, and plans have been pursued with as much rapidity as is consistent with thoroughness to have legislation on the Statute Book that would greatly improve the way young people who come in conflict with the law are treated. The council's report has proved invaluable, and I repeat my expressions of appreciation that I have offered many times to the members of that council, including the member for Bragg, for its work and for the far-sighted recommendations it made.

However, it is not to be thought on that account that the council report is the beginning and the end of the treatment of the subject of juvenile delinquency. Other people have been consulted, and the new Director of the department has done much work on the subject. Several drafts of proposed legislation have been made and a revised draft came into my hands about three days ago. The only reason why a Bill has not been introduced (and will not be this session) is that time has run out. It is not practicable to have the legislation drafted and introduced before the end of this session. It will be one of the early measures to be introduced next session.

The honourable member's criticism, of course, was completely worthless if based on a true quotation of the question and reply, and its only pretence to validity was based on the false quotation which he made and by which he sought to suggest that the Government had laid the subject aside and was not considering it. I think he suggested that I was all talk or all wind, or something of that sort. I assure the honourable member (and I am sure he will receive the news with delight) that he will be confronted with legislation early in the new session, and I look forward to his enthusiastic support of it when it is introduced.

The final matter to which I refer is criticism relating to social welfare policies. It was interesting to notice that the honourable member could not criticize pronouncements on the Government's social welfare policy. The best he could do was to say that he thought of it first. The honourable member bases his claim that it was all his idea on the fact that, whilst he was in office, he introduced the amalgamation of the Social Welfare and the Aboriginal Affairs Departments. I assure the honourable member that, valuable as that move was, it is only a minute aspect of the reforms in social welfare which are needed in this State and which will be implemented by this Government. What this Government has approved, and what will be outlined to this House when legislation is introduced in the new session, is a blueprint for a completely new scheme of social welfare in this State, a subject that was neglected not only by the previous Government, in which the member for Mitcham was a Minister, but by all Liberal Governments that have held office in this State for over 30 years.

Now, the Labor Government is resolved to do what can be done to repair the neglect that has taken place in this area over that period. The Government has approved policies, as the House will see when they are outlined in due course, that will not only completely overhaul social welfare policies but will ensure that these policies are geared to the real needs of the people. We will see in this State a completely new approach to social welfare.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you give any details now?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member will receive them in due course. I will not occupy any more time of the House this evening, because we have had the extraordinary spectacle of Opposition members one after the other complaining that we have not introduced a Social Welfare Bill, a Police Pensions Bill or some other Bill, although they spend the time of this house in a muckraking expedition based on nothing but an attempt to smear the Government and its members in the eyes of the public.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I have listened with much interest this evening to the comments made by Ministers. However, I do not need to listen to them: I only have to observe the look on their faces to know that, regarding many of the things said by members on this side, the Ministers concerned are guilty. Indeed, there are many aspects of the Government's activities concerning which Opposition members can attack the Government. Last Wednesday, at the opening of the Strathmont Centre, the Deputy Premier, who has just left the Chamber, read a speech (I take it, on behalf of his Leader), and said that we had filled our pockets and were now

filling our lungs. However, the pockets of country people are not full; they are almost empty, and the position is becoming worse.

The Treasurer has received deputations and knows about meetings held throughout the country in connection with unimproved land values. Although he said he was sympathetic to statements made on this matter during the farmers' march last year, the position has deteriorated. In fact, unimproved values under the present quinquennial assessment are considerably higher than they were five years ago. However, the indications are that land values as at July 1, 1970, are lower than they were five years ago. Although Valuation Department officers tell us that values in the previous quinquennial period were low throughout the State, we find that values in even the stable areas have been increased by 20 per cent, 30 per cent, and up to 50 per cent. As land values have dropped considerably, the unimproved values should have been decreased.

These unwarranted increases in value have created problems in respect of other taxing measures also. It is necessary that the Treasurer put things right, particularly where the Grants Commission is concerned, and that the correct values be established, even if some primary producers are not required to pay land tax in future. Within about one hour and 20 minutes (tomorrow on April 1) there will be an increase in this State in rail freights: growers whose grain is carried on the longer hauls will pay 1½c a bushel increase. That is what this Government is doing to encourage primary producers to stay in the country! These producers are financing the State through the railways. However, they will be finding other means of transporting their grain to a terminal and, as a result, the railways will become a white elephant.

From time to time I have asked the Minister of Roads and Transport about the next stage of gauge standardization in this State, and the Minister talks about standardizing the Northern lines. However, he would do primary producers a service if he closed most of these lines and did not expect them to subsidize the State's finances by using those lines when, in fact, they can have their grain transported by road at about half the price. According to Labor's rules, its rural policy is to "encourage co-operation between the Government and South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in order to provide adequate storage for cereals where required". That is interesting, because this company is one of the few bulk handling companies in Australia through whose producers, who pay tolls in respect of country terminals and port facilities, there has been no call on the State Government whatsoever to build silos.

True, there has been a Government guarantee, but the assets of the company are such today that the guarantee could be taken away and the company remain an enterprise on its own. We are expecting legislation to be introduced soon regarding the Commonwealth rural reconstruction scheme, and we know that the State Government will have to show that it is in such a financial position as to warrant the implementation of this scheme. However, we regret that, with the moneys on hand, there will be a delay. I sincerely hope that the Government will get this policy under way as quickly as possible in order to help those urgently in need. As the scheme will not be easy to administer, I hope the Government will set up rural offices to help in this regard.

We do not want to see the mistakes being made that have been made previously in helping our rural people. Unfortunately, as there are supposed to be no votes for the Government in rural areas, the Government is not sympathetic to these matters. Although the Administration of this State is getting into difficulty, it cannot blame the rural areas, for it has done nothing to help them. On the first page of the Labor policy speech, delivered by the Premier prior to the last election, we see the following:

With Labor, South Australia will become the technological, the design, the social reform, and the artistic centre of Australia. It will be the State with the most highly developed and diversified economy: the State which provides the complete range of human and community services. We'll set a standard of social advancement that the whole of Australia will envy.

We are seeing at the moment just where we are heading.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I wish to place before the House for consideration Supplementary Estimates for 1970-71 totalling $2,800,000. Before dealing with them in detail, however, I would like to touch very briefly on the possible eventual results for this year.

REVENUE BUDGET 1970-71

On September 3 last I presented to Parliament a Revenue Budget which forecast a deficit of just under $5,000,000. As I explained then, the costs of further wage and salary awards were to be expected and these would be offset

in part only by increases in the taxation reimbursement grant through the operation of the formula. On February 23, when I explained to the House the prospective financial situation and the revenue measures which the Government intended to introduce because of the Commonwealth's refusal at that stage to approve additional grants to the States, it appeared that the 1970-71 revenue deficit could be about $11,500,000. The expected worsening of $6,500,000 from the original forecast of just under $5,000,000 was at that time accounted for entirely by the calculated cost of salary and wage awards given or expected to be given after the framing of the Budget, and amounting to about $11,000,000, and offset in part only by an estimated increase of about $4,500,000 in the taxation reimbursement grant owing to the operation of the formula.

I am now able to report a relatively small but neverthless significant improvement in the year's prospective results, as a current review indicates that the deficit may be held to $10,000,000 or perhaps a little less. The possible improvement of about $1,500,000 from the review of mid-February is due in large part to the Government's positive actions to increase revenues and to restrain expenditures. The group of revenue measures which have been outlined are estimated to yield about $700,000 this year, while the most up-to-date review of payments indicates that the eventual aggregate could be about $800,000 less than shown by the February review. It is not possible to say just to what extent the apparent lower payments may result from the positive restraint in staffing, travel, printing, and use of other goods and services, but our firm measures are clearly having some appreciable effect.

A later advice from the Commonwealth Treasury now suggests that the taxation reimbursement grant could be about $5,000,000 above the original estimate given to Parliament, that is to say, some $500,000 higher than indicated in the February review. This possible addition of $500,000 is likely to be offset, however, by the net adverse effect of other recent variations and trends in revenue receipts. To sum up, the original Budget forecast a deficit of just under $5,000,000, the February review indicated that it might be as high as $11,500,000, and an up-to-date assessment is that it may be held to just under $10,000,000. Of course, with three months of the year still to go it is too early to make these forecasts of the probable end-of-year result with any great confidence.

APPROPRIATION

Early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act (supported by Estimates of Expenditure). If these allocations should prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a Supplementary Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3):

The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs owing to any award, order or determination of a wage fixing body, and to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water through the three major mains. This special authority is being called on this year to cover the larger part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of the national wage case decision and a number of other salary and wage determinations, with a small part of wage increases being met from within the original appropriations. It has not been necessary to call upon the special authority to cover any part of the cost of pumping water.

Governor's Appropriation Fund:

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the recent amendment to the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this sum, one-third is available, if required, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation.

Until the amendment to the Act was passed last year, the authority provided in this way was a fixed amount which rapidly became inadequate as the scope and cost of the Government's activities expanded. As was explained at the time, the intention behind the new provision was not to depart from the tradition of closely restricting the authority for "excess" expenditure without prior reference to Parliament, but rather to avoid frequent amendments to the Public Finance Act to increase the amount in absolute terms, or alternatively the burdening of the annual Supplementary Estimates with a great deal of detail. Even with the extra and increasing appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund each year it was to be expected that there would

still be the necessity for Supplementary Estimates from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

The main explanation for this recurrent requirement lies in the appropriation procedures which do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year the Government must rely on other sources of appropriation authority irrespective of the fact that another department may be under-spent by the same or a greater amount. Similarly, where a department gains automatic additional appropriation for a wage award pursuant to the main Appropriation Act, but then makes a corresponding saving on salaries and wages because vacancies remain unfilled, the additional authority may not be transferred to cover excess spending on contingencies.

I should point out that the excess of the grand total of all anticipated payments this year beyond the total in the original Estimates is expected to be much the same as the actual increased costs arising from wage and salary awards. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations but, because it is not permissible to offset "overs" against "unders", it is not sufficient to provide for all the larger excesses.

Supplementary Estimates:

Consequently, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates designed to cover the estimated excess expenditure in certain of the major areas of the Budget and to relieve the fund accordingly. The proposals for additional appropriation of $2,800,000 in all are as follows:

	$
Hospitals Department	350,000
Public Buildings Department	800,000
Education Department	630,000
Minister of Education—Miscellaneous	350,000
Railways Department	670,000
	$2,800,000

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

I will now explain in more detail the reasons for seeking further appropriation in these areas.

Hospitals Department:

The amount provided in the Estimates of Expenditure for the Hospitals Department was $34,313,000 but since the Budget was first framed there have been increases in the prices of many of the items essential to the operation and maintenance of Government hospitals. While some reduction in the level of purchases may be possible, the Government, as it has stressed on a number of occasions, is determined to ensure that drugs and other supplies continue to be available as required to provide those health services vital to the well-being of the community. For this reason appropriations of an additional $100,000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and $250,000 for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are included in these Estimates.

Public Buildings Department:

The original provision for the Public Buildings Department was $10,231,000. Extra funds are now being sought to meet unavoidable commitments in the maintenance and repair of public buildings, particularly Education buildings. The department is making every effort to slow down the rate of commitments while still continuing essential services, but work on a large number of minor contracts let in the time of the previous Government has proceeded more rapidly than expected. Despite recent economies made by the department, the original estimates will be exceeded, and to cover this excess it has been necessary to provide for a further $800,000 in Supplementary Estimates.

Education Department:

The sum of $74,697,000 was appropriated for the Education Department at the beginning of the year but increases in the prices of materials and equipment used at departmental schools, and in items of cost such as postage, seem certain to make the original appropriations for these purposes inadequate. In addition, the volume of requirements has been greater than originally estimated. Payment of salaries to teachers who have been given leave from teaching duty in order to improve their qualifications are regarded as scholarship payments and, because the people undertaking study in this manner are more senior than had been expected, the total of debits to "scholarships" will be increased and the existing authority will not be sufficient. Largely as a result of these factors, extra appropriation of $630,000 for the Education Department is sought for this financial year.

Minister of Education—Miscellaneous:

For many years it has been the practice for finance for the universities to be determined for three-year periods and for Commonwealth legislation to set out the amount of Commonwealth grants which will be attracted by specified levels of State grants and fees. It has also been the practice for the legislation

to be amended to make provision for additional finance to cover the heavy additional costs involved when academic salaries have been reviewed. However it has been customary for the original financial provisions fixed for three-year periods to take account of the much smaller increases in costs which may flow from increases in non-academic salaries and, of course, for universities to plan in their annual budgets to meet such increases.

Arrangements for the financing of colleges of advanced education have followed a similar pattern and, with the acceptance of a recommendation by Mr. Justice Sweeney that the salaries of suitably qualified staff at these institutions should be the same as the salaries of comparable staff at the universities, the treatment of the two types of institution is now very much the same. It is therefore to be expected that the legislation dealing with the colleges will be amended to provide for higher academic salaries in much the same way and at much the same time as the universities' legislation is revised for this purpose. When Mr. Justice Eggleston reported last year on appropriate levels of academic salaries for Australian universities, he made his recommendations on the assumption that these salaries would be adjusted in line with national wage case decisions and that the Governments concerned would arrange finance for the universities to cover the additional costs so incurred. As the South Australian Government accepted these recommendations, subject to the Commonwealth's legislating to provide its share, the grants to the universities will have to be increased to cover the additional costs of the 6 per cent decision as it affects academic salaries from January 1, 1971, and these Estimates provide accordingly for the latter half of this financial year.

The Eggleston report did not deal specifically with staff at colleges of advanced education, but in the present circumstances the salaries of academic staff at the colleges may be expected to move in line with salaries of comparable staff at the universities. Subject to the Commonwealth's accepting an obligation for its share of the cost, college academic staff will receive the benefit of the national wage case decision, and appropriation is necessary in anticipation of this. The additional amount involved in grants ($350,000) must be appropriated in full by the State for the three major institutions in 1970-71, as follows: University of Adelaide, $210,000; Flinders University of South Australia, $70,000; and South Australian Institute of Technology, $70,000. It is expected that by June 30 the State will recover 35 per cent of these amounts from the Commonwealth as that Government's normal share of the additional costs, and the sums so recovered will be paid to the credit of Revenue Account.

Railways Department:

The original Estimates of Expenditure included $38,066,000 for the running expenses of the Railways Department. A further $670,000 is now required to meet increased costs of a number of items. The main reasons for the increase are unexpectedly heavy costs incurred in the repair of tracks other than the main arterial lines, expenditure above estimate in the repair and maintenance of rolling stock, and an increase in the price of distillate for diesel fuel. The total additional appropriation for the purposes I have explained is $2,800,000

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line of the Supplementary Estimates.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1972.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1972, a sum of $60,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishments or services shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1971, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of $60,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. As honourable members know,

the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, normally two such Bills each year, and without this Bill now before the House there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1971.

For each of the past three years the first Supply Bill has been for $40,000,000. With increasing salary and cost levels it is necessary to up-date these measures from time to time and, accordingly, the Bill before honourable members is for a higher amount of $60,000,000. It should suffice to cover requirements through July and August. Accordingly, it will be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to the House in the latter part of August to provide for requirements while the Estimates and the main Appropriation Bill are being considered during September and October. A short Bill for $60,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1971-72, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1970-71. In accordance with normal procedures, honourable members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1971-72 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented.

Later:

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer has assured the House that this Bill will have no consequences in addition to those associated with similar previous measures. Although I may not develop here any argument concerning the Supplementary Estimates, I point out that they have been presented earlier than has been the case previously. However, this is a matter on which we may comment when those Estimates are considered. As it seems that this Bill covers the contingencies outlined in the second reading explanation and has no unusual feature, I support the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I agree that there is nothing unusual in this Bill. However, I ask the Treasurer whether, as this measure and the Supplementary Estimates are being considered on April 1 (and not, as is usually the case, in June), it is not likely that the House will sit in June.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): That is the case. It is not intended that the House will sit in June. We can expect that the new session will open in July. The practice that has existed at a time when normally the House did not sit in the first half of the year, except to consider the Supplementary Estimates, has not obtained this year. Therefore, we are trying to dispose of all business for the first half of the year in this part of the session. The House will be asked to sit for the new session in July, and then to sit for the remainder of the year.

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

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL (SEATON)

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TROTTING)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, 1962, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The second schedule to the Companies Act, 1962-1970, prescribes the fees payable under the Act, and the purpose of the Bill is to repeal and re-enact that schedule to give effect to a decision made by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and the States at a conference held in Canberra, when it was agreed that, because of the increase in the cost of administering the companies legislation, it was necessary to increase some of the fees prescribed by the Act. Particulars of the proposed increases are as follows:

1. The minimum registration fee, which is prescribed by item 1 of the schedule and which is payable in respect of a company having a nominal capital not exceeding $10,000, is increased from $60 to $100.

2. Where the nominal capital exceeds $10,000, the additional fees payable under

item 2 of the schedule in respect of that excess are being doubled.

3. Where an existing company increases its nominal capital, item 3 of the schedule requires the company to pay fees in respect of the amount by which the capital is increased to the same extent as if the company had been originally registered with the increased amount of capital. The new scale of fees payable in respect of the nominal capital will apply to increases of capital.

4. The fee payable under items 20 and 21 of the schedule on the registration of a charge created by a company, and on the registration of particulars of a series of debentures, is increased from $8 to $10.

5. The fee of $4 payable under item 22 of the schedule on registration of particulars of each issue in a series of debentures is increased to $5.

6. The proposed fee of $50 prescribed by items 27 and 27c of the new schedule for lodging a prospectus by a local company or a trust deed relating to "interests" (as defined in section 76 of the principal Act) represents an increase of $30 over the existing fee. Prospectuses of local companies and trust deeds must be carefully checked by the Registrar before being accepted for registration, and it is considered that the number of man hours devoted to the checking of those documents fully justifies the increase in the fee.

7. The fee of $4 prescribed by item 31 of the schedule for entering on the register a memorandum of satisfaction of a charge is increased to $5.

8. The fee of $10 payable under items 39 and 39a of the schedule on the lodgement of an annual return of a company and of a balance sheet of a foreign company is increased to $12.

9. The Act makes provision for the lodgement of returns upon the happening of certain events—for example, changes in directors, allotment of shares, change in situation of registered office, etc.—and a common fee of $3 is payable under item 40 of the schedule on the lodgement of those returns. It is proposed to increase that fee to $4.

Items 18a and 19a in the amended schedule do not effect an increase in fees but have been inserted to correct an anomaly in the existing schedule. The share capital of some oversea companies consists of shares that have no par value, and it is therefore impossible to apply the formula set out in items 1, 2, and 3 of the schedule when assessing the amount payable on the registration of the company or on an increase of capital. Items 18a and 19a prescribe a formula to overcome that difficulty and to ensure that large oversea companies do not escape payment of reasonable registration fees.

The effect of the increases in the fees will be that, in the vast majority of cases, existing companies will pay only an additional $3 or $4 a year and will produce about an additional $100,000 in revenue. It is difficult to estimate the amount of additional revenue that would result from the increase in the registration fees of new companies, because the registration fee is based upon the amount of nominal capital in each case and because it is impossible to know how many new companies will be registered each year. However, it is conservatively estimated that an additional $150,000 will be derived from that source.

In view of the obvious benefits derived by persons who take advantage of the protection and facilities afforded by the Companies Act, it is considered that the proposed increases are by no means unreasonable. The Companies Amendment Bill currently being debated by the Victorian Parliament contains identical increases in the fees payable under the Companies Act of that State, and in Queensland it is proposed to adopt the increased scale of fees in the near future. The remaining States are also examining the question, and it is expected that similar action will be taken by them at an appropriate time. The Bill is to be brought into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from March 30. Page 4473.)

Clause 5—"Enactment of heading and sections 27a to 27g of principal Act."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

In new section 27b to insert the following new subsection:

(2) Where in the opinion of the Minister—

(*a*) a lump sum paid in accordance with subsection (1) of this section entitles a person or two or more persons to attend a series of entertainments; and

(*b*) the amount of the lump sum, or so much thereof as is referable to the entertainments would if apportioned equally between the entertainments result in an effective admission charge for one person to each entertainment of not more than one dollar,

the amount of the lump sum shall be exempted from entertainment tax under this Act.

I understand that, when the Committee was previously sitting, several members opposite raised a point about people joining football clubs, for instance, and paying a year's subscription, which would allow them to enter ovals from time to time and, at the same time, give them some other rights and facilities. Those rights and facilities are coped with in new section 27c. However, on examination, the Government is satisfied that it is wise to make a further specific provision about this so that there can be no question of an increase occurring that will mean that people rather than joining the clubs will simply pay admission money at the gate. My amendment covers the query about a lump sum payment, and I think it satisfies objections raised by members opposite.

Mr. COUMBE: This amendment appears to cover some of the anomalies that may occur when people pay an annual subscription to certain clubs where some type of entertainment is provided. I am not referring to other rights in other parts of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: This amendment clears up the situation that concerned me. However, if we accept this amendment now, are we precluded from going back to discuss a previous new section?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Acceptance of the amendment does not preclude discussion on the clause, but it does preclude the moving of any amendment preceding the amendment now under discussion.

Dr. EASTICK: New section 27a (5) uses the word "reasonable", whereas the equally nebulous word "substantial" is used in other legislation. I want to be absolutely sure about what the Treasury will regard as reasonable costs that clubs or organizations may incur. Unless I can get a clear definition of the word and the way in which it will be interpreted, I may have to seek leave to move that "reasonable" be struck out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This implies a Ministerial discretion, and I think that is necessary. At times people can put in costs for charitable entertainment which are in fact unreasonable to any reasonable man.

Mr. Coumbe: There have been unfortunate cases in the past.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. If there is to be an exemption in relation to a charitable entertainment, it must be genuinely a charitable entertainment where the costs and outgoings are effectively related to the kind of entertainment that it is, and there must be some genuine return to the charitable body. We cannot have things covered up under the disguise of a charitable cause that are other than a genuine charitable cause. In a Statute, we cannot define this or lay down a rigid rule. It must be looked at administratively in each case; we cannot put in a table. That is why in cases such as this the word "reasonable" occurs commonly in our Statutes. The standard of the reasonable man is something that has often been passed on in the courts.

Mr. EVANS: Following the discussion last evening, I am pleased that the amendment has been moved. I am not really sure what we mean by "entertainment". I take it that, if a person pays a subscription to a golf club and there is entertainment for him, that would not be classed as entertainment.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Dr. EASTICK: I am happy with the explanation that has been given. As this new section did not previously have any subsections, now that new subsection (2) has been inserted, there will need to be a new subsection (1).

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is an automatic amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FISHERIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 17. Page 4130.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): All good things come to those who wait, and fishermen have waited 50 years for this all-embracing legislation. The Bill repeals the Fisheries Act. It will provide for an industry that is important as an income earner not only to South Australia but to the Commonwealth as well. Statistical records show that the industry has flourished, despite the discussions we have had from time to time about various fluctuations in it. The figures show that 10 years ago there were 1,650 fishing boats in South Australia, their value being $3,400,000, and about 6,000 people were engaged in the industry. In 1967-68, 2,360 vessels were engaged in fishing, and in 1968-69 the number of vessels had increased to 2,691. By comparison with the wool industry, the fishing industry is going ahead. In 1967-68, the value of the vessels was $7,216,000 (in 1968-69, it was $8,876,000), 13,052 people were engaged in the industry (this number had increased to 14,883 in 1968-69), and the quantity

of crayfish taken was 5,264,000 lb. as against 4,926,000 lb. in 1968-69. There was a decrease for some reason or other. In 1967-68 the value of crayfish caught was $3,369,000, whereas in 1968-69 that value had increased to $3,448,000. In 1967-68, 22,678,000 lb. of other fish was taken, as against 25,115,000 lb. in 1968-69. In 1967-68 the value of other fish was $3,624,000 as against $4,235,000 in 1968-69. The total value of all fish taken in South Australia in 1967-68 was $6,993,000, whereas in 1968-69 it was $7,683,000. So, the industry should be respected and it should be given all possible assistance to see that it has a worthwhile place in our community.

In his second reading explanation the Minister referred to the work of the Select Committee that reported to this House in September, 1967, after taking much evidence. That committee looked at every aspect of the industry. An eminent lawyer, Sir Edgar Bean, who is one of the acknowledged authorities on Parliamentary drafting, was retained to consult with the authorities in preparing the Bill that would bring the legislation into line with the requirements of a modern fishing industry. The Select Committee conducted its inquiries with searching finesse and took into account all the complexities of the industry. The decision to repeal the old Act was taken in consultation with Sir Edgar. So, it was a decision based on firm grounds, and the House can be assured that there is a real need to rewrite the legislation.

Every member should examine the Bill to ensure that it adequately provides for improvements in research and administration so that this important industry will continue to make a significant contribution to our economy. I believe that that is the ideal of the Bill. The Opposition has carefully considered the Bill and wants more information from the Minister than he has given in his second reading explanation. One point requiring further explanation is the abstract penalty that applies to a person having a catch one-tenth of which is undersize fish; if he has such a catch the whole catch can be cashiered. I shall deal with that point later. The Opposition's major objection centres around clause 67; in this Bill the sting is in the tail. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

By clause 67 a fisheries research and development fund is established in the Treasury. It will consist of one-third of all licence fees and registration fees paid under the Bill other than fees paid for the use of facilities provided by the Minister of Marine under clause 22 of the Bill and money appropriated for the fund by Parliament. It is contemplated that money will also be made available by the Commonwealth.

Subclause (3) sets out the purposes for which the fund may be used—that is, fishing research in South Australian waters, conservation and development of fisheries, and other purposes beneficial to the fishing industry.

We agree that there must be research and that decisions must be taken that are beneficial to the industry. The Commonwealth Fishing Industry Research Act was assented to on September 26, 1969, to approve research funds. Section 4 (1) provides:

The Minister may from time to time, by instrument in writing, direct a fund or account established under a law of a State in connection with the fishing industry to be an approved research fund in respect of a State for the purposes of this Act.

Can the Minister say what sum the Government will put into the research fund? In the lobbies we have heard the sum of $20,000 mentioned. That figure appears to be paltry compared with the sums that some of the other States have provided. Because fees for new licences will be fixed by regulation, we are buying a pig in a poke. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation expects an income of about $130,000 from fishing, gun, animal and bird licences. Amateur fishermen will not be required to have a licence, but they will be restricted to two devices and they will not be able to sell their catches. I have no real quarrel with that. However, the rub comes in clause 67. My research shows that in New South Wales a new Bill is being prepared. Victoria and Western Australia will contribute $100,000 each. I understand that the latter State imposes a levy on a big catch and a well established industry. The small State of Tasmania will contribute $67,000 whilst Queensland and the Northern Territory are getting their houses in order.

The Minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that about $600,000 is expected to be raised from licence fees, notwithstanding that we will allow amateur fishermen to fish to their heart's content with two devices. The Bill provides that South Australia will contribute $20,000 to the fund. This is the amount to be paid by this responsible State whose Premier, as we have heard, creates "firsts". We in this State should have the best research, but I am sure that our sister States will take a dim view of our contribution.

Every member who has been interested in the fishing industry knows of the need for research. In the Whyalla area, represented

by a Government member, the area adjacent to Port Lowly has previously provided an excellent whiting ground, as the member for Whyalla knows. The whiting fed on a natural cover of tape weed which I think was known officially as *posidonia Australis*. This weed has disappeared now and the whiting, and even trumpeters, have left the area. This has happened notwithstanding that the present member for Whyalla represents the area.

I understand further that a spill of acid and slag has polluted the area and a once great fishing ground on clean white sand no longer exists. The ecological system in that part of the gulf has been upset. That is one reason why the contribution to research should be much larger. An amount of $20,000 is not nearly sufficient to deal with that illustrious area. Again, I have heard that at one time in my own district crayfish could be caught if one paddled out up to the knees. That certainly cannot be done now, and that is another reason why we need more research.

We are repealing the principal Act and rewriting it. That is a big task, as we have found in other legislation. It is a pity that we have had to cram the debate into one week. I point out the difference between the amounts being contributed to the fund. Fishermen have expressed to Opposition members their concern and it is a pity that we are hurrying this measure through in the remaining days of the session. I have made this protest on behalf of the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is the protest?

Mr. RODDA: I am sorry if I have not made myself clear to the Minister. We are making a protest about the niggardly contribution to the fund, as provided in clause 67. It is good to put the sting in the end. I think it is reasonable that a person who devotes the whole of his time to the industry and the man who makes the major contribution should have privileges. This is spelt out in the provision regarding class A fishing licences. The A class man is recognized in clause 28 as being the backbone of the industry. It has been suggested that we should make further provision to protect the professional man. The qualifications for a fishing licence are dealt with in clause 30. I shall be pleased to hear the Minister deal with this part of the industry in his reply to this debate. Some concern has been expressed about the policing of this Act, because the countryside and our seaboard covers many hundreds of miles and it would be almost impossible for inspectors to be in every region of the State at any particular time. I have been told that there have been many sales of fish to outlets that are self-evident at discounted rates, and this reacts against the industry.

Much interest has been created in this legislation. The Bill seeks to detail the requirements for class A and class B licences. Amateur fishermen will not be required to have a licence, and for this consideration they will be restricted to two devices and will not be able to sell their catch. Clause 56 (*h*), the regulation-making clause, provides:

> . . . requiring such classes of persons as are specified in the regulations (being persons who take, sell, process, transport or otherwise deal with fish or fish products) to furnish the Director with statistical returns.

I hope that when regulations are promulgated they will pay due recognition to the fact that the outlets for fish should be considered. I believe that the industry wants this legislation, because it will improve the industry and help to preserve it. Members will be able to discuss regulations when they are laid on the table. Clause 37 (3) seems to me to prejudge the issue, as it provides:

> If the holder of a fishing licence or permit to take fish is charged with an offence against this Act the Minister may by written notice to the holder suspend the operation of that licence or permit until the proceedings for the offence have been disposed of and during the period of such suspension the licence or permit shall have no effect.

This seems to be rough justice in that the person is being found guilty before being tried. There may be good reason to include this provision, but I should like the Minister to say why this clause has been so worded. There seems to be an abstract penalty associated with clause 12 (5), which provides:

> If more than one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle are undersize an inspector may take and retain possession of all of the fish in the receptacle and dispose of them by sale, destruction or otherwise as the Minister directs.

I believe that there is another clause that provides some relief from this provision, and I wonder why clause 12 (5) has been included. A member of a fishing team could easily have more than one-tenth of his catch as undersize fish, but his total catch would be confiscated. Amendments will be moved in Committee but, generally, the provisions of the Bill underline the need to upgrade the industry in keeping with modern requirements. The eminent draftsman, Sir Edgar Bean, considered this Bill in its early stages. Fishing is an important industry to South Australia, and we need

primary industries that can be given the encouragement, security and research to make them flourish. We have a contributory Act under the Commonwealth jurisdiction, and details in the Bill provide that we make full and adequate contribution. The Bill can be improved but, generally, with a few exceptions, I support it. It is accepted by the fishing industry, and it will improve that industry. Anomalies must exist as this is a repealed and re-enacted Act, but I hope that these anomalies will be recognized and amended when necessary.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): The concept of this Bill goes back some time and, for the benefit of members, I reiterate some history of this legislation. On October 6, 1966, the then Minister of Marine (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) moved that a Select Committee be appointed to investigate the fishing industry in South Australia. From reading *Hansard* of that time, it seems that the Minister set up this committee after complaints had been received concerning the survey of fishing vessels.

It is interesting to read *Hansard*, because it seems that there were political reasons behind the move, as the Government of the day was in a fairly sticky situation regarding the industry and chose this way out. It is a pity that the matter had to become political, because the fishing industry is too important to this State to allow this to happen. At present, the industry has a revenue of almost $8,000,000 (much of it is export income), employs about 15,000 people, and has much capital involved in boats and equipment.

One wonders whether the terms of reference at the time were not too broad, particularly as the motion to appoint the Select Committee was moved on October 6, 1966, and the committee was to report on March 14, 1967. A Royal Commission which was set up to inquire into this industry in 1934 and which had much narrower terms of reference took 14 months to report. When speaking to the motion moved in 1966, the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. G. A. Bywaters) said that he doubted whether sufficient time had been given to investigate the matter thoroughly. In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Minister of Works said:

> The Select Committee on the Fishing Industry was appointed on October 6, 1966, and, following a reorganization of membership on November 17, 1966, the Select Committee submitted its report to Parliament on September 14, 1967.

He did not give any reason for this reorganization of membership, but this applies to the point I am making: insufficient time was given, and two members of the committee resigned for this reason. However, that is past history. The committee finally reported not on March 14 but on September 14, six months after the date originally set, and I imagine the committee found the task a difficult one. This Bill is the result of the report made by that committee, and the fact that it has taken 3½ years from that time to draft and introduce this measure shows the complexity of the matter. Indeed, the fishing industry is a complex industry; it is a peculiar industry, in which different classes of people must be considered. First, there is the professional full-time fisherman; then there is the part-time fisherman, who is quite important to the industry; and at the other end of the scale there is the amateur.

Obviously, the professional full-time fisherman is the most important person to be considered under this Bill: he is the man who usually has the largest capital outlay and who has to stand good seasons and bad and depend on the weather. The part-time fisherman, on the other hand, can pick and choose his times but, at the same time, I believe that he should be allowed to continue in this industry. That is the embodiment of free enterprise, in which all members on this side believe. I believe that a man should reap the reward of his labour and enterprises; if he is willing to work and to provide the necessary capital in order to obtain extra income, he is entitled to this reward. Fishing is an extremely popular sport or hobby, and thousands of people fish for this reason. These are amateurs who fish purely for the sport and for the pleasure they gain from it. Again, the Bill must ensure that the activities of these people are not restricted too much.

The draftsmen (Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. A. M. Olsen) are two able men; one is an extremely competent draftsman, and the other is a man experienced in fishing matters. They have been responsible for the drafting of this Bill which, by and large, satisfies the three groups of people to whom I have referred. Although I support the Bill as a whole, I foreshadow some amendments, which are on members' files, and I will be seeking an assurance from the Minister in Committee in respect of several clauses. The first clause to be considered is clause 4, which contains the provision that is necessary when an Act is being repealed, allowing those who are at present engaged in the industry and who have licences and permits under the existing Act to

continue in the industry under the new legislation. This is all right, except that I am not particularly happy about clause 4 (4) (i), about which I will be seeking an assurance from the Minister. This provision states:

The holder of a licence under section 13 of the repealed Act without and who was not at that time the holder of any other authority under that Act shall on and after that commencement be deemed to be the holder of a class B fishing licence.

That means that some full-time professional fishermen will not be able to hold a class A fishing licence under the new legislation. On my reading of this provision, a tuna fisherman, who does not need to hold any permit except a fishing licence (he does not operate in a restricted fishery), will not hold a class A fishing licence, and I think this is wrong. This could also apply to a full-time shark fisherman and to any man who is not operating in a restricted fishery. As I say, I will seek an explanation on this matter from the Minister. Frankly, I cannot see the need for class A and class B licences as provided for at present when, broadly, these two classes are almost identical.

A class B fisherman can carry the same equipment as that carried by a class A fisherman and can fish in the same fisheries, so I cannot see why the Government has introduced this provision. A Bill drafted by the previous Government, following the recommendations of the Select Committee to which I have referred, did not have this differentiation: it referred to commercial and amateur fishing licences.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where did you get that Bill? Was it ever introduced?

Mr. CARNIE: No, it was a draft that was never introduced. It was drafted following the report of the Select Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Have you a copy of it?

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. I cannot see the need for a class A and a class B fishing licence, although I point out that the foreshadowed amendments, if carried, would create a slight difference between the two, and perhaps in that case I would have no real argument. The Bill as a whole removes many anomalies that have developed over the years and tidies up many provisions. The difficulty experienced in this matter has been shown by the fact that originally, I understand, the draftsmen were asked to amend the old Act and found this to be completely impracticable. That Act is now being repealed and new legislation enacted. The Bill tidies up the provisions regarding the powers of inspectors: for example, it gives them the power to arrest and to enter residences with a warrant. Although I do not like too much intrusion in these matters, I admit that the industry is far too important not to be properly policed. This Bill increases the powers of inspectors. However, I am not particularly happy about clause 7 which, granting greater powers to the Minister and to the Director, provides:

The Minister and the Director shall each have power to delegate by writing to any person any of his powers or functions under this Act . . .

I consider that this is an extremely sweeping clause. The power of delegation can be a very awkward thing. Under the present Director there will be no problem, for I know from experience that he has a great sense of responsibility; but we do not know what future Directors will be like. This power of delegation could be abused, and I am not happy about it.

Part II deals with administration, and clause 9 provides for the appointment of honorary wardens, which is a good move. It will broaden the inspectorial section of the Fisheries Department without the need to appoint full-time inspectors. This was recommended by the Select Committee. I hope I am not contravening Standing Orders when I say this, but a draft Bill was drawn up and never presented. It was really only a draft proposal. There have been some alterations to the original proposal, which was not meant to be the final thing at that stage. Clause 12 allows inspectors to enter residential premises with a warrant, so it gives them virtually the same powers as the police have. I have already referred to that, so I will not labour that point. While it may not be a good thing, unfortunately it is possibly necessary.

Then there is the variation of licences, about which I spoke. I note that this Bill fails to deal with the assignment of permits. I should like the Minister, when he replies to this debate, to tell us why the assignment of permits is not allowed. Why has this been omitted? This can cause some serious situations. For example, a man with a prawn trawler and a permit to fish prawns from that trawler may want to sell his boat, but the person wishing to buy it has no assurance under this legislation that he will obtain a prawn licence, which, in effect, is part of the goodwill in that trawler for the person selling it because, without the permit, the trawler is virtually useless for the purpose for which it

was designed. I should like to see the assignment of permits allowed, with the Minister's approval.

The provision concerning aquatic reserves is new, and it is in line with the current thinking about conservation. I think this is an extremely good move. The Director of Fisheries (Mr. Olsen) has said many times that he sees his duty as being to ensure that fish are farmed and not plundered. In that respect he carries out his duties very well, at times in difficult circumstances. Plundering has happened in some fisheries, and strict control by regulation has proved to be necessary, crayfishing being a case in point. A similar situation has not been allowed to develop with prawns and abalone, because the possibility of this occurring was foreseen from experience gained in the crayfishing industry, and regulations were introduced to control it from the start, by controlled licensing and the introduction of zoning. It is a difficult line to walk between conservation and exploitation—to allow people a reasonable living and at the same time to prevent them destroying a fishery. I do not envy the Director his job in that respect. In connection with aquatic reserves, clause 24 (5) provides:

The Minister may grant to any person (*a*) a permit to enter a controlled aquatic reserve; or (*b*) a permit to take from an aquatic reserve any fish, sand, shell, coral, rock . . .

I should like an assurance from the Minister that, when such a permit is granted, he will be guided by the purpose for which the reserve was created in the first place and will take into account the likely long-term effects on biological, ecological, geological, educational or other conservational value of the reserve; otherwise, it could destroy an important part of our State.

The clause providing for the licensing of fish dealers is completely new. Fish dealers are now required to obtain a licence. I think this is a good move, for it will allow the department to check the dealers' fish sales and sales by unlicensed persons. As a sideline, of course, it will bring in more revenue for the Government. Clause 29 (2) (*a*) deals with amateur fishermen. It provides:

. . . take fish otherwise than for the purpose of sale by means of a rod and line, hand line, hand fish spear or declared device.

I presume that a "declared device" could include a net. I should not like to see amateur fishermen banned completely from using a net. After all, some fishermen go out on dark cold nights and enjoy the sport. Many people enjoy this sport and should be allowed to continue to do so. During the Committee stage, I shall seek some assurance from the Minister (or perhaps he will tell me before then) that allowances will be made for amateurs to use nets under this clause.

Clause 33 (3) deals with the granting of a fishing licence without fee to any person who has attained a certain age and is in necessitous circumstances. The age has been increased from 60 to 65 years. Can the Minister say why that has been done? It seems to me that 60 years is all right under the present Act, and I see no reason for changing it. I am pleased to see that there is an amendment on file to strike out subclause (3) of clause 37. This is the clause about which the member for Victoria spoke and which we consider to be a denial of British justice.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): The honourable member cannot refer to amendments at this stage.

Mr. CARNIE: It is a denial of British justice, for it prejudges a man and assumes that he is guilty until proven innocent, and this is the reverse of what we normally allow. I come now to what may prove to be the most controversial clause of the Bill. It is clause 67, which deals with the setting up of a fund to be called the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. Clause 67 (2) provides:

There shall be paid into the fund (*a*) an amount equal to one-third of the amount of all charges or fees payable under this Act not being charges or fees prescribed by the regulations referred to in subsection (2) of section 22 of this Act.

As I am not allowed to refer to amendments, I will not go too far on this subject. At the same time, I wish to compare the sum specified in this Bill with what is spent in other States. For a start, it is estimated that returns under the Bill will amount to about $60,000, which will provide $20,000 or $30,000 for research.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where did you get that figure? You didn't get it from anyone in authority.

Mr. CARNIE: I have obtained information from several sources, although I have not been able to check its accuracy. However, this is an estimate, and I cannot see that much more than that can be raised from these fees. The value of the fisheries in this State is nearly $8,000,000, whereas the value of the Western Australian fisheries is about $22,000,000. In Western Australia, $98,000 was spent on research last year. Incidentally, the money for research in Western Australia is raised

from the fish processors' fees; all processors' fees are paid into a research and development fund. Western Australia maintains at Waterman a marine research centre, which has been built in the last few years and which incorporates 11 seperate laboratories and a large aquarium for experiments and studies of fish behaviour. It employs fisheries research workers from the Fisheries Department, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the University of Western Australia. Research is carried out into rock lobsters, salmon, prawns, tuna, whiting, abalone, scallops and whales. As whales are not involved in our fisheries, they need not concern us.

By contrast, in many cases South Australia relies on its fishermen to do research. I have no argument with the need for fishermen to supply statistics, as this is helpful to the department, in many cases, this being the only way in which it can obtain these vital statistics. However, I object to the fact that apparently the department looks on fishermen to do a little more than this. A senior inspector of the department has been quoted as saying in evidence that fishermen are sent to certain zones virtually to do research work. They are sent to zones about which the department knows nothing so that they can do this research work. This gentleman said that it is wellknown that fishermen will not volunteer to undertake research work. Why should they? They are in business to make a living and to get a return from their capital; they cannot afford the time that is often needed to carry out research work. I do not necessarily blame the department for its attitude, because its funds for research are extremely limited, only $6,800 being granted for this purpose last year.

The total value of the fisheries in Victoria is a little less than $6,000,000, which is less than the value of South Australia's fisheries. In that State, all fees under the Fisheries Act go into the Fisheries Research Fund. From this, the Government can withdraw up to 10 per cent for administration purposes. In other words, over 90 per cent of all fees paid under the Victorian Act must go into the research fund. We should compare that to the much smaller sum allocated under this Bill. I will not give figures for New South Wales and Tasmania, as the member for Victoria dealt with those States. These figures prove that other States are doing much more in this field than we are. I had hoped to move an amendment in this connection, but I have been told that I am not allowed to do so, because it is an appropriation matter. Therefore, I can only express disappointment at the niggardly sum provided under the Bill for research. Clause 23 provides:

> The Minister, or the Director with the approval of the Minister, may conduct research, exploration and experiments relating to fish and fisheries and to the processing and marketing of fish and, for the conduct of such research, exploration and experiments, may establish biological stations and other necessary establishments and make and carry out arrangements with other authorities and persons.

That is a large clause, which covers much ground and which will certainly need much money to implement, but the Bill does not provide this. A subclause of clause 67 allows the Government to make available such other moneys as may be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose. I only hope that in the next Budget the Government will allow a substantial sum for fishing research in this State. As I said earlier, I will seek assurances from the Minister in Committee. Until then, I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the second reading, with some reservations about the Bill; its provisions will be of considerable use in the fishing industry. We have only to look at the way that certain fishing areas have deteriorated to see that more has to be done in the way of legislation. Anyone who has been interested in fishing can recall from his own experience the difficulty in getting fish in areas where years ago they were plentiful. History books show much evidence of great quantities of fish. There is a flowery reference in a handbook of South Australia of 1908 to the "plentitude and amiability" of the fish of Australia. It goes on to praise the wonderful possibilities in South Australia. According to the writer, all that was necessary in those days was someone willing to go out and do a bit of work. Apparently the writer thought there were not enough fishermen, for he said that South Australia alone could do with 5,000 fishermen from the United Kingdom. That statement is not very scientific, but it shows what people thought of the fishing potential in those days.

There are many references to the quantity of fish that were available when there were large populations of Aborigines along the banks of the Murray River. Sturt refers to them in his books about his explorations down the Murray. Anyone who has looked at the rocky outcrops around the shores of Lake Alexandrina will have seen the large quantities of the earbones of mulloway. They

were thick-boned and did not rot easily. They were left there by natives who used to run mulloway off into the shallows and catch as many as they wanted to. I have been told of a case where one professional fisherman at Redbanks on Kangaroo Island is reported to have caught, in the 1920's, 41 dozen whiting in four hours on his own. Although I do not know whether that is exaggerated, I was told it quite definitely. It would not be possible to get anything like that nowadays. So, there has been an undoubted depletion.

I was a member of the Select Committee that was appointed some years ago to inquire into the fishing industry but I resigned from it, as did Sir Glen Pearson. We both voiced our doubts about the wisdom of having a Select Committee because we thought it had been appointed principally to achieve a political solution to the problems and we thought it would not have regard to its terms of reference in the way it should. Those terms of reference were so far-reaching that a Royal Commission, not a Select Committee, should have been appointed. The committee was asked to inquire into and report upon the need for amendments to the Fisheries Act considered necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries resources. In the words in the terms of reference, "the proper management of fisheries resources", is tied up an enormous amount of inquiry. I did not think that members of Parliament would have the time or the experience to do the technical work involved in such an inquiry and, indeed, they did not.

The Select Committee made some useful recommendations, but no-one should think that it gave us all the answers. A Royal Commission was required, comprising men who understood the fishing industry and perhaps a man with scientific knowledge, too. They could have devoted their full time to the work for months or for a year or more. At present many things have to be done by administrative action without proper research backing. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation is an experienced fisheries administrator, who was formerly a fisheries research scientist. He is more likely to give the right answers than are most other people, but he would certainly have to make guesses about some matters. We do not know what will be the effect of bag limits and size limits because we do not have enough statistical information. However, it is clear that the limits for certain fish are too small. For example, the minimum size for spotted whiting has been 11in. for many years. That limit can be altered by regulation. In connection with whiting, Trevor Scott, the Curator of Fishes at the South Australian Museum, has reported as follows:

> Spawning takes place in May through June, and the majority of females mature in their fourth year at a length of about 14in. However, an occasional fish has been observed to spawn as small as 11½in.

We must remember that our minimum size for whiting is 11in. It is therefore legal to take whiting that cannot possibly have spawned and have therefore had no chance of reproducing; they would need to live for a year after they reached their minimum size if they were to spawn. We should do something about this matter; no doubt the Director has plans in mind. If we tell some people that a whiting must be about 14in. long to be capable of reproduction, they say, "If you increase the minimum length to that size you will put every fisherman out of business." That is perfectly true, but there is nothing to stop us from increasing the minimum size by a small amount each year. An annual change of half an inch, if properly policed, would be effective. Policing alone makes a big difference. Even policing the 11in. minimum length is very effective. We must eventually deal with these matters. I only wish we had a scientific study that would give us greater certainty about these limits.

We should not forget the importance of tourism in this connection. Certain places depend on fishing as a tourist attraction. Consequently, for this reason, too, we should seek to preserve our fish stocks. Clause 7 provides that the Minister and the Director may delegate their authority. I do not doubt that the Bill has been well drafted, because Sir Edgar Bean helped in its drafting. Clause 7 (1) provides:

> The Minister and the Director shall each have power to delegate by writing to any person any of his powers or functions under this Act (except this power of delegation) . . .

The power of the Minister and the Director to delegate appears to be almost too wide. The power of delegation applies to the issue of identity cards, the disposal of seized fish, entry to aquatic reserves, the issue of licences, and even the appointment of people to review the Director's decisions; perhaps such decisions may have really been made by a delegated person. So, the power is too wide.

An amendment has been foreshadowed to clause 37, and I hope that that clause will be negatived. The issue of class B licences must

be handled tolerantly. I have found it impossible to frame a satisfactory amendment to meet all the circumstances in this respect; I think we will have to leave this matter to the administrators. I have discussed it with the Director and I think he is willing to deal tolerantly with the matter and to see that the right sort of weekenders get a chance to catch fish for sale; in other words, to get class B licences. I do not mean that everyone who wants to pay for his holiday should get a class B licence, but many people make hundreds of dollars a year from fishing, partly during weekends—not only seasonal workers but also factory workers who have a day off in the middle of the week or at weekends. I hope the Minister will make a clear statement to the House on this matter. As I have said, this cannot be expressed in words and a clear statement by the Minister will give us a guide.

I also ask the Minister to comment on the use of devices by amateurs. I understand that the present number of holders of fishing licences is about 14,000 and that, when this Bill becomes law, the number of class A licences and class B licences will not be more than 4,000. This means that about 10,000 persons who now hold licences will become amateurs on the expiry of their licences and will be restricted regarding their gear. That is rightly so, but discontent could arise when the regulations are framed. Many yards of net throughout the State can be used legally now and people should not be disqualified from using that net when they become amateurs.

I have also spoken to the Director on this and I am satisfied that he is trying to ensure that there is fair administration in this respect. However, as it is not possible to include a provision in the Bill in unequivocal terms, I think the Minister should make a statement on the position.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not intend to reply to the second reading debate at length, because I think the Bill is essentially a Committee measure and that the comments that have been made during the debate can be dealt with more adequately in the Committee stage. However, I want to make some general comments. Some members have said that certain features of the Bill do not appeal to them and all members who have spoken have referred to the need for certain features of the Bill.

The member for Alexandra has referred to the Select Committee, which was appointed in 1966 and of which he was originally a member. After a period the honourable member and the then member for Flinders (Sir Glen Pearson) decided, for reasons of their own, to retire from the committee. The member for Alexandra has said this evening that he did not consider that that Select Committee was the proper committee to examine the terms of reference given. However, I think that the committee did an extremely valuable job, and this Bill is based largely on the committee's work. Whilst the committee may not have been able to answer questions on the type of research needed, and matters of that kind, it was able to establish the need for the research, and I would not expect the committee to go further than that.

The member for Alexandra and, I think, the member for Flinders, have expressed doubts about giving a power of delegation. Such a provision is not unusual in Acts. For example, a power of delegation is contained in the Prices Act and in the Mining Act. It is obvious that the Minister and the Director must have power to delegate functions, because they could not physically deal with all the matters involved. The delegation of power can always be taken away. If it is issued in writing, it can be taken away in writing, so no problem arises there.

I consider that the Bill is overdue. I have been pleased to hear members opposite say that it is good to have the Bill and that it should have been introduced some time ago, because I remind those members that their Party was in Government for many years but it was not until a Labor Government came to office that the positive move that led to this legislation being drafted was made. Of course, I am not saying that other Governments did not do anything about fisheries.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Leader made some comments about this.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The member for Alexandra has said that it seemed that someone played politics on the matter, and that is so. We have heard this evening of the need to improve research and, because this Government is facing up to the matter for the first time, we on this side cannot be blamed. Other Governments have had plenty of opportunity to act.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You should take your share of the responsibility.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows how long his Party was in Government and how long it had to establish a fund for research. I am pleased

that that fund is now being established. However, I do not want to speak at length now, because I can deal more adequately with honourable members' requests for information in the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 25. Page 4428.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I have a gripe about the provisions regarding the membership of the authority. I consider that the representatives of persons in the land agent business have sufficient experience and the integrity appropriate to such membership. As far as I know, no complaints have been made about the activities of any members of the authority, but under this Bill they will be pushed off and replaced by other persons. Another omission will be one of the local government representatives. I understand that the Municipal Association has now ceased to operate (although it may be part of the Local Government Association), and there will not be a representative from that association but only one from local government. Formerly, there were two representatives, one from each association. The Government seems to blow hot about local government one day and cold about it the next, and it is incredible that on an authority of that size the local government representation should be reduced to only one member.

The other anomaly, referred to by the member for Mitcham, is that, whilst the member of the Real Estate Institute is to be taken off the planning authority, a person representing that institute or belonging to it will still be a representative of that body on the appeal board. I do not agree with the Government's attitude towards the membership of the authority, particularly in its removal of the representative of the Real Estate Institute. I know there is no personal animosity against this man, who has conducted himself with great credit and has been useful to the authority. I believe that he is valued as an adviser on these matters in other States.

My other complaint is the reduction of local government representation on the authority, and the anomalous situation whereby a representative of the Real Estate Institute is removed from the authority but can be a member of the appeal board.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The Minister gave notice of this Bill on Thursday, March 18, but members learned something of its provisions from the *Sunday Mail* of March 20. It is not unusual for members to be given details of Bills other than in this House. Many aspects of this Bill cast doubts on the real purpose for its introduction. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that much thought had been given to the shortcomings of the authority and the board and the aims and purposes for which they had been set up and, as a result of those considerations, this Bill was introduced. If these are the only reasons for its being introduced there should be no problem, but I wonder whether there is not some evidence of previous conflict coming to the fore, particularly in relation to real estate agents.

We recall that there was some difficulty when the Act was implemented, when there was an attempted bulldozing by the Premier of the day to force local government authorities to nominate a group of people for his selection, even to the point of trying to bulldoze the organizations into making a selection beyond the scope of their constitutions, which indicated a need for a certain period to elapse between the giving of notice of a meeting and the holding of the meeting. The Bill introduces two things: on the one hand, a member of the Real Estate Institute is able to be a member of the appeal board, but the same person is not capable of being considered as a member of the authority. It seems to me that there is a variation in the manner by which local government will be represented on the planning authority in that there will be a nomination from the Local Government Association.

Also, the Bill provides for the Government to appoint someone versed in local government. Although two people will, in effect, represent local government interests, only one need be associated directly with local government. The Minister said that one of the major issues of the new provisions was to give a greater ability to the authority so that it would be well versed in every aspect of the subject. I believe that the Minister's thoughts on this matter will be defeated by the removal of the second person directly representing local government. The Municipal Association, which used to be responsible for nominating one person, no longer exists, but there was a big

difference between the type of person who could be made available by that association and the person who could be made available by the Local Government Association.

The Municipal Association's representative understood and was actively engaged in local government in the town or city, but the person representing the Local Government Association knew or was active in local government in the country. That one of these positions is to be removed from the authority indicates that one person will represent local government; that person could not be expected to be fully aware of the requirements of local government in the city and in country areas. The Minister has suggested that this appointment will improve the knowledge available to the authority but knowledge will be lost in this one field alone. Under the new provision, the person concerned may well be a departmental officer of the Minister of Local Government. Although I do not deny that such a person would have a wide knowledge of local government, I consider that a member of the body that is active in this field, if appointed to the authority, could enhance the authority's value. New section 8a (1), which is inserted by clause 6, provides:

On and after the appointed day, no person who, either directly or indirectly, has any financial interest in the business of buying, selling, developing or otherwise dealing with land as proprietor, broker, agent or director of a company shall be eligible for appointment or re-appointment by the Governor as a member of the authority.

This provision is so embracing that it may preclude a member of the authority from conducting the sale of his own premises. It is not necessary for a person to conduct a real estate business in order to sell or promote the sale of his own property, and I should like a clear indication from the Minister that the type of person I have mentioned would not be precluded. The new Planning Appeal Board will consist of a minimum of eight members, and this number may be increased. Although a minimum of eight members will be appointed, it will not be necessary for more than one person to sit on any appeal. There is a series of provisions under which the appeal board may consist of the Chairman and other members, including the associate chairmen, although it may be that by direction or decision of the people involved only one person will hear an appeal. It is provided that a quorum will consist of three members and, if for some reason a person does not wish to continue hearing an appeal, the Chairman may direct that that appeal be recommenced before a new panel. As provision is made for the legal profession to be involved in an appeal, a person whose case may have to be recommenced before a new panel may be involved in extra legal expenses, and I find it hard to appreciate the reason for this proposal. Surely, that would not be in the best interests of the appellant. However, these matters will undoubtedly be considered when we reach the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I shall speak only briefly to this Bill. The exclusion of a member of the Real Estate Institute from the authority, even though we allow a representative from that body to stay on the board, concerns me. Objection would be raised if we excluded a person or persons interested in conservation, environment, or local government; yet we are excluding representatives of landowners. The only person who can really represent landowners is he who acts as their agent—a member of the Real Estate Institute. To say that he would have enough influence to outvote the rest of the authority is completely wrong: he would be far outvoted, being only one individual in a group; yet the landowner is to have no direct representation on the authority, although he is to be allowed to have representation on the board. The explanation of this given by the Minister is weak. It is as follows:

The principal object of the Bill concerning the State Planning Authority is to reconstitute that body with a better and wider representation of experts in the fields of local government, conservation, and aesthetics.

How do we know it will be better? We do not. When we appoint people, we do not know whether the representation will be better until they are actually working in that field. We hope they will be better and anticipate that they may be, but we are excluding two people. Surely we could have left on the authority one representative of the Real Estate Institute even if we did not like either of the two present representatives. We could appoint another person to give the landowners representation. That is my main objection to this part of the Bill. If we are to exclude members of the Real Estate Institute from the authority, we must act likewise in respect of the board if we are to be fair. The Government is trying to protect one person and dispose of two others. I see no reason for that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be so uncharitable.

Mr. EVANS: It is not a question of being uncharitable: I see no reason for it. No-one can say that one member of the authority or the board could outvote the others. I support the second reading, but I shall wait to see what happens to the Bill in the Committee stage.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): The Bill, as I see it, is to reconstitute the State Planning Authority with what has been claimed by the Minister to be a better and wider representation of experts, particularly in local government; yet we see a distinct change in the representation of local government, because the Government has said that only people with a knowledge of local government can be representatives. Many people can claim a reasonable knowledge of local government, so the representation of local government is being reduced. The Government is not enlarging the authority: it is replacing, or sacking, two members from the present authority. I wonder why that is being done. Are they incompetent or inefficient? Have they done anything wrong? One of them is a nominee of the Real Estate Institute and the other is a member chosen from a panel submitted by the Municipal Association.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is the Local Government Association now.

Mr. MATHWIN: True, but why not make it the Local Government Association? It is a similar organization.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you want to disfranchise the five councils that are not members of the Local Government Association—Mitcham, Burnside, Marion, Port Adelaide and Enfield, which represent about one-quarter of Adelaide's population?

Mr. MATHWIN: That is what is done in a union organization, isn't it? I am pleased that the Minister has drawn my attention to this. The Minister made special reference to this fact in connection with the Planning Appeal Board at page 4265 of *Hansard*, where he said:

> The disqualification relating to the holding of any interest in the business of buying and selling land is not to apply to members of the board, as it cannot be said that board decisions could benefit a member to the extent that the fundamental policies of the authority could possibly benefit a member of that authority.

I entirely disagree with that; the Government is most inconsistent on this point. As we know, the board deals with many aspects of local government such as zoning, problems with high density living and high-rise flats, infringements of the rights of subdividers, submissions of councils, problems of house builders, and many other matters. The board is just as open to the possibility of malpractice as is the authority so I do not see the point of this provision.

The Bill provides for the board to be enlarged to a minimum of eight members. However, we do not know how many members there will be: the number could be unlimited. I hope the Minister will clear up this point. I presume that members of the board will be paid, and expenses will be involved as they visit various places. Therefore, the Government must have some idea of what will be the cost of operating the board. I cannot support the Bill in its present form, as I think its provisions are far too wide. I will support amendments that make these matters clearer.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation): Most Opposition members who have spoken have followed the line adopted by the member for Mitcham. Unfortunately for them, the member for Mitcham made probably the worst speech he has ever made, so they have been struggling to work out his complaints. The excuse he offered for his speech was that he had not had an opportunity to study the Bill as he had been tied up with the Royal visit or some other visit.

Mr. Coumbe: That statement is not worthy of you.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is what he said. As I pointed out in my second reading explanation, this short Bill alters existing provisions, and members opposite have objected to most of these alterations. As the terms of office of present members of the board and of the authority were drawing to a close, the Government decided to take the opportunity to review the position and consider what it should do. The Bill provides for there to be at least eight members of the board. As my second reading explanation shows, we expect to have eight members on the board, which at present is 10 months behind in its hearings. By having eight members we hope to be able to conduct three hearings at the one time and so shorten delays in the hearing of matters before the board. I should have thought that members opposite who were interested in local government would approve this provision.

Clearly there is conflict between Opposition members and Government members on the types of person who should be on the authority. Since I have been Minister for Conservation numerous people have drawn my attention to the fact that they are not

happy with the current membership of the authority. However, I have no criticism of anyone presently on the authority. As the member for Mawson said, the public is not happy to have on the authority people who have an interest in the buying and selling of land, for the authority constantly makes decisions in relation to the future development of the State, such decisions involving much confidential material.

Mr. Coumbe: The complaints received are against the occupation and not the person?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. People in the community believe that those with an interest in the buying and selling of land should not be involved on the authority.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the board?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will come to that shortly. In view of the problems that I have had with regard to the Windy Point subdivision in the Mitcham District, in respect of which hundreds of people have indicated their lack of confidence in the authority, I am surprised that the member for Mitcham has expressed the views that he has expressed.

Mr. Evans: Do you think that members of the board had anything to do with that?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No. I am suggesting that members of the public do not have confidence in the authority; I do not suggest that it has ever made an incorrect decision. However, when it makes decisions involving matters such as the Windy Point subdivision or the Hallett Cove development, it is obvious that members of the public lack confidence in it, and this distrust continues to be expressed to me. If there is no public confidence in the authority, that is not in the best interests of the development of the State. As the Government feels strongly about this matter, it will continue to adopt its present attitude.

Members opposite also complained about the change made in relation to the representation on the authority of local government representatives or of people with a knowledge of local government. Apparently the last two Opposition speakers were confused about this because they seemed to think that there would be some reduction on the authority of the number of local government representatives. By way of interjection the Minister of Local Government said that the Local Government Association would continue to be represented on the authority. The Municipal Association is now defunct. Five councils, all within the metropolitan area (I think the Mitcham council is one of them) are not members of the Local Government Association.

Mr. Mathwin: They should join.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Perhaps they should; the honourable member would debar the Government from appointing a person outside the Local Government Association as a member, even if that person had proper qualifications.

Mr. Coumbe: Because of its size, should the Adelaide City Council receive special consideration?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It does have a special interest. The Adelaide City Council nominates a member of the authority. Since the Government is making no change in this respect it is obvious that it agrees with what the honourable member has said. I have already said that it is necessary to increase the board's membership because of the waiting list of appeals. The members for Glenelg and Light seemed to misunderstand the Bill. They said that members of the Real Estate Institute should not be included as board members. If they look at the current position and examine the legislation they will see that there are no members of the Real Estate Institute on the board.

Mr. Mathwin: We all know whom we are talking about, don't we?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is most unfortunate that the honourable member should join with the member for Mitcham in making a personal attack on individuals.

Mr. Mathwin: I did not do that.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member should consult *Hansard* and see what the member for Mitcham said; then he could not deny that the honourable member made a personal attack on an individual. I point out to members opposite that there is a difference between the membership of the authority and the membership of the board. The authority meets in private and takes evidence that relates to future development and the type of land use that may be required throughout the State. It is fair to say that, if a member of the authority with an interest in buying and selling land wanted to take advantage of the confidential information given to the authority, he could do so. I stress that I am not suggesting that that has ever happened, but no-one can deny that it could happen. Members of the community and I object to the existence of that possibility. If we do not take steps now, when the current members on the authority who have an interest

in buying and selling land are replaced problems could arise. The real difficulty that I see (and it has been referred to me) is that this doubt in the minds of members of the community should not even be there.

Mr. Coumbe: Why was the provision included in the legislation in the first place?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government did not provide for this category of person when the legislation was first introduced, because it felt the same way then as it feels now. However, rather than have the Bill collapse the Government had to accept amendments from the other House, otherwise we would not now have a Planning and Development Act at all. The honourable member can imagine what sort of situation we would have been in if that had happened.

I have pointed out to members the undesirability of having on the authority a person who had an interest in buying and selling land. The situation with the appeal board is different, for all of its hearings are in public, and any member of the community, including a member of Parliament or a real estate agent, may attend the hearings and hear every word that is said. The appeal board is dealing only with matters of law; it does not have any of the confidential information to which I have referred or information that could be useful to anyone who wished to misuse it. Although the legislation empowers the Chairman to conduct an inquiry in private if a person appearing before the board so applies, I have been told that this has never occurred. In fact, it is most unlikely that it would ever occur.

Mr. Mathwin: But it works very closely with the authority.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No, it does not.

Mr. Mathwin: As people they would be very close.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No, they are completely apart: they are two completely separate bodies in two completely separate places. I hope members opposite will fully understand the Government's attitude. It is obvious that during the second reading debate they did not know what they were talking about, and I think it is just as well to have these issues cleared up now.

It has been held by the Supreme Court that members of the appeal board are acting in a judicial capacity, and this is another very important difference between the functions of the board and those of the authority. The member for Mitcham may laugh; perhaps he knows more about some of these matters than I would know, although I doubt it. I simply make the point that this is a further indication of the difference between the role of the authority and the role of the board, and that it is not necessary to have the same provisions applying to both. I regret that this matter has been raised by the member for Mitcham, obviously, as I have said, as a personal attack on a certain member of the Planning Appeal Board.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Disqualification from membership."

Dr. EASTICK: I have referred to the provisions regarding buying and selling being so wide as to prevent a person from handling the sale of his own property. The clause does not specify a registered business, and the dictionary meaning of "business" is wide enough to allow involvement regarding the sale of a person's house or other property.

Mr. EVANS: I object to this clause, because it excludes a member of the Real Estate Institute from membership of the authority. In the case of other authorities, such as the Potato Board and the board and the advisory committee established under the Builders Licensing Act, persons who may derive a benefit are permitted to be members. Although the Minister has said a person could use information for his own benefit, the Minister knows that, if a member of the Real Estate Institute did this, it would be obvious to the other members of the authority.

Mr. Clark: There may be—

Mr. EVANS: There will still be ways for other members to pass on information by a back-handed method. I do not think they would, but that is probably what the member for Elizabeth is suggesting.

Mr. Clark: No, I did not suggest that.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member knows what he is implying. We cannot exclude as members of the authority representatives of a group that may own property. If an area of 300 acres was being considered for a national park, the local council would be at a disadvantage because no rates would be paid whereas, if this land was subdivided, the council would gain. As I believe landowners are entitled to have one representative on the authority, I ask the Government to reconsider its decision to prevent a member of the Real Estate Institute from being a member.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has suggested that a person with an interest in real estate should not be a member of the authority because of complaints that have been made concerning personal gain. I think the reverse would occur: with the knowledge that members of the authority would have they would be debarred from dealing in land because of their code of ethics. This is common for a person belonging to an organization whose word is his bond, and this sometimes reacts against him in his personal dealings. This matter is not as one-sided as the Minister suggests, particularly from what I know of the present members of the authority. The Minister said that he has received no complaints about the integrity of the present members.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation): Although the Government feels strongly about this matter, it is clear that Opposition members are not willing to accept the Government's view. However, in addition to complaints I have received about there being an opportunity for people to abuse their position, we have been told many times that the authority is not weighted sufficiently in favour of planning but that it is weighted too heavily in favour of development. The alterations that we will be making will meet this criticism and will ensure that the activities of the authority are, in fact, directed towards planning and that less emphasis is placed on development. Finally, in reply to the member for Light, I point out that the clause to which he referred relates to the business of buying and selling of land and would not apply to a transaction undertaken by an individual.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BUILDERS LICENSING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That the Builders Licensing Board regulations, 1970, made under the Builders Licensing Act, 1967, on November 26, 1970, and laid on the table of this House on December 1, 1970, be disallowed.

(Continued from March 24. Page 4312.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.10 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, April 1, at 2 p.m.