

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

NORTHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. WELLS (February 20).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN. A tender call for the erection of a 6ft. (1.8 m) high chain-mesh fence and the construction of an access road and car park at Northfield High School will close on March 22, 1974. Subject to the receipt of a satisfactory tender and the availability of materials, it is expected that the contract will be completed in 10 to 12 weeks from the date of the contractual agreement.

HUBBARDS PROPRIETARY LIMITED

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (February 21).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Several complaints have been received by the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch regarding the practice adopted by Hubbards Proprietary Limited in demanding a cancellation fee when a customer has sought to cancel a telephone order. Following a discussion with the Managing Director on February 14, 1974, the company undertook not to attempt to enforce agreements entered into by telephone only, and to refund any cancellation fees already paid.

BUS SERVICES

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (February 21)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Most passenger buses offered for charter work in South Australia also undertake regular route services. In order to perform this latter activity in the area outside Municipal Tramways Trust jurisdiction, it is necessary for the operator to hold a current licence from the Transport Control Board. The issue of such licences is dependent upon the vehicle being submitted for examination at the Government Motor Garage every six months. This examination involves a series of checks on the vehicle's engine, exhaust system, transmission, steering system, suspension, chassis, wheels and tyres, body, lights, brakes, and accessories. Those buses used exclusively for charter work to other States are examined at least every 12 months in accordance with the requirements of section 159 of the Road Traffic Act. However, vehicles in this category are relatively few.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total cost of acquiring private bus services in the metropolitan area?
2. Is any goodwill included in the purchase price?
3. What is the total number of buses acquired and their respective make and model?
4. If any of these vehicles are to be replaced, what kind of vehicles will replace them and when?
5. From what sources and how is the acquisition being financed?

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

1. The total cost will not be known until the acquisitions have been completed.
2. No.
3. This information is not yet available.
4. These decisions have not yet been made.

5. The trust is borrowing moneys from the Treasury on debenture in the normal manner to pay for the assets acquired.

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What is the cost of taking over certain private bus operations in the metropolitan area by the Municipal Tramways Trust recently, as to capital acquisition, management fees, and any other associated costs, respectively?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The total cost will not be known until the acquisitions have been completed.

Mr. BECKER (on notice). Does the Municipal Tramways Trust intend to enter into competition with private bus operators in the charter field?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Municipal Tramways Trust is continuing the service runs and charter work of the metropolitan private operators that have relinquished their services to the trust in the same way as they have been operated in the past. This arrangement has been agreed with representatives of the Bus Proprietors Association.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (February 21).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Work on installing school crossing lights on South Road at Black Forest Primary School has been completed, and they are now ready to be switched on. However, the lights have to be tested by the Electricity Trust and, if satisfactory, they will be switched on at 2 p.m. on Friday, March 8, 1974.

EXHAUST FUMES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (November 15)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Australian design rule 27 relates to the control of emissions from motor vehicle engines. On advice from the Australian Motor Vehicle Certification Board it is intended to operate this design rule from April 1, 1974, and regulations will be promulgated shortly to bring this into effect.

FLOODS INSPECTION

Mr. ALLEN (on notice)

1. What kind of aircraft was used on February 21 and 22 to make an inspection of the floods in the north of South Australia?
2. What was the carrying capacity of the aircraft, both passengers and freight?
3. How many people were aboard the aircraft for this trip and how much freight was carried?
4. What were the names of the people aboard the aircraft and what departments or organizations did they represent?
5. What was the total cost of the trip?
6. Why was the member for Frome not asked to accompany the party, as the inspection was held in his district?

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

1. Trans-Australia Airlines DC3 aircraft VH-DAS, which is under permanent charter to the Lands Department for aerial survey duty.
2. Six passengers and 150 lb. (68 kg) of freight, plus five permanent air crew, under Department of Civil Aviation regulations.
3. Six passengers; five aircrew; and 143 lb (64.9 kg) of freight.
4. (a) Passengers: Hon. A. F. Kneebone, M.L.C. (Minister of Lands); James Vickery (Chairman, Pastoral Board); B. F. Evans (Member, Pastoral Board); R. A. Everett (Member, Pastoral Board); B. C. Bills (Superintending Engineer, Rural, Highways Department); and B. Boucher (Advertiser Newspapers).

(b) Crew: Captain E. Sundstrup (Trans-Australia Airlines); F/O M. Robinson (Trans-Australia Airlines); C. T. J. Burton (Aerial Surveyor, Lands Department); C. A. Vincent (Aerial Surveyor, Lands Department), and D. Parslow (Aerial Cameraman, Lands Department).

5. \$4 733.

6. The aircraft was fully laden in accordance with Department of Civil Aviation regulations.

BEE-LINE BUS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total cost of operating the Bee-line bus service up to the present?

2. How many passengers have been carried up to the present on this service?

3. How many buses are employed on this route?

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

1. \$18 000.
2. Sample counts indicate about 540 000 people
3. Seven buses are employed on the route, being made up of six in traffic and one spare.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What has been the cost of establishing the Bee-line bus service, and how was that cost made up?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The establishment costs are as follows:

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| | \$ |
| (1) Repainting and modifying seven existing Municipal Tramways Trust buses (estimate) | 7 000 |
| (2) Cost of bus stop signs and notices in the street (estimate) | 600 |
| (3) Publicity costs (including newspaper advertisements, printing of Bee-line bus brochure and associated design work, etc.) | 3 477 |
| Total | \$11 077 |

GOVERNOR'S RESIDENCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to acquire a country residence for the Governor?

2. If a residence is to be provided, where will it be and what progress has been made in this matter?

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

1. No.
2. Land has been purchased at Sellick Beach on which it was intended to erect a country residence for the Governor. However, the letting of a contract has been deferred indefinitely, because of the stringent situation in regard to Loan funds.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How many daily-paid persons were employed by the Government on May 30, 1970, and February 28, 1974, respectively?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As at May 30, 1970, there were 17 013; and at February 28, 1974, the total was 16 425. The total of 17 013 includes some psychiatric nursing staff who are now salaried officers.

RAILWAY ADVERTISING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many Ministers appear in South Australian Railways television commercials?

2. Who are the Ministers and why did they so appear?
3. How many such commercials were made and how many times will they be screened?

4. Why were professional actors not used?

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

1. Two.
2. The Hon J. D. Corcoran and the Hon. G. T. Virgo. They were invited to appear, because they fulfilled the attribute of being well known and readily recognized.
3. Eight. Up until the week commencing March 31, 1974, there will be 50 screenings on each of channels 7, 9 and 10. The number of times they will be screened after March 31, 1974, will depend on how long they retain topical appeal.
4. In some cases they were.

ACCIDENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many modified motor vehicles have been involved in accidents during the past three years?

2. What are the details of such accidents regarding cause, fatalities, and injuries?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not known how many modified motor vehicles have been involved in accidents during the past three years, as this information is not recorded on police accident reports.

POLICE VEHICLES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many unmarked motor vehicles does the South Australian Police Force have, and what are the makes and models thereof?

2. When were these vehicles purchased?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The information sought is considered to be confidential, and it is in the public interest that it not be disclosed.

SELICK BEACH LAND

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the Government own land at Sellick Beach and at what locations?

2. Is the Government acquiring additional land in the vicinity?

3. What was the price and date of purchase of the land?

4. For what purpose is the land being acquired?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is requested that the honourable member be more specific and refer to specific areas and Government departments and authorities.

GLENELG INTERSECTION

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice). In accidents at the junction of Maxwell Terrace, Dunbar Terrace, and Brighton Road over the period 1968-71:

- (a) how many people have been killed?
- (b) how many were injured?
- (c) how many accidents have been reported?
- (d) how many pedestrians were involved in these accidents?
- (e) how many vehicles were involved?
- (f) how many bicycles, motor cycles, buses, trams, trucks and motor cars, respectively, were involved?
- (g) what were the ages of pedestrian casualties involved in these accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The information is as follows:

| | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | Totals |
|---|------|------|------|------|--------|
| (a) Number killed | — | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| (b) Number injured | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| (c) Number of accidents reported | 11 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 43 |
| (d) Number of pedestrians involved | 2 | 3 | 1 | — | 6 |
| (e) Number of vehicles involved | 20 | 14 | 19 | 29 | 82 |
| (f) Types of vehicle involved: | | | | | |
| Bicycles | — | — | — | — | — |
| Motor cycles | — | 2 | — | 1 | 3 |
| Buses | — | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| Trams | — | — | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Trucks | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Cars | 20 | 11 | 17 | 26 | 74 |
| (g) Ages of pedestrians involved in years | 75 | 67 | 65 | — | — |
| | 11 | 64 | — | — | — |
| | | 59 | — | — | — |

HILTON PROPERTY

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Was the property at 136, 138, and 140 Burbridge Road, Hilton, acquired as a result of specific Ministerial direction?

2. Is the financial return by way of lease, equivalent to that which applied before Government purchase?

3. Are the amounts charged consistent with Government valuation for such premises?

4. If the rental rate is lower than valuation, on whose instruction and for what reason was the variation effected?

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

1. Because the property which was required in part for road-widening purposes was being offered for sale, I asked the Commissioner of Highways to negotiate for the purchase of the property.

2. Immediately before purchase by the department on March 23, 1971, the whole of the property was leased for \$30 a week by Theatre 62. The property has since been divided into two leases as follows:

(a) No. 136 to 138 Burbridge Road leased to Theatre 62 for \$10 a week.

(b) No. 140 Burbridge Road is leased as a licensed restaurant at a weekly rental of \$20.

3. Yes.

4. See No. 3.

YATALA VALE ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice):

1. Is Yatala Vale Road, which runs between Golden Grove, Modbury, crossing Hancock Road to the foothills, Fairview Park, under the jurisdiction of the Highways Department or the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully?

2. If this road is the responsibility of the Highways Department, has the department any plans for the road to be widened and reconstructed?

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

1. Yatala Vale Road is under the care, control, and management of the city of Tea Tree Gully.

2. The department has no current proposals for the widening or reconstruction of Yatala Vale Road, and it is not part of the proposed future arterial road system.

GOVERNMENT GUARANTEES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For what industries and businesses is the South Australian Government currently acting as a financial guarantor?

2. What is the amount of the guarantee in each specific case?

3. For which specific cases have guarantees been executed during the past two years and for how much?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government would regard this information as confidential as between it and the

industries and businesses concerned. Certain information regarding the nature of industries assisted and the amounts involved is published in the Auditor-General's Report (see pages 36-38 of the 1973 report).

GAY ACTIVIST ALLIANCE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Have any members of the Gay Activist Alliance been permitted to speak at Government schools in South Australia and, if so, at what schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government has no knowledge of any case occurring.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): How many escapes from the McNally Training Centre occurred during 1973?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were 163 escapes, compared to a total of 246 during 1972.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How does the Government determine relative priorities for spending funds from all sources in relation to grants for the arts, and to urgent hospital rebuilding projects?

2. How are relative priorities established for individual hospital building projects?

3. What factors were considered in the Government's decision to defer the building of a replacement for Litchfield House at Hillcrest in favour of other projects including a new locker room in the recently completed north wing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

4. What other hospital projects is it expected may have to be deferred because of escalating building costs?

5. What priority will now be allocated to the replacement of Litchfield House when the Government again allocates funds?

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

1. Building projects in South Australia are normally undertaken from Loan funds. This has been the practice under successive Governments. In determining priorities in relation to the expenditure of moneys from Loan funds, the major essential things are taken first. This Government has given far greater priorities to hospitals, health, and education projects from Loan funds than has any Liberal Government. The proportions of the Loan Budget spent by L.C.L. Governments in 1963-64 and 1968-69 on buildings for hospitals, health, and education were about 20 per cent and 32 per cent respectively. For 1972-73 and 1973-74 the Labor Government has increased these provisions to about 43 per cent.

Grants to the performing arts in South Australia are part of the Revenue Budget. Money is not expended normally from this source for major building projects. Priorities are determined on the view of the Government as to the relative importance of spending. Again in this area priority has been given to education, health, hospitals, and welfare expenditure in stark comparison with expenditure under Liberal Governments. As an illustration, the proportions of the Revenue Budget spent by L.C.L. Governments in 1963-64 and 1968-69 for the social services of hospitals, health, welfare, and education were about 35 per cent and 38 per cent respectively. For 1972-73 the Labor Government increased such provisions to 44 per cent of the Revenue Budget, and in 1973-74 is increasing the proportion further to about 46 per cent.

The suggestion that a building project in hospitals should be weighed against current expenditure for the performing arts and/or other areas of art expenditure assumes that we would always say that expenditure on hospitals or schools would exclude expenditure on art galleries, public libraries, museums, or performing arts. In other words that we would have a completely unbalanced community. The Government does not accept that view.

2. On the basis of service needs and the physical condition of existing buildings.

3. Limitation of Loan funds has necessitated a close examination of each project in accordance with priorities determined as in 2 above. In the case of the two projects mentioned, namely, Litchfield House at Hillcrest and the new locker room at Royal Adelaide Hospital, which were considered to be of equal priority, the determining factor was the extent of the funds required for the work, which were \$825 000 for Litchfield House compared to \$84 000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

4. Submissions have been made already to the Australian Government for major additional funds for hospital projects, and should such additional moneys become available from that source, other hospital projects will be accelerated in order of the priorities determined as in 2 above.

5. See 4 above.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When were the extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Radiology Department completed?

2. Has new radiological plant now been installed?

3. What has been the reason for the prolonged delay in installing the equipment?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Empty rooms were handed over by the Public Buildings Department on October 18, 1973.

2. Now in process of being installed.

3. Much of the equipment has come from overseas, and delays are beyond local control.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What investigations are now made on a routine basis of the quality and safety of the metropolitan water supply?

2. Are additional investigations made following specific complaints about water quality?

3. Has there been any change in the overall microscopic picture, particularly in relation to micro-organisms and suspended matter during the last five years?

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

1. The frequency with which various analytical procedures is carried out for the metropolitan Adelaide supply is as follows:

148

Monthly: Comprehensive chemical analyses including detailed ionic concentrations; nutrients (phosphorus and nitrogen); radioactivity; heavy metals for example, mercury, cadmium, iron; pesticides, and chlorophyll.

Weekly: Algal counts, dissolved oxygen; colour, turbidity, taste, and odour; and temperature.

Bi-weekly: Bacteriological (coliforms and *E. coli*); fluoride; and chlorine residuals.

The above programme is carried out at 10 reservoirs and major supply sources, and at 75 locations in the metropolitan Adelaide distribution system. The adopted objectives or criteria for water quality have been based on World Health Organization standards.

2. Additional investigations may be made at the time, but all water parameters or characteristics are being measured on a frequent and routine basis.

3. Water quality changes that have occurred during the past five years can be readily attributed to seasonal changes. This is particularly evident in the quality of water derived from the Murray-Darling river system, where high levels of suspended solids occur during flood conditions. At this period, overall bacteriological levels in the river increase but localized areas frequently decrease by the flushing effect associated with high flows. Despite seasonal variations during the past five years, there has been a slight general improvement in the bacteriological quality of the reticulated water.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): What future plans does the Engineering and Water Supply Department have for sewerage a small group of houses in Paradise Grove and Paradise Close, Highbury?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sewerage of the small group of houses in Paradise Grove and Paradise Close is dependent on approach sewers in land that is at present unsubdivided. There is a subdivision proposal for part of the land that is expected to proceed soon, but there are still two areas over which no subdivision proposals have been received. A proposal to sewer Paradise Close and Paradise Grove will be considered as soon as firm subdivision proposals are received for all the land on the northern side of the Lower North-East Road and to the west of Paradise Grove.

SUPREME COURT JUDGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it expected that it will be necessary to appoint a tenth Supreme Court judge during 1974 and, if so, when?

2. If an appointment is not to be made in 1974, when is it expected that it will be necessary to make such an appointment?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not possible to say at this stage. A careful watch will be kept on the court lists and on any trends that emerge. The progress of the Australian Government's plans to transfer jurisdiction to the proposed Commonwealth Superior Court will also be observed. An appointment will be made when its necessity becomes clear.

2. Not applicable.

HUMAN RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the result of the conferences between officers of the States of South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania with Commonwealth officers concerning the implications of the Human Rights Bill with respect to State law?

2. What further action is to be taken concerning this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth Attorney-General has agreed to take matters raised by the State officers into consideration in the course of preparing the Human Rights Bill for re-introduction into the Parliament.
2. None for the present.

STATE ENERGY COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Upon what terms does the Government intend that members of Parliament may be given access to the comprehensive report of the State Energy Committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report will be made available for discussion only between members and not for discussion with the press or the public. When the nature of the report has been determined and the contents known, it may be possible, in part, to ease this restriction on availability.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What check, if any, is made of the accuracy of replies to Questions on Notice before those replies are given and by whom is this check made?
2. If no check is made, is it intended that a check be made in future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Questions on Notice are distributed to appropriate Ministerial offices with a request that a reply be provided not later than 9.30 a.m. on Mondays so that Cabinet may consider them. The departmental submissions are then settled in Cabinet. Officers of the Premier's Department transcribe the settled replies to the forms submitted to Parliament. These typed forms are checked for typographical errors.

POLICE FORCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has Senator Cavanagh made allegations of brutality against a South Australian policeman?
2. If allegations have been made:
 - (a) to whom have they been made and when;
 - (b) have they been investigated;
 - (c) what conclusion, if any, has been reached concerning them;
 - (d) what action has been taken as a result;
 - (e) has Senator Cavanagh been informed of such conclusion and, if so, when?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. (a) To Mr. Shard (as Chief Secretary) by letter dated March 6, 1973, and, later, to Mr. Kneebone.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Conclusions are at variance with the complaint, but the matter is not finalized, because the motor cyclist involved cannot be located.
- (d) Every attempt has been made to locate the motor cyclist. Deputy Police Commissioner Draper has appealed in the press to him to come forward in order that the investigation of the allegations may be finalized.
- (e) Yes: three written replies were posted to Senator Cavanagh on March 15, 1973, March 30, 1973, and June 28, 1973.

SPORTS ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the Sports Advisory Council and what interests do they represent?
 2. What is their term of appointment and remuneration?
- The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:
1. Members are yet to be appointed.
 2. Not applicable.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What plans does the Government have for the creation and implementation of priority roads in this State?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The principle of priority roads has been applied to Port Road between Hindmarsh and Alberton, where all the crossovers are controlled either by "give way" signs or traffic signals. Main North Road between Gepps Cross and Gawler has been similarly treated as a priority road. It is intended to investigate the implementation of additional priority roads in this State after the Australian Transport Advisory Council's recent decision to change the meaning of the "stop" sign to "stop and give way" has been incorporated in State law. In the meantime, reports on the effectiveness of the priority roads already established in Perth and Sydney are being studied.

OFFSHORE LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. When does the Government expect to make a decision whether to challenge the validity of the Commonwealth Seas and Submerged Lands Act?
 2. What has delayed a decision on this matter?
- The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:
1. It is not possible to say at this stage.
 2. There is no delay. All aspects of the matter are being considered, including the problem of the justiciability of the issue of the validity of the Act and the desirability of awaiting clarification of the decision not to refer the petitions of Tasmania and Queensland to the Privy Council.

STAMP DUTIES OFFICE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the limit of 12 placed on the number of documents presented for stamping by any one person on any one day by the Stamp Duties Office?
 2. What action is it intended to take to relieve this situation, and when is it expected the limit will be lifted?
- The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:
1. No limit is placed by the Stamp Duties Office on the number of documents presented for stamping by any one person on any one day.
 2. See 1. above.

CRAYFISH

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many persons have been apprehended for taking under-size crayfish at Victor Harbor and in the South-East area, respectively, during the past 12 months?
 2. Of the persons apprehended, how many have been prosecuted and how many prosecutions are pending?
- The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:
1. Persons apprehended for taking under-size crayfish: at Victor Harbor, nil; in the South-East, 19.
 - 2.

| | Prosecuted | Prosecutions pending | Warning letter sent |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Victor Harbor | nil | nil | nil |
| South-East | 2 | 16 | 1 |

UNIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government intend to take following the speech made by the member for Goyder in the urgency debate on February 26, 1974?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: None as a Government. However, we ask and encourage the member for Goyder to have the honesty and decency to repeat his defamatory allegations publicly, so that he may be required to stand up to his allegations before a court of law, which can determine their truth or falsity. If the honourable member has information on crimes, he should accept the invitation of the Police Department to provide information to it.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is the Minister of Labour and Industry satisfied that section 129 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act is being complied with?

2. Have any unions or associations not filed audited balance sheets in terms of this section of the Act?

3. What action has been taken against offenders for lodging returns after the specified date?

4. Have any irregularities been discovered in the returns and, if so, how many, and by which organizations?

5. What action has followed breaches of the Act?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Section 129 provides that the returns be delivered "within one month after the completion of the yearly audit of the accounts of the association". Those associations that have not complied with that part of section 129 are contacted by letter and/or telephone.

4. No irregularities have been discovered.

5. See 3 above. On July 23, 1973, the registration of an association was cancelled for failure to deliver financial and other returns.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many times has the lessee of the restaurants in Ayers House delayed meeting the due date for his payments, and what have these payments been for?

2. How much has been owing each time?

3. When have these delays occurred and how long have they been?

4. Is the lessee in default now and, if so, for how long has he been in default and for how much?

5. What attempts have been made to collect what is owing?

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

1. The lessee has been late three times in meeting payments due for rent in advance at the rate of \$2 000 a quarter and interest of \$375 a quarter in respect of furniture purchased by means of a loan.

2. Each time \$2 375 has been owing.

3. The payment due within 21 days of July 1, 1973, was made on September 18, 1973; the payment due within 21 days of October 1, 1973, was made on December 4, 1973; and the payment due within 21 days of January 1, 1974, was made on February 13, 1974.

4. The lessee is not in default now.

5. Accounts and normal account rendered statements have been sent to the lessee as required.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Will those officers of the Agriculture Department who are not willing to live in Monarto be permitted to remain in the Public Service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position of officers of the Agriculture Department who are not willing to live at Monarto is no different from that of other officers who are required to undertake Public Service duties anywhere in the State. The Government has established a Public Service Re-location Committee, chaired by a Commissioner of the Public Service Board with representatives from the departments concerned and the Public Service Association of South Australia Incorporated. This committee will consider the terms and conditions of persons who are required to shift to Monarto.

PENAL REFORM

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier confirm a report that the Government is considering introducing penal reform based on the non-imprisonment of criminals? A report in today's press quotes the Chief Secretary as saying that the Government will this year introduce changes in the structure and operation of prison reform, probation and parole services. The Chief Secretary is reported to have said the following:

It has been argued for a long time that imprisonment as a correctional device is self-defeating, and that wherever possible it should be avoided or, if it is used, it should be for no longer than is absolutely necessary.

The Government does not have an impressive record in the area of penal reform. It has implemented numerous changes to its prisoner rehabilitation procedures, and the public has had to bear the cost of repeated abscondings and of crimes against the community by absconders. Many people have expressed to me their support for the statement made by Adelaide magistrate Mr. D. F. Wilson that too much emphasis has been placed—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition says that many approaches have been made to him on this matter. I take that statement as a comment and, as such, it cannot be used in explaining a question.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not refer further to those who have approached me regarding Mr. Wilson's comment that too much emphasis has been placed on prisoner rehabilitation rather than on deterring potential offenders, the vast majority of whom will be one-time offenders only. For this reason, I ask whether the Government intends to foist an experimental programme of non-imprisonment of prisoners on an already long-suffering public.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage of proceedings, Cabinet has not considered legislation on this matter. I point out, however, that there is considerable evidence to support the things that have been said by the Chief Secretary. The Government has undertaken an inquiry into penal methods in South Australia, and a report has already been presented to Parliament. The Government intends, in due season, to put before Parliament legislation in consequence of the recommendations made to it. The suggestion that the only way in which to treat criminals is to lock them up in maximum security is, quite frankly, antediluvian and, if the Leader proposes that as an alternative to present practices—

Dr. Eastick: Come back to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has suggested that our present practice is unsatisfactory and that the public is suffering depredations because of it. If the Leader is proposing an alternative, I can only assume that what he is suggesting is that we should lock them up in maximum security.

Dr. Eastick: Is that what you're going to do?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not, but that is the only reasonable inference that one can draw from the Leader's remarks.

35-HOUR WEEK

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the move that has been made by the Amalgamated Postal Workers Union, which is seeking a poll regarding a 35-hour working week, and the differing views that have been expressed publicly by the Prime Minister, and by Mr Hawke of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, will the Premier say what is the Government's policy on the introduction of a 35-hour working week in South Australia which will affect so much of this State's work force, including employees of Government departments and semi-government organizations such as the Electricity Trust and the Municipal Tramways Trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government's position is that the 35-hour week ultimately must be introduced. However, it would be wrong to introduce it in South Australia on a one-State basis and so place our industry at some disadvantage compared to other States. The 35-hour week must be instituted nationally and achieved by proper representation before the arbitration tribunals of this country.

TEACHER AIDE

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education say when a decision will be made on the appointment of a male teacher aide at Basket Range school? It seems that the applicant for this position, who was acceptable to the school council, was not appointed, because he was a male. As there is now equal pay for men and women, the only reason that I can see why a decision has not been made on this appointment is that the person concerned is being discriminated against because of his sex.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check the matter to find out how many female chauvinists are operating in my department, and I will provide a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

UNION INVESTIGATION

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say which Government Minister ordered the investigation into the affairs of the Australian Government Workers Association?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry, but I am at a complete loss. What investigation has been ordered by any Minister into the affairs of the Australian Government Workers Association?

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what the question was.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I do not know of any investigation ordered by any Government Minister into the affairs of the association. I do not know the basis of the honourable member's question.

PENSIONERS' RENTS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Development and Mines say what is the position arising from a statement he made, I think in mid-February, that pensioners would receive beneficial consideration in rent payments through the Housing Trust? There are many pensioners in my district, and one of them has been told that, as his income increases, his rent will be levied at the rate of one-sixth of his income. This morning it was announced that pensions would increase by \$3 a week, and this will materially affect the incomes of many people living in trust houses. I ask the Minister whether the House is to understand that,

while the hand of Gough giveth, the hand of Don taketh away.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not comment.

Mr. RODDA: This policy matter is vital to these people who have borne the heat and burden of the day in their working lifetime, and I should be pleased if the Minister would give his attention to it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: May I explain the matter this way. First, the Housing Trust has a policy of replacement rents; that is to say, when a vacancy occurs in one of the trust's rental premises and new people move in, generally speaking the rent moves to the current economic rent, except that the rebate provisions operate if the people want to take advantage of them. The announcement that I made some time ago was along the lines that there would be increases in rents quite apart from the replacement rents (which would occur on all existing tenants) in three levels of rental. Those levels were 50c a week for those who were in the \$10 to \$12.50 range; \$1 a week for people below the \$10 range and down to \$8 a week, I think it was; and \$1.50 for people below that level. I also said that pensioners would be exempt from these increases and that other low-income earners would also be able to take advantage of the rent rebate provisions that the trust operates. That situation remains but, if the honourable member would like to give me further details of a specific case that was raised, I shall have it checked out.

HILLS SPRAYING

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what has been the total amount of spraying undertaken in Cleland Conservation Park and surrounding areas; what sort of sprays were used in those areas; and to what extent was the Environment and Conservation Department involved in the decision to use these sprays to the extent that they have been used since the beginning of November, 1972? I think members of the public have been concerned to read a report in the *Advertiser* this morning which, to quote one sentence, states:

A three-year-old boy is in hospital, families have suffered sinus infections, and new growth of trees and shrubs has died since recent anti-weed spraying in Cleland Conservation Park

The report goes on to say that the spray 245T was used to control blackberry and gorse growth and that no-one was sure whether this had been responsible for the conditions referred to in the press report. When I recently asked the Minister a question about Weedazol and about the death of trees and shrubs in that area, the Minister in his reply intimated that the department was not greatly concerned about this because it did not appear to be as widespread as had been reported. Representations have been made to me that the use of the spray 24D may in fact have caused blindness in wallabies born after spraying and that this matter should be investigated further. I should be grateful if the Minister would make available as soon as possible the report of the official party inspecting the area yesterday as reported in the newspaper

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think I ought to make clear to the honourable member that the report in this morning's newspaper was somewhat confusing because it gave the impression that the inspection made yesterday was as a result of the aerial spraying that took place some weeks ago and not, as is in fact the position, as a result of a secondary spraying that the East Torrens council

undertook recently for the purpose of controlling blackberry and gorse growth; so that we must get the matter in perspective. The reply I gave last week dealt with aerial spraying that had taken place in Cleland Conservation Park for the purpose of controlling African daisy, and I said that, although there was minor discolouration on some trees, it had been pointed out to me that those trees would not die as a result and also that, while it was true that a few trees were dying and that this could well have been as a result of aerial spraying, it could also have been associated with an infestation of mistletoe on trees in the area. I pointed out at the time that, although spraying of daisy in the area had certainly impeded its growth and had gone some way towards achieving our object, nevertheless because of its effect on the trees in the area further such aerial spraying would not be undertaken without our carefully considering the position. This morning's newspaper report refers to action taken by the East Torrens council for the purpose of controlling blackberry and gorse bushes. It was not in any way related to the aerial spraying. I think it should also be pointed out that the spray used in the aerial spraying last year was amitrole. The spray used by the East Torrens council was in fact 245T. The environmental officer who inspected this area yesterday told me that he looked at plants at a property in an area about 100 metres from the area that was sprayed by the council. Inspection of plants which were highly susceptible to 245T, the herbicide that was used (for example, tomatoes and vines) revealed no indication of damage. Inspection of the plants showing some damage, that is, death of young leaves, revealed that this was most likely due to some stress such as lack of water. Tied in with the lack of damage to the highly sensitive plants, it could be concluded that damage was not due to the herbicide but due to some form of natural environmental stress. Further investigations of a neighbouring residence revealed similar damage to that already seen. From observations of trombones, which are also highly sensitive to 245T and which were completely healthy, it was concluded that damage was again of a natural stress form. This further is substantiated by observations of the soil where extensive cracking surrounding many plants revealed the dry nature of the soil. As a result of the investigations conducted by the officer of my department, it was concluded that the damage referred to in the newspaper was probably not caused by the spraying. However, further investigations are being undertaken. In view of the report about a young lad in the area suffering from some type of allergic reaction, the Public Health Department has shown an interest in the matter. When that inquiry has been completed, I shall be pleased to supply that information.

Dr. Tonkin: And also about spraying generally there?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will also supply detailed information relating to the total spraying of the area.

PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS

Mr MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say what the Government presently intends concerning appeals from the Supreme Court of this State to the Privy Council? In last Friday's *Advertiser* there appears what purports to be a verbatim report of part of the Queen's Speech in opening the Commonwealth Parliament last Thursday. Having stated that the Commonwealth Government believes the High Court of Australia must become the final court of appeal, the report quotes Her Majesty as saying:

There have been consultations with the United Kingdom, and my Government—
the Commonwealth Government—

will proceed with its legislation to abolish appeals to the Privy Council.

I am a little hazy as to the constitutional power of the Commonwealth Parliament to legislate on the matter with regard to the States, although it could be that there has been a request for some legislation by the British Parliament on the matter; in the present situation, whether or not that will ever get through I should think is a little cloudy. In a reply I received today from the Attorney-General to a question about offshore legislation, he made this rather enigmatic statement:

... the desirability of awaiting clarification of the decision not to refer the petitions of Tasmania and Queensland to the Privy Council.

I cannot get much sense from the phrase "clarification of the decision". One would expect the decision to be given and the reasons with it; one would not expect reasons to follow the publication of the decision. Perhaps the honourable gentleman in his reply to this question could also elucidate what he means by that phrase because obviously it is all part of the same subject matter. I know that it is the policy of honourable gentlemen opposite, in pursuing their shallow nationalism, to abolish—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not debate the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the honourable Minister will also see fit to mention my own recent appearance before the Privy Council, although he will probably deny he ever had any intention of doing so now that I have mentioned it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am interested to learn that the honourable member has been engaged in an appeal to the Privy Council. Perhaps at some time convenient to him outside the Chamber he will tell me all about the case and I shall be interested to hear how he got on, but just what relevance the honourable member's appearance before the Privy Council has to the abolition of the Privy Council, I do not know. The honourable member's question relates to the attitude of the South Australian Government to appeals to the Privy Council. It is the policy of the South Australian Government that appeals from South Australian courts to the Privy Council should be abolished and that the final disposition of appeals should take place in Australia. The question of the Bill to be introduced in the Australian Parliament on this subject is one for that Parliament. If the Commonwealth Parliament possesses the constitutional power (and this is by no means clear, to put it at its mildest) to abolish appeals from State courts to the Privy Council on matters of State law, the South Australian Government is willing to accept that position. If Commonwealth Parliament possesses that constitutional power it is up to that Parliament to exercise it and we shall be happy with the ultimate results. The stand we took and continue to take is that it is not a proper way for this matter to be dealt with: that is, for appeals from South Australian courts on matters of State law to the Privy Council to be abolished by an Act of the United Kingdom Parliament at the request of the Australian National Parliament. We have repeatedly said that the proper way to deal with this situation, if the Commonwealth Parliament does not possess the power to do this, is for the matter to be dealt with by a joint request of Commonwealth and State Parliaments to the United Kingdom Parliament to abolish appeals to the Privy Council or, alternatively (and I think this is the preferable course), for the Commonwealth and State Parliaments to join in an approach to Westminster to have the Statute of Westminster applied to the State of

South Australia and to the other States so that this Parliament may make the decision itself.

I want to make the position clear. This Government favours the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council on matters of State law. It is content, if the Commonwealth possesses the constitutional power, for it to exercise it; but it would be completely opposed to a purported exercise of Imperial power, in relation to appeals from South Australian courts, at the request of the Commonwealth Parliament alone. I am in some difficulty about the latter part of the question. The petition was a petition submitted by the State of Tasmania and a petition was also submitted by the State of Queensland. The communication as to the outcome was, of course, made to the Governor of Tasmania, and doubtless also to the Governor of Queensland. My information comes from Tasmania, and the Governor of Tasmania has requested clarification of the terms of that communication from Westminster. I am not clear in my own mind whether I have the authority of the Tasmanian Government to disclose or discuss the contents of that communication. I shall be happy to do so if I have such authority. In view of the question, I will approach the Tasmanian Attorney-General to see whether there is any reason why I should not disclose publicly the matters in the communication that require clarification.

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier bring the House up to date regarding the possible establishment of an interstate or international airport near the new city of Monarto?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A survey was conducted by the Department of Civil Aviation some time ago regarding a local airstrip near Monarto. I understand that the Commonwealth Government has since undertaken an investigation regarding possible sites for a much larger airport, but necessarily it could not be close to Monarto or in an area close to Adelaide where noise pollution problems could be experienced. At this stage I do not have any more information.

Mr. Wardle: There's a joint Commonwealth-State committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so, and it is currently examining the whole matter. However, the committee has not made available to the Government any conclusive reports.

RURAL YOUTH

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain how many Agriculture Department officers are engaged as advisers to the rural youth movement, and what efforts are being made to increase the number of advisers to help the work of the rural youth movement? Approaches have been made to me from time to time, including one recently, regarding the seemingly inadequate number of advisers in the rural youth movement. Indeed, I was told recently that the number of advisers had dwindled to two. Discussions have taken place regarding the provision of headquarters for the movement, but its work is not receiving the encouragement that it should be receiving. There is no need for me to comment on the importance of the movement and the work it is doing to foster good relations between young people in the city and in the country, especially as a large rural youth club is situated in Adelaide. Will the Minister of Works seek this information from his colleague so that the Government can try to satisfy the people from whom I have received frequent submissions and complaints?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

OIL RECLAMATION

Mr. VENNING: Before asking the Premier my question, I thank him for going to Clare last weekend. Will the Premier say what is the situation regarding the treatment and reclamation of oil in South Australia? I understand that all other States have a process whereby used oil can be reclaimed for further use and that a plant, owned by one of the oil companies, was operated in South Australia but that, because of the expansion of the company concerned, the area in which the reclamation plant was installed no longer exists. Will the Premier say what is the present situation in South Australia regarding the possibility of reclaiming oil?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me say, before answering the honourable member's question, that I was pleased to go to Clare last Saturday in connection with the wine festival and that I was grateful to the honourable member for his warm, kindly and liquid welcome. In reply to the honourable member's question, although I have seen many reports from the Industrial Development Branch regarding the reclamation of oil, I think I should obtain an up-to-date report on the matter rather than give the honourable member an off-the-cuff reply.

EDUCATION OFFICER

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education say whether the position of Chief Executive Officer for the South Australian Council of Education and Planning Research is to be readvertised? Persons in the teaching profession, including some in the Education Department, have expressed concern that this position was advertised at a low key and that only a few persons applied for it. Rumours are afoot that the appointee to this position, which attracts an annual salary of \$23 000, could come from within the Education Department. It is considered, however, that if the appointee is objectively to undertake this job, which involves the planning of education in this State, he should be divorced entirely from the department, as taking a person from within the education system could be damaging to the overall objectives of the council that is being formed. It is considered that the job should be readvertised in other States as well as overseas, because it was advertised at a low level and little publicity was given to the opportunity to apply for this appointment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It seems to me that the honourable member may have been got at, as the position, carrying a salary of \$23 000 a year, was advertised not only in South Australia but also in the national press and overseas and, indeed, as a result applications from Australia and overseas were received. The selection committee that considered the applications and the reports of the referees that were written to regarding each applicant has met and reached a unanimous decision. I will announce that decision soon, when one or two matters can be finalized. It is intended that the council shall be established ultimately under Statute. The council will not be located within the Education Department building, and the appointee, no matter what his background may be, will be expected to treat objectively the various matters on which he has to advise the council. I remind the honourable member that the council itself will represent all levels of education and the various educational institutions in South Australia, and this wide representation should ensure the full co-ordination of all educational activities and of long-term planning. I have no hesitation in saying

that the fears expressed by the honourable member have no foundation whatsoever.

PERPETUAL LEASES

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to have his department amend its policy regarding the subdivision of irrigation perpetual leases for residential purposes so that residents pay only one water rate and not two as is the case at present in certain circumstances? As a former Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture would probably recognize the problem to which I am referring and which arises when an irrigation property is subdivided for housing allotments and water is provided from the town supply for which the normal residences are rated accordingly. Unless the department has excised from the irrigation rate the irrigation perpetual lease used in the subdivision, the people concerned are forced to pay two water rates, even though the irrigation water is not available, and the land that has become part of the town will never again be used for horticultural purposes. I understand that the department is concerned that the irrigation rated area is decreasing because of town development, resulting in a reduction of irrigation rate revenue. I suggest that, if this is the case, the excised areas should be reallocated to growers with suitable land to maintain the rated area. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will ask his colleague to take the necessary action to solve the problem of some residents who, having to pay two water rates, receive supply for only one.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to consider the matter and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

CATTLE TESTING

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider granting a certificate of cleanliness for contagious abortion or brucellosis, similar to that granted for tuberculosis, in a herd that has been regularly inoculated and tested? I understand that a certificate is issued to owners of tuberculosis-free herds for a period of up to four years. Animals inoculated against brucellosis in South Australia have three punch holes placed in one ear, and stud breeders and commercial herd owners surely are entitled to this verification in written form.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague for a report and let the honourable member have it.

PETROL STATIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry make available information, as requested by the Government from the oil industry, concerning the rationalization of petrol outlets? Further, will the Minister say how this rationalization broke down, necessitating the proclamation of legislation for rationalization, and will he also say whether the Government intends, through this legislation, to stop petrol discounting? When the Premier initially announced to this House that he intended to rationalize service stations, he said that information would be requested from the oil industry, and the exact terms of this request are given on page 125 of *Hansard* for 1973. On October 29, 1973, I wrote to the Premier requesting this information as well as supplementary information. On December 17 last I received an inane sort of reply from the Acting Premier indicating that this information could not be made available without much work and effort, which showed that the information originally requested from the industry had not been collected. I wrote again on

January 15 last, again requesting the information and indicating that, under the terms of the voluntary agreement, this information was to be supplied to the Government. On January 30 the Premier sent a reply stating that the information I had requested was too difficult to collect. Of course, that information was the information indicated in *Hansard*, as well as supplementary information. However, I received nothing. Then, last week the Government announced that legislation would be introduced at the end of June or at the beginning of July to rationalize service stations. Therefore, I ask whether this shows that the Government has the information that I have been trying for some time to obtain, and I ask whether this request is being dealt with in a similar way to that in which a request made last week regarding Ayers House was dealt with.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and debating, and he is grossly out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Furthermore, as indicated in the press statement last week, the Premier now, in the same report about the rationalization of service stations, has brought in the topic of the discounting of petrol in the metropolitan area. Therefore, it would seem that the Government will not only rationalize outlets but also control discounting.

The SPEAKER: It seems that the honourable member has gone beyond the bounds of a brief explanation of his question to the Minister. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member's question was rather long and that it involved several matters too numerous for me to even follow at this stage. Further, the honourable member would understand that the administration of this Act has been transferred to my department only recently. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you make the information available?

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: I have said I will obtain a report for the honourable member, and I will make it available to him as soon as it is humanly possible to get the information.

GRAPE SPRAYS

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question, which is addressed to the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Agriculture, refers to the availability of chemicals for downy mildew control. Will the Minister find out whether his colleague is aware of the tremendous damage done to this year's grape harvest by downy mildew and of the unfortunate effect this could have on next year's canes? Further, will the Minister obtain from his colleague a report on whether the Agriculture Department will start a campaign to encourage farmers to adopt an organized and determined programme during the next two seasons to try to bring this disease under control? If such a programme is started, is the Minister of Agriculture aware of the possible shortages of many spray materials of German origin, such as delan, brought about because German chemical firms are not interested in supplying chemicals to Australia, as a result of the present exchange rates between the \$1 Australian and the deutschmark? Further, I ask whether the Minister of Agriculture is aware that, because of the substantial increases in the price of copper, products such as copper sulphate (used in Bordeaux mixture) and copper oxychlorate, spray prices are tending to increase dramatically. If my information regarding the German products is correct, will the Minister of Agriculture take this matter up with

the Commonwealth Government to find out whether an arrangement can be made at Government level with respect to supplies of these important chemicals from German suppliers? Further, regarding the local product, will the Minister have the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs examine whether the dramatic increases in price can be justified? I ask these questions because adequate supplies of the chemicals concerned at a reasonable price will be essential for future control and possible eradication of the disease.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the series of questions to my colleague and ask for a report.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Local Government say when legislation will be introduced regarding quarterly billing for council rates? I understand that the Minister was reported in the *News* of January 29 as having stated that he considered that most councils favoured quarterly rating. I also understand that, at a general meeting of the Local Government Association in October, 1973, a motion was passed requesting the Minister to oppose any suggestion for the preparation or passing of legislation relating to quarterly billing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It was hoped to introduce the legislation during the current session, but for a variety of reasons this is not possible. Accordingly, the legislation will not be introduced until Parliament meets again in the middle of this year. Therefore, it will become operative as from July 1, 1975. If the *News* has done me the honour of reporting what I said when I opened the local government conference this morning, the honourable member will see that I said just that: that quarterly rating represented this Government's policy and that I believed that it was in the interests of the people. Whether some councils may oppose the system for reasons best known to themselves is their business. I do not quarrel with their attitude: I accept it. But, by the same token, I would expect them to accept this as the Government's attitude, which I believe is in the interests of the people.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister order a survey of all metropolitan councils to ascertain which councils permit people proving hardship to pay their council rates by instalments, and, if such a survey is undertaken, will he make the report of that survey available to Parliament? The Government seems to be threatening to introduce quarterly rating, a system that no-one but the Minister desires. It appears that practically all councils in the metropolitan area now allow people proving hardship to pay their council rates by instalments.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will discuss with my officers the practicability of trying to get this information. If it is considered practicable and desirable to obtain it, I shall certainly proceed in that way. However, from his explanation, it appears that the honourable member is more concerned about expressing opposition to the quarterly payment of rates than he is with getting this information. Let me make plain to the honourable member that, simply because a person is a pensioner, he should not be required to humble himself in front of a council, declaring that he is a pensioner and setting out his financial position to prove to the satisfaction of that council that he merits being permitted to pay his rates by instalments. The procedure I have outlined is usually the one that is followed. For some reason or other, the honourable member has a thing against people paying council rates by quarterly instalments. He claims that all councils oppose this method of payment and that I am the only person who supports it. By nodding his head now, he shows that he agrees completely with

what I have said, and I am pleased about that, because I want to say that it is so much ballyhoo for him to make a statement as stupid as the one he has made. What he has said is simply not true. If the honourable member is honest in his attitude, I ask him to table in the House an account of the water rates he pays annually, showing that he does not take advantage of the opportunity, afforded him by the Government, to pay those rates by quarterly instalments.

COOK FIRE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Transport use his good offices with the Commonwealth Railways Department to see whether it can upgrade (indeed, drastically improve) its fire-fighting facilities on the east-west line? The Minister may be aware that a few days ago a fatality occurred at Cook, and one of the problems facing the people in that town at the time was that insufficient fire-fighting equipment of a reasonably high standard was available to contain the fire, which completely gutted one timber-frame house. Fortunately, the wind was blowing from an easterly direction: if it had been blowing from the west, as many as 10 houses might have been destroyed. If the Minister has good offices with his Commonwealth colleagues and with the Commonwealth Railways Department, will he have this matter investigated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Without any qualifications, stupid as they are, from the honourable member, I shall be pleased to take up this matter in the interests of the people concerned.

BUS SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether there has been any rationalization of the services that were previously provided by the recently acquired private bus operators? Specifically, have any services been either curtailed or extended during the period of Government management? Further, if the real intention is to improve services to the public by increasing the availability of those services, will the Minister say when the appropriate changes will be initiated? People in the Ingle Farm and Para Hills area who, between 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays and 9 a.m. on Mondays, previously enjoyed a service provided by Elizabeth bus services have now been denied a service extending up to and including what is known as the Maxwell Road intersection. I seek an assurance from the Minister that services provided in the past will be maintained and that, if improvements are to be effected, they will be effected without delay. I also seek details of the situation generally relating to management.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The specific service to which the honourable member refers is obviously a matter of management involving the Municipal Tramways Trust, but I assume he wishes me to inquire about it, and I shall certainly be happy to do that. In the general context of the take-over, I want to make perfectly clear to the House that I believe that the officers and employees of the trust have done a magnificent job of assimilating the operations of the 14 or 15 private operators whose services recently became part of the trust's operations. Of course, one expects to find certain areas where teething troubles may have to be overcome, but let us reverse the situation and transfer the whole M.T.T. operation to the private operators in the space of a fortnight and see what sort of a job is done.

Dr. Eastick: That's a reflection on private enterprise.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is the implication that has been made throughout this whole matter: that a socialistic policy is being inflicted on the private operators. The fact that members opposite, including the Leader, consistently ignore is that it was the operators themselves who asked the Government to take over the services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that Opposition members have for political purposes deliberately tried to paint a false picture.

Dr. Eastick: If you say it often enough, you'll believe it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The private operators passed a resolution (I have a copy of it if the Leader would like to see it) asking the Government to take over their services.

Mr. Becker: What happened 12 months before?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like any member opposite, including the Leader and the member for Hanson, who is so vocal on these issues, to stand up and be counted if he is willing to increase by 5c or 6c the fares of passengers who were using the private bus services. If that is the Opposition's policy, it is not the Government's.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The situation is clear: it was a matter either of increasing the fares of those passengers who were carried by the private operators or of the operators' asking the M.T.T. to take over their services.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You would not expect them to run at a loss, would you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel wants higher fares for the public, let him stand up and be counted. In fact, the member for Glenelg was reported in the newspaper last week as condemning the Government because we had increased rail fares. I suggest that he meet with his Leader and the member for Hanson and sort out a common policy.

FLOOD ASSISTANCE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what practical assistance has been given to residents and travellers affected by the recent floods in the northern areas of the State? Was the civil defence organization consulted or invited to assist in undertaking rescue or relief work and, if it was not, will the Premier say why it was not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

CLARE LAND

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether the land which is adjacent to Clare High School and which has been recommended to be used for agricultural science activities has been purchased for this purpose? I understand that a favourable area adjacent to the school has been selected for this purpose but, because of housing development in the area, I ask the Minister whether a final document has been prepared

purporting to show that this land will be purchased by the department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check this matter for the honourable member.

RENMARK NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Education say what consideration has been given to the request by the Renmark North Primary School to have established within its grounds pre-school facilities? The Minister may recall that late last year Mr. Glen and I discussed with him the need for additional pre-school facilities in the Renmark area. Evidently, in 1972 and again in 1973 this school approached the department to have these facilities established. As suitable rooms are available at the school that could be converted for this purpose, I ask whether this request can be considered further. I point out that, as about 50 per cent of the enrolments at this school are from Greek families, it is considered essential that pre-school, before grade 1, be available to these families.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Only about 10 days ago I was notified of Commonwealth approval of the availability of funds, that notification being the first to be given to any State in Australia. These funds are available through the Kindergarten Union or the Education Department for the establishment and running of pre-school kindergartens. Only in the last two weeks has the interim pre-school committee been established in South Australia with the task of recommending on priorities in establishing pre-school kindergartens in the case of the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union. The balance of recurrent funds has been determined by the Australian Government in the case of additional funds coming in. I imagine that for the future the local pre-school committee will recommend to me on submissions to be made to the Australian Government for future assistance, and that this submission will involve the allocation of funds between the Kindergarten Union and the Education Department. I am sure that the honourable member will appreciate that many requests for assistance have come in, either through the Kindergarten Union or the Education Department, for the establishment of new kindergartens or for the conversion of existing spare accommodation to establish pre-schools. In current circumstances, it is not possible for me to sit down, run through the list of all applications, and say, "Bloggs gets them and someone else does not," and so on, all the way through. That would not be satisfactory to the people who missed out; I am sure they would want a better assessment than that of their priority. An overall assessment of priorities in establishing Education Department pre-school kindergartens will be involved. On the recommendation of my officers, we decided to establish seven pre-school kindergartens this year. The existing funds we have to the end of June will enable the conversion of buildings to take place and the running costs of these establishments to be covered. However, further steps will have to be assessed and recommended on by the pre-school committee.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to superannuation benefits and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Members will be aware that the Government, conscious of the increasing financial burdens imposed on contributors to the present superannuation scheme, commissioned a working party to put before it proposals for a new superannuation scheme. The working party's proposals were approved by the Government in the latter part of last year and the drafting of this measure giving effect to them was put in hand in early December of that year. At the outset it must be made clear that this measure is an extremely complex one. For this complexity the Government makes no apology, since it arises from an attempt to do substantial justice to all classes of contributor. A less complex scheme, while superficially more attractive, would have resulted in some classes of contributor being disadvantaged *vis à vis* other classes of contributor. The choice between complexity and apparent simplicity was, in the Government's view, really a choice between justice and injustice.

Before an explanation of the proposed scheme is attempted it may be worth while to outline, briefly, the workings of the present superannuation scheme, since a clear understanding of that scheme is an essential prerequisite to an understanding of the proposed new scheme. Under the present scheme a contributor is, on joining, entitled to contribute for a number of units of pension appropriate to his salary. For present purposes, he may be regarded as being entitled to contribute for one unit of pension for each \$87 of his annual salary. Once in each year during his service, on his entitlement day, his salary is examined and if it has increased since his last entitlement day he is entitled to take out one additional unit of pension for each \$87 of the increase. If he does not wish to take out all the units which at any time he is entitled to take out he is said to have neglected them, and these units are referred to as "neglected units". In respect of neglected units he makes no contribution and of course derives no benefit by way of pension.

The contributions for a unit of pension must, over the contributor's service, amount with interest to about \$200 if he is contributing for retirement at age 65 years and about \$227 if he is contributing for retirement at age 60 years. The reason for the higher amount for retirement at age 60 years is that a person retiring at that age will expect to enjoy a pension for a longer period than will a person retiring at age 65 years. The capital sum so arrived at should be actuarially capable of providing 30 per cent of a pension of \$2 a fortnight for each unit together with an appropriate widow's pension. When the pension emerges the Government pays the remaining 70 per cent. Thus the Government can be said to be subsidizing \$7 for each \$3 that the contributor contributes.

Since the total sum that must be contributed for each unit of pension is fixed, it follows that if the contributor contributes for that total over a long period his fortnightly contributions will be relatively small, whereas if he contributes for that unit over a relatively short period his fortnightly contributions will be correspondingly large. For example, a male contributing for retirement at age 60 years can, at age 16, buy a unit of pension for 8c a fortnight, whereas at age 59 a unit of pension would cost him \$8.75 a fortnight. In each case his total contributions with interest would amount to \$227. In past years, when salaries remained relatively stable, the present scheme worked well and enabled contributors to make adequate provision for retirement by making payments spread fairly evenly over their working life.

However, in these inflationary times, the present scheme has imposed a heavy financial burden on an older contributor whose salary increases are occurring relatively late in his working life. To take out the units of pension to which he is entitled by virtue of his increases in salary he has to make a most substantial contribution, since the period over which he is contributing is necessarily short. In many cases he has been simply unable to afford this contribution. To some extent the present scheme provided some mitigation by permitting a contributor to take out up to 16 reserve units of pension at an early age when the contribution for each unit was low. Towards the end of his service the contributor could then apply some or all of those units towards his then entitlement and hence, to some extent, lessen the increase in his net payments at that time. However, even this arrangement could not keep pace with inflation.

The net result of the application of the present scheme was that contributors could not afford to make the contributions necessary for the full pension for which they were entitled to contribute and were therefore obliged to neglect units. The foregoing, then, briefly outlines the economic climate in which the present scheme failed. Under the present scheme, for the reasons that I have outlined, contributions when expressed as a percentage of total salary were very low on entry at an early age and, in these times, excessively high at the later stage of the contributor's career, so high in many cases that they could not be met, with a result that the contributor suffered a reduced pension. There was also provided in the existing scheme special provision for female contributors in two areas. First, they had the option of retiring at age 55 years by paying higher contributions and secondly they paid a rate different from that paid by men for retirement at age 60 years.

The proposed new scheme abandons the "unit of pension" concept and is based on the concept of the contributor's contributing a fixed percentage of his salary throughout his working life until he attains the age of about 60 years and receiving by way of pension a fixed percentage of his final salary, as defined, at the time he retires. The contributor is required to choose whether he wishes to obtain the highest benefit under the scheme and contribute at the higher rate or contribute at half that rate and receive half that benefit. The percentage of his final salary that he receives by way of pension is determined by his years of service during which he makes contributions up to a maximum of 30 years, which, in the case of a "higher benefit contributor", will yield a pension of 66½ per cent of that final salary. Further payments may be made by a contributor who will not have 30 years of service during which to make contributions, in order to increase his benefit. Provision is, of course, made for appropriate benefits for his spouse or children on his death whether it occurs while he is still a contributor or after he becomes a pensioner.

The foregoing explanation is necessarily an overly simplified one and will be elaborated on in the explanation of the clauses of the Bill. So far the concepts that are given effect to in the measure are relatively straightforward. It now remains to outline the principles on which the transitional provisions are based, that is, the provision to bring the present contributors into the new scheme in a manner that does reasonable justice to all. Present contributors are required to make a choice whether or not to obtain the higher benefit under the scheme by electing under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, whether to be a higher benefit contributor or a lower benefit contributor.

At the outset it should be pointed out that while the percentage of his final salary that a new contributor receives is determined by the factor of his years of service during which he makes contributions and any further payments he makes, this factor does not apply to a present contributor, who is entitled to a pension of 66½ per cent of his final salary, if he elects to be a higher benefit contributor, subject to the two factors outlined below which take account of his contributions to the present scheme. Let us first consider the case of the contributor who is contributing for retirement at age 65 years and assume that on his last payment day he was contributing for all the units for which he was entitled to contribute, that is, that he had no neglected units. The first step in determining his new rate of contribution is to estimate the amount that, pursuant to the old scheme, he would pay if he was contributing for retirement at age 60 years. This calculation is necessary because, under the proposed new scheme, all contributors will be entitled to retire at that age. This calculation will give us a fixed amount, in the Bill called his "adjusted contribution".

If the amount of contribution required of him ascertained by reference to the eleventh schedule to this Bill is less than his adjusted contribution he may either contribute the lesser amount and have his pension subject to a deduction of a fixed amount referred to as the "fund share reduction" or contribute at the rate determined by reference to the eleventh schedule plus a fixed amount being the difference in absolute money terms between that rate and his adjusted contribution rate, in which case he will be entitled to his full pension. This choice is provided for by an election under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, to make "pension maintenance payments" by way of fortnightly contributions. If he elects not to make the additional fortnightly payments required of him to obtain his full pension he may at any time during his service make that payment by means of a lump-sum payment or he may obtain part benefit by paying a smaller lump sum. It may be that at the end of his service he will have some available capital to make these payments from his long service leave payments.

If, however, the amount of contributions he is required to make pursuant to the eleventh schedule of the Bill is greater than his adjusted contribution (and this may well be the case of a contributor who is under, say, 35 years), he will in his first year under the new scheme be required to contribute a percentage of his salary equivalent to his adjusted contribution or half of his rate ascertained by reference to that schedule, whichever is the higher, increasing each year by half of 1 per cent until he reaches the required rate. To this extent the impact of the new scheme is somewhat softened in so far as it touches contributors who are at present contributing a relatively low proportion of their salary. The same principles apply to the case of a contributor under the old scheme who was contributing for retirement at age 60 years, the only difference being that in his case his "adjusted contribution" would be the amount he was actually paying, since his contributions are already based on retirement at age 60 years.

Where a contributor under the old scheme had neglected units of pension he will be entitled to increase his contributions to receive the benefit of a pension for those units. This choice is provided for by an election under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, to make "neglected unit maintenance payments" by way of fortnightly contributions. If he does not desire to increase his contributions, he may make a lump sum payment of an amount equal to those contributions and still receive

the appropriate increase in pension or he may pay a smaller lump sum for a portion of the benefit. Again, the foregoing explanation of the transitional arrangements is necessarily grossly over-simplified and will be elaborated upon in the explanation of the clauses of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 is a fairly standard repeal and savings provision. Clause 5 has the dubious distinction of being one of the longest clauses ever to appear in a Bill presented to this House, encompassing as it does about 14 pages. It sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this measure and it is commended to honourable members' closest attention, since a clear appreciation of almost every definition is vital to an understanding of the measure. The complexity of some of these definitions is regretted but is unfortunately largely unavoidable, being related to the provision of adequate transitional provisions to bring present contributors under the new scheme.

However, it is only by a clear understanding of the concepts encompassed by the definitions that one can safely advise as to the provisions of the measure that will apply to a particular contributor. To assist honourable members in this regard, officers of the Public Actuary's office will be available to explain the application of the measure to individual cases. It should also be indicated that under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974, each present individual contributor will, in being asked to make an election, be given a clear statement of his position.

Clause 6 extends and elucidates the meaning of the expression "employee" in clause 5. This definition is a crucial one, since only persons who are employees may become contributors to the fund. In substance, though not entirely in form, the extension follows the corresponding provision of the Act proposed to be repealed. However, the term "employee" has in this Bill been extended to cover persons on the establishment of His Excellency the Governor who were not previously entitled to contribute to the fund. Clause 7 is self-explanatory. Clause 8 is intended to ensure that contributors to the fund cannot receive the benefit of any other superannuation scheme in respect of which the Government is liable to contribute.

Clause 9 provides for the absence of a Public Actuary and, again, substantially re-enacts the corresponding provision of the existing legislation. Clause 10 provides for the cost of administration of the measure to be met by moneys provided by Parliament and is a re-enactment of an existing provision. Clause 11 provides for employees of public authorities to participate in the superannuation scheme, contributions equivalent to the contributions that the Government is required to make in relation to its employees being met, in relation to employees of public authorities, by the relevant public authority.

Clause 12 continues the present South Australian Superannuation Fund in existence. Clause 13 sets out the investments to which the fund may be applied and is somewhat wider in application than was previously the case. In this regard the attention of members is drawn to sub-clause (1) (g) of this clause. Clause 14 grants a specific borrowing power to the fund with a corresponding guarantee by the Treasurer. It is thought that the provision of such a power may assist the fund to resolve certain "cash flow" problems, particularly in the early stages of the new scheme. Clause 15 provides for a formal triennial investigation by the Public Actuary, who in the course of his duties will exercise continuous oversight over the fund.

Clause 16 provides for a report to Parliament on the results of the Public Actuary's investigations. Clause 17

provides for an audit of the accounts of the fund. Clause 18 continues the present South Australian Superannuation Fund Board in existence but changes its name by omitting the word "Fund" from its title. The reason for this omission will be dealt with in relation to the explanation of clause 33. Clauses 19 to 32 are, it is felt, in their terms, self-explanatory, and deal with certain formal matters connected with the functioning of the board. They differ little if at all from the corresponding provisions of the Act proposed to be repealed.

Clause 33 represents a substantial departure from the terms of the previous legislation, in that it provides for the establishment of a "South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust" to deal with the fund. This trust, the composition of which is set out in clause 34, will be responsible for the control and investment of the fund, and its establishment commends itself to the Government. Clauses 35 to 42 again are, in their terms, self-explanatory, and deal with certain formal matters relating to the trust. However, I draw honourable members' particular attention to clause 38, which is a new provision and which in its terms permits the trustees, under specified conditions, to borrow from the fund.

Clause 43 provides for employees, as defined, to apply to become contributors to the fund. It also provides for the board to be satisfied as to the soundness of the applicant's health. If the board is not so satisfied the applicant may: (a) be permitted to contribute to the fund and receive certain limited benefits, as to which see the explanation to clause 65; or (b) be permitted to contribute to the provident account in the fund, as to which see clause 101 and the following clauses.

Clause 44 requires each new contributor to elect to be a higher or lower benefit contributor. In brief, the contributions required of a lower benefit contributor are half the contributions required of a higher benefit contributor, and the benefits available to him are also half the maximum benefit. All present contributors are required to make a similar election under section 4 of the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974. Regarding clause 45, members may recall that it was indicated that the new scheme was a "years of service related scheme": in short, the amount of pension that can be obtained is related to the years of service of the contributor, a full pension being obtained if the contributor has 30 years of service after attaining 30 years. It follows that anyone joining the fund after attaining the age of 30 years who wishes to retire at age 60 could not attain his full pension. This clause provides that such a person may in effect "buy" years of service or, as they are expressed in this provision, "contribution months", and this may be done by the making of increased fortnightly contributions or by the payment of a lump sum. Years so bought will count as years of service for the purpose of determining the purchaser's final pension. This provision will be particularly useful for contributors who are over the age of 30 years joining the scheme, having previously belonged to another superannuation scheme.

The Public Actuary when setting the increased fortnightly contribution will ensure that it is sufficient to cover both the fund share of the prospective pension and the Government's share. This level of contribution is necessary since the contributor will not be rendering any service to the Government during the years of service bought pursuant to this provision. Clause 46 limits the absolute right to buy years of service where that right is not exercised on joining the fund. Before a contributor

can buy such years after he has commenced contributions he is required to satisfy the board as to the soundness of his health. The reason for this limitation is to prevent a person who anticipates invalid retirement from securing an undue advantage by electing to buy back service and thereby increasing his pension.

Clause 47 sets out the level of contributions for a new contributor which will be found in the twelfth schedule and, depending on his entry age, which range from 5 to 6 per cent of his salary as ascertained once in each 12 months of his working life. Clause 48 provides a concessional contribution rate of 3 per cent of salary for those contributors who are under 19 years until they attain that age, and is intended to make early entry into the fund more attractive.

Clause 49 is intended to provide entry for and the obtaining of full benefits for older persons who for one reason or another are to be attracted to enter the service of the Government. For example, a person aged 50 or over on joining the fund would expect to receive something of the order of one-third or less of his full pension if he retired at 60 years. If his services as an employee are particularly required it will be possible to attribute years of service (in this section referred to in contribution months) to him so as to increase the amount of pension that he may expect. Clause 50, which is on the face of it somewhat obscure, is intended to enable a new contributor who has been an employee for at least 20 years before the commencement of this Act to join the new scheme on the same basis as he could have joined the old scheme. In short, it provides that in the purchase of his years of service he will pay no more for his entitlement than he would have paid if he had purchased units under the old scheme. He will not be obliged to pay for the Government's share of his pension.

Clause 51 provides that a new contributor is not required to continue paying contributions on attaining age 60 years if he became such a contributor before attaining the age of 30 years, or if he became a contributor after that age when he has attained 30 years service including any years he has bought or has had attributed to him. Clause 52 provides that a transferred contributor, that is, one who has been transferred from the existing scheme, will not be obliged to make any further payments to the fund after attaining the age of 60 years or 55 years if the contributor was contributing for retirement at that age. At this stage I again draw honourable members' particular attention to the fact that the "years of service" principle does not apply to transferred contributors. In general terms, the period of service of a transferred contributor is not relevant to the determination of his pension.

Clause 53 sets out the method of calculation of the contributions of a transferred contributor. Basically, these contributions are based on between 5 per cent and 6 per cent of the contributor's salary ascertained once in every 12 months, the actual base being ascertained by reference to the tenth or eleventh schedule to this Bill as is appropriate. In addition, the transferred contributor may elect to make certain additional payments by way of pension maintenance payments or neglected unit maintenance payments more particularly referred to in subclause (3). To determine the contribution rate of any particular contributor the definitions of "adjusted contribution", "adjusted contribution percentage" and "contribution percentage" should be applied to the case of that contributor.

Clause 54 makes special provision for a transferred contributor whose contributions to the fund were, in effect, frozen by virtue of section 26 of the repealed Act. This section provided that any contributor who was also a

contributor to any other scheme subsidized by the Government would not, after the coming into operation of the repealed Act, be entitled to contribute for any additional units of pension to which he may be entitled. The effect of this clause is to continue this situation in existence but to permit its application to be modified as circumstances and justice dictate. Clause 55 provides that contributions will cease to be payable immediately before a contributor attains the age of retirement, generally 60 years.

Clause 56 relates to the making of neglected unit maintenance payments, which will afford a transferred contributor an opportunity of "picking up" the benefit he has lost in the past by neglecting units of pension. Briefly he may obtain all of the benefit by: (a) increasing his fortnightly contributions by a fixed sum; or (b) paying a lump sum equivalent to the amount by which his contributions would be increased, or he may obtain portion of the benefit by paying a somewhat smaller lump sum. Clause 57 relates to the making of pension maintenance payments which will enable a contributor, whose present fortnightly contributions will be reduced in the application of the new scheme, to avoid a pension reduction of a fixed amount consequent on his reduction in contributions. In essence the same options are open to this contributor as are open to the contributor referred to in relation to clause 56.

Clause 58 enables a contributor to continue contributions after his age of retirement and to discontinue those contributions at any time. Clause 59 is relatively self-explanatory and sets out the method of making contributions. Clause 60 provides that employees who cease to make contributions to the fund will be formally parted from the scheme.

Clause 61 is self-explanatory. Clause 62 deals with the matter of the relatively lowly paid contributor, who could well find contributing even at the minimum rate a financial hardship. For this class of contributor there is provided a notional "contribution salary" which is less than his actual salary and the application of his appropriate contribution percentage will give him a somewhat smaller, in money terms, obligation than he would otherwise be required to bear. Clause 63 provides for the case of a contributor whose salary has been reduced.

Clause 64 enables a contributor whose salary has been reduced in circumstances not due to his own fault to pay his contributions at his old rate and as a result to receive a pension appropriate to that salary. Clause 65 has been already touched upon in relation to clause 43 and in fact continues in existence the present scheme of limited benefits for contributors who are unable to satisfy the board as to their soundness of health. Clause 66 formally authorizes the payments of the Government's share of pension.

Clause 67 sets out the circumstances in which a contributor is entitled to a pension. Briefly, these circumstances are: (a) retirement on attaining the age of retirement, normally 60 years, (b) premature retirement at or after age 55 years, (c) invalidity; and (d) retrenchment after age 45 years where the contributor has had not less than five years service.

Clause 68 enables an employee to have his retirement treated as his resignation and so obtain the lump sum resignation benefit rather than the pension on retirement. In certain circumstances some former contributors may find this provision to their advantage. Clause 69 sets out the precise method of calculation of the pension of a new contributor and in this regard the attention of honour-

able members is drawn particularly to the definition of "final salary" in clause 5. Clause 70 sets out the method of calculating the pension for a transferred contributor and here the definitions in clause 5 of "final salary" and "standard pension" deserve close consideration.

It is pointed out that both pensions are subject to increase if the contributor continues in his employment after the age of his retirement or in the case of a new contributor after attaining 30 years service after attaining the age of 30 years. Clause 71 sets out the method of calculating the pension that is payable on premature retirement at age 55 or after. It is conceded that the pension offered here is perhaps not as generous as may be available in comparable schemes but it is pointed out that the purpose of this measure is to encourage employees to work until age 60 years and not to retire earlier than that age.

Clause 72 sets out the amount of pension payable on invalidity retirement and here the definition of "notional pension" in clause 5 should be referred to. This clause also provides for a minimum pension, as defined in that clause, should this prove necessary. Clause 73 provides for the determination of a pension on retrenchment. Clause 74 is self-explanatory. Clause 75 provides for commutation of portion of certain pensions and is, in this State, an innovation. Briefly the following pensions are commutable: (a) pensions which emerged after January 1, 1973; (b) pensions first payable under this measure; and (c) widows or spouse pensions, but no invalid or retrenchment pension is commutable.

Up to 30 per cent of a commutable pension may be surrendered for a lump sum payment fixed by the Public Actuary. However, if part of the commutable pension has been derived from a specified lump sum payment (as to which, see the definition of "prescribed deduction" in clause 5), the amount of the pension that may be commuted will be reduced accordingly. Clause 76 sets out the circumstances in which an invalid pensioner may be recalled to duty and clause 77 sets out the circumstances in which a retrenched pensioner may be so recalled. Clause 78 limits the amount that an invalid pensioner or retrenched pensioner may earn before his pension is subject to reduction.

Clause 79 sets out the benefit payable under the Act to the contributor who ceases to be a contributor where no other benefit is payable. This kind of benefit may be characterized as a "withdrawal benefit". Clause 80 provides for a special retrenchment benefit where no retrenchment pension is payable. Clause 81 provides a general benefit where all other pensions and benefits payable to or in relation to a contributor do not exceed his contributions plus interest.

Clause 82 provides a pension for the spouse of a deceased pensioner. This concept of "spouse" pension which differs from the former "widow's" pension has two innovations: (a) first, it is payable to the "spouse" of the pensioner, that is, to the widow or widower of the deceased pensioner; and (b) secondly, it is payable for the life of the spouse, that is, it does not cease on remarriage. The amount of pension payable is two-thirds of the deceased pensioner's pension.

Clause 83 makes similar provisions for the spouse of a deceased contributor. Clause 84 provides for the commutation by a spouse of up to 30 per cent of his or her pension. This communication is only available on the spouse attaining the age of 60 years. Clauses 85 to 90 set out an entirely new and considerably more generous method of providing benefits for children of whom one or both parents are deceased. The method of

ascertaining these benefits is set out in detail in these clauses but it is sufficient here to say that on the death of a contributor or contributor pensioner, as defined, up to one-third of the amount of his pension will be available for distribution amongst his or his spouse's children. Should the spouse also die, then an amount up to the whole of the pension of the deceased contributor or deceased contributor pensioner will be available. Child benefit is payable in respect of a child up to the age of 25 years, who is attending full time at a recognized educational institution.

Clause 91 formally provides for the continuance of pensions payable under the repealed Act. Clause 92 is self-explanatory. Clause 93 is, to put it no higher, another extremely complex provision. It is to honour an undertaking given by the Government that so far as is possible pensioners who went on pension after January 1, 1973, will not be in any worse position than they would have been had the Act presaged by this Bill been in operation on that day.

The complex formulae as provided for in this clause are an endeavour to cast up the pension that would have been payable to such a pensioner had this measure been law on January 1, 1973. If the pension so cast up is higher than the pension they at present enjoy they will be entitled to the higher pension. Clauses 94 and 95 increase certain widows' pensions. Clause 96 gives an "across the board" 3 per cent increase in pensions that emerged before January 1, 1973. Clause 97 provides the legislative framework for a further increase in pensions referred to in relation to clause 96. While the amount available to fund this increase is known and is available the actual distribution of this increase is still the subject of discussions with the pensioners' representatives.

Clause 98 formally ceases certain childrens' pensions which will be replaced by the child benefit adverted to earlier. Clause 99 provides for the automatic adjustment of pensions, annually, so as to reflect changes in the cost of living. Clause 100 establishes three accounts to be maintained as part of the fund. They are (a) the Provident Account; (b) the Retirement Benefit Account; and (c) the Voluntary Savings Account.

The Provident Account is established to provide a means by which employees, whose state of health is such as to not even entitle them to contribute for the limited benefits provided by clause 65, may still derive some benefit by way of a lump sum payment. Briefly, employees of the class indicated may contribute to the Provident Account at the same rate they would contribute if they were accepted as contributors to the fund. However, on ceasing to be an employee in circumstances that would, if he were a contributor, entitle him to a pension the employee will, in lieu of that pension, be entitled to receive an amount equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ times his contributions plus interest.

Provision is also made for an employee who is making payments to the Provident Account and whose health sufficiently improves to be, as it were, transferred to the fund and hence be entitled to full benefits under the proposed measure. The benefit payable on resignation or withdrawal from the Provident Account is the same as the benefit payable to the contributor. The matters referred to are dealt with in clauses 101 to 104 of the Bill. The Retirement Benefit Account, which is covered by clauses 105 to 110 of the Bill, is established to take up certain lump sum amounts which are standing to the credit of contributors and which resulted from a distribution

to contributors of a surplus of the fund some years ago. In addition, this account will be used to take up contributions voluntarily made by contributors after attaining the age of retirement. Further, moneys standing to the credit of contributors in the reserve unit account under the present Act will also be taken up in this account. All moneys standing to the credit of the contributors in the account will attract interest compounded annually, and will be payable on retirement or withdrawal from the fund.

Clauses 111 to 117 continue in operation the Voluntary Savings Account which has existed for nearly 40 years. Part VIII, comprising clauses 118 to 128, represents a new departure in that it establishes a specialized appeal tribunal constituted of a Local Court judge to determine appeals against decisions of the board. The Government considers that such specialized tribunals exercising judicial powers are the most effective method of reviewing administrative decisions of this nature and in time its operation should ensure a high degree of consistency and certainty in the board's decisions that will be of ultimate benefit to both contributors and pensioners.

In one significant area the tribunal will have what may be characterized as an original jurisdiction and this jurisdiction is set out at clause 122 to which members' attention is particularly directed. This clause gives a *de facto* spouse of a contributor or pensioner the right to apply to the Tribunal to receive the pension and other benefits that, in the ordinary course of events, would go to the lawful spouse of the contributor or pensioner. It is indicated that the relationship between the contributor and *de facto* spouse must have existed to the exclusion of the lawful spouse for at least one year to grant an application under this provision. The other provisions of this Part are, it is suggested, reasonably self-explanatory.

Part IX sets out certain miscellaneous provisions of which only one, clause 134, seems to require comment. This clause gives a general power of the board to extend the time limits provided for the making of elections under the measure. This power, in its terms, extends to cover elections under the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974. There only remains then the schedules to the Bill which elaborate on matter contained in the Bill.

In conclusion, it is pointed out that this Bill is presented as a legislative attempt to provide fair and reasonable solutions to matters and cases, which while simple in themselves, in combination result in situations of extraordinary complexity. It may well be that in its passage through this House or in its early operation anomalies will appear and within the framework of the philosophy of this measure the Government will be happy to try to correct them, but for the present it is presented as a measure which gives full effect to the undertakings given by the Government to those whose interests are vitally affected by it.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

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

That the report be noted.

As the report speaks for itself, I do not intend to paraphrase it or explain its effect. However, I wish to thank my fellow members of the committee for the assiduous and careful way in which they devoted themselves to a not inconsiderable task, for the committee was faced with the problem of assessing the value of the various views and

criticisms put before it and of reconciling, where possible, and resolving, where not possible, the various conflicting interests involved. All members of the committee applied themselves with great care, with judgment, and with diligence, to the important task that they had to discharge. Also, I thank all witnesses who attended before the committee to give evidence, as well as the organizations and individuals who made submissions. I am sure that my fellow members of the committee will join me in saying that we found the submissions of great value in reaching a final conclusion. Also, I thank members of the staff of the House, particularly Mr Geoff Mitchell, for the part they played in the proceedings of this Select Committee: all members of the committee are grateful to Mr. Mitchell. From a perusal of the report members will see that the recommendations of the committee involve substantial modifications to the Bill and, indeed, to the principles on which the Bill, as introduced, was based. I think the fact that the committee has been able to agree unanimously on these recommendations, involving substantial modifications to the Bill, is a tribute to the open-minded way the committee approached its task. Indeed, it is a tribute to the value of a Select Committee in relation to a Bill of this kind. We were given the chance, which no-one had previously possessed in relation to this matter in this State, of hearing the views of all persons involved in the matter and of being able to question them, and of thereby putting ourselves in the position of being able to assess the value of those views.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the remarks of the Attorney-General in which he referred to the amount of work involved in this exercise and, with him, I thank all members of the committee for their attention and support. I also support the Attorney-General in his remarks about the work undertaken by Mr. Mitchell. As the Attorney-General has said, some fairly major changes have been effected and, so that all members may have the chance to digest the report and consider this matter as it should be considered. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WAREHOUSEMEN'S LIENS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 28. Page 2246.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I support the Bill, the main proposition of which is to reduce the period of storage after which a warehouseman may sell goods possessed by him in order to recover unpaid charges for the storage. The Bill shortens the period from 12 months to six months, the period recommended by the South Australian Road Transport Association. Because it is such a minor amendment and because it has been recommended by the professional body, Opposition members support it.

Three clauses alter the old currency to dollars and cents in some sections of the Act. However, although no details were given in the second reading explanation, I point out to the Attorney-General that clause 3, in amending from the old currency units to dollars and cents, shows that \$4 has been made the equivalent of £4, whereas under the monetary system £4 should have been converted to \$8.

The Hon. L. J. King: That would double the rate per cent.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I cannot reconcile this legislation with a warning issued by the Premier to the public, to this House, and especially to Opposition members that the present sitting of the House would be a difficult one that would involve late-night sittings, especially if the Opposition

delayed the important legislation that was to be introduced by the Government. Although we are almost half-way through the session, we have had nothing but trivia thrown up to us, although an important Bill just introduced by the Premier is the legislation dealing with superannuation.

Mr. Payne: Is that why you speak on every Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with policy in this Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I spoke on some legislation simply so that the House would not rise before 4 p.m. This is a procedural Bill, introduced with the recommendation of a professional organization, and supported by the Opposition, but the Opposition is looking forward to the important legislation the Government promised to introduce in the present sitting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot continue to debate policy dealing with what this House will consider this session when we are dealing with an individual Bill. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. Dean Brown: I have finished.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am sorry that the honourable member does not regard this Bill as being of any significance. It was requested by the South Australian Road Transport Association as long ago as 1956, and it was regarded by that organization as important to its business. I do not think that this Parliament is entitled to dismiss amendments, which are asked for by a section of the community—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why have you taken four years?

The Hon. L. J. KING: —as being so unimportant that we should not devote ourselves to the matter. This measure has taken its place in the legislative programme—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It must have been a low-priority job!

The Hon. L. J. KING: Of course it was, in 1970. I deprecate the suggestion that, merely because legislation is regarded as low priority because it affects only an individual section of the community, it is not worth Parliament's devoting time to it. I deplore the attitude that is being taken by the member for Davenport; I regard it as wrong. The Road Transport Association is as much entitled to have attention given to an aspect of its business that is creating difficulty as is any other section of the community. It is the business of Parliament to consider proposals of this kind when they are introduced. Although they may not be top priority compared to measures that affect a much wider section of the community or have a greater degree of urgency, it is wrong to suppose that, when we are considering a measure of this kind, Parliament is not occupied with the business with which it should be occupied.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Power to sell goods."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Attorney-General has said this is an important and urgent matter for the Road Transport Association. If that is so, why has it taken more than four years of Government for this matter to be presented to this House?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am surprised that the honourable member makes the year 1970 sound almost like the beginning of the Christian era: everything dates from 1970. That is a very complimentary way of looking at things, but I remind him that the original request was made in 1956, so another Government or other Governments for 14 years had not dealt with the matter. I should have thought that the honourable member would ask why this had not been done since 1956. This, like many other measures, was

committed to the Parliamentary Counsel, who has been extremely busy during the past three years drafting legislation that the Government wished to put on the Statute Book for the benefit of the people of the State. The result of that was that this, like many other measures, had to wait its turn in the legislative programme. That does not mean that its turn should never come. That apparently was the attitude of the Playford Administration, which received this request in 1956 and had done nothing about it when it went out of office in 1965. All the measures the Government approves are committed to the Parliamentary Counsel, priorities are set, and, no matter how low the priority, and no matter how narrow the section of the community that might be affected by it, at some stage it reaches its turn. This Bill has now reached its turn and therefore it is before the House.

Mr. GUNN: I observed one or two interesting points in the Attorney's comments. I believe the correct situation is that this Government called this Parliament together before it had its legislation ready, and that this small Bill is being used to take the time of this House to keep it in session so we will not be going home at 3.30 in the afternoon. I remember reading headlines in the press to the effect that Parliament would be sitting late each evening of the autumn session—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): Order! The honourable member must keep to the matter under discussion.

Mr. GUNN: I think I am speaking to the matter under consideration. The Attorney-General went to some lengths to explain to this Committee why the Government and other Governments had not introduced the measure earlier. I believe that the Government has no real regard for the South Australian Road Transport Association—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: First, I will comment on what the honourable member has had to say, to no great purpose. What the Government intends and plans are to be gleaned not from headlines in the press but from statements made by the Premier on behalf of the Government. Secondly, I wonder what the attitude of the Opposition would have been if we had not called Parliament together in the autumn. I hear no comment on that. Thirdly, let me draw the attention of the honourable member to the attitude of his Leader as expressed last year, namely, that the Government was putting too many Bills before Parliament and not giving Parliament sufficient time to discuss those Bills. It seems to me—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. I think the Attorney-General is somewhat off the Bill. If your previous ruling was correct, the Attorney-General is dealing with the same topic as was spoken on by the member for Eyre.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I gave the honourable Attorney-General the opportunity to reply.

Dr. TONKIN: On a further point of order, I uphold the statement of the member for Davenport, and I ask you, Sir, to do the same. The Attorney-General was speaking on the same subject.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is too late. He should have taken the opportunity at the appropriate time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, you ruled that that matter was not raised at the appropriate time. No vote had been taken, the member for Bragg rose immediately I resumed my seat.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: He did not rise immediately.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: There was no other member on his feet between myself and the member for Bragg. Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 5) and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 28. Page 2247.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I do not think we have ever seen a piece of legislation so poorly presented to the House as we have seen with this Bill. There is no doubt that this legislation has been rushed into this Chamber in an attempt to keep the Parliament sitting and to put up something vague, hoping that during the debate some solution may reach the Government to assist it because of its poor handling of the transport policy in this State. The Government's policy on transport would be probably one of the poorest and weakest we have seen in the history of this State. It is becoming clear that what the Minister wants to achieve in some shape or form is complete control of the public transport system in the metropolitan area, but that is not the real issue in this Bill. It may seem to be so, but the crux of the matter is that the Minister wants to seize control of all forms of transport throughout the State, make one unholy mess of it, and hand it to the Commonwealth Government and say, "We cannot keep the lot."

It is typical of the promise made nearly five years ago when the then Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament said that, if he were elected Prime Minister and his colleague in South Australia were elected Premier of South Australia, they would make South Australia the model Socialist State. This is the first step in what this Government is trying to do: it intends to control all forms of transport and, come what may, it will achieve this end. This legislation is the beginning of the end of the transport system. This legislation is so vague and so poor, as is evidenced by the Minister's opening remarks, which were not read in the House but which were circularized, as a result of which the public must look up *Hansard* to see what happened.

Mr. Coumbe: How would the public know what it really meant?

Mr. BECKER: Quite. This is how legislation is being thrust on us now: we are getting it in this vague form so that no-one knows what is happening, in the hope that the Opposition will not notice what is going on, so that the Government's ultimate aim of nationalism will be achieved. The Minister's second reading explanation began as follows:

In July, 1973, the Government appointed a committee to advise the Minister of Transport and of Local Government on the means of establishing a single transport authority to control the activities of certain existing bodies operating in this State. The Government has had an opportunity of considering the report of the committee, and this Bill goes some way towards giving effect to its recommendations. The term "goes some way" is used advisedly, since the ultimate intention of having a single authority actually operating all major forms of public transport in this State is not capable of being realized at this stage. However, it should be clear that this is the ultimate aim.

This is the ultimate aim for one who believes in a Socialist policy and in the nationalization of free enterprise, and it is what the Government intends. Let me now return to what occurred in July, 1973, when this

committee was formed to examine this single transport authority, a matter on which the Government has received a report.

Mr. Coumbe: This is committee No. 27, is it?

Mr. BECKER: It could be. The Government will not say how many committees have been established, how many persons are on them, or what salary or expenses they receive. It is therefore impossible for one to work out what is happening. Still, that is the idea of the open Government that we have: the left hand must not know what the right hand is doing. And the left hand is well and truly in control of the right hand at present! That committee met and brought down a report to the Minister but, believing in and supporting open Government, the Minister has not seen fit to make that report public. As a result, the Opposition has not had a chance to study it. The Opposition is supposed to accept the Minister's attitude regarding what is contained in the report: he believes that another committee must be formed to examine the previous committee's report and, when that committee brings down a further report, another committee should be formed to examine its recommendations, and so on. Pyramid selling has been illegal for some time in this State, but we have had the greatest pyramid building in relation to committees ever since this Government assumed office. What used to be called passing the buck is now called passing the committee, and, of course, it means jobs for the boys.

If the Opposition wanted to follow the same system and went to the public it could say, "Elect us to Government, because by the time we replace the committees that have been appointed to report on previous committees, and so on, we could just about find everyone in South Australia a job." We know who sponsors this type of legislation when it is put forward at certain annual conferences: it goes into the Government's policy documents, and the Labor Party sponsors, who contribute so heavily to Party funds, insist that the legislation go forward. How in the name of responsible Government can we accept this type of legislation, which is so airy-fairy and on which so many committees are being set up. The Minister says, "Our ultimate aim is to control all public transport", but when one examines the Bill one sees that it does not really say that at all. However, I will deal with that matter later. The second reading explanation continues:

For present purposes there are three bodies concerned in the operation of major forms of the public transport in this State. They are the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Transport Control Board.

Dr. Tonkin: Any other bodies?

Mr. BECKER: They are the three main ones to which the Bill specifically refers. Although the South Australian Railways carries passengers, it also carries freight. The Tramways Trust deals mainly with the public, which it moves for one point to another. We already have the Transport Control Board, but the Minister wants to have complete and ultimate power over the board, and this is how he will achieve it. He wants to establish this authority, put his lackey at the top and appoint six other lackeys, and then control the whole three organizations. Over the railways, the Transport Control Board and the Municipal Tramways Trust will be the Minister, for whom those bodies will work and to whom they will make recommendations. I do not know what are the Minister's intentions, but, if the recommendations of those authorities do not agree with Government policy, out they will go.

149

The railways have suffered huge losses and have entered into debenture funding arrangements because of poor management by Government. They will be downgraded by this transport authority, and one can imagine the frustrations that our top public servants will feel. These experts, who have tried to make a career in the Public Service and who have been sent overseas to study transport problems throughout the world, will be told by someone, who, in turn, is being instructed by the Party machine that a certain policy must prevail and that, even though they are experts, what they say is unacceptable.

This transport authority will be one of the most dangerous pyramid organizations that we have seen in this State relating to transport. Although the Bill refers to public transport, the Opposition cannot see how it will ultimately remain as such. It does see, however, that the Government's ultimate aim is to control this State's transport system. It wants to control freight movements and road haulage in this State. Indeed, it has been said that the railways could go into the road haulage system. What will that mean? Will it mean people who support an open-road policy will not be able to send anything unless it is carried by the South Australian Government? What will that cost the State in subsidies, and what effect will it have? One cannot send a letter from one place to another within three or four days because no-one wants to cart or deliver it. Man's greatest invention was the wheel, because it meant that he could independently transfer himself from one point to another. However, the Government is now telling everyone that they are being denied the freedom to do this. The basic principles of freedom are therefore being removed.

There is no doubt that the Minister has rushed this legislation in. He knows that consideration has been given to transport authorities. However, why prepare legislation to authorize the setting up of various committees to examine various recommendations made by former committees? All that the authority will do is investigate and advise the Minister, and further committees will be appointed thereafter to study those recommendations. The Minister does not really know what the transport authority's job will be. We know who has pushed this to the Minister and who is behind it, but he cannot tell the Minister really what he wants.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who is it?

Mr. BECKER: If the Minister has not enough brains to work that out—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You haven't enough brains to read the legislation! You merely make wild insinuations.

Mr. BECKER: They are not wild insinuations. The Minister is stuck with the worst transport policy that we have ever had in this State. He is trying to get out of an awkward position by introducing this legislation, but he will get further and further into the mire. The board will comprise a Chairman and six members, but we have no idea who these people will be, where they will come from, who will be the Chairman, or what his qualifications will be, such as whether he will be a guard, signaller, bus driver or rickshaw driver! The Minister would be afraid to appoint one of these people, because that might pay!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's why you had to get out of the bank.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Minister has cast a reflection on the personal integrity of the member for Hanson and I ask that he be requested to withdraw the remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER. The Chairman of the authority will be a full-time appointee and the difficulty will be to find the right type of person. Doubtless, the Government, following past practice, will bring someone from overseas. One would think that the Government, in making this appointment, would consider our Public Service and form a consortium, using the expertise in the State Public Service, including the South Australian Railways, and in the Municipal Tramways Trust and Transport Control Board. Doubtless, there will also be union representation on the authority.

The authority should represent a balance of the whole transport system throughout the State. If the Government starts so narrowly with the public transport system and then extends the coverage, as the Bill gives power to do, there could be many dangers. Clause 5 of the Bill deals with the establishment and constitution of the authority. Apart from many other things, the authority will hold all its property for and on behalf of the Crown and will have the "powers, duties, functions and authorities conferred, imposed or prescribed by or under the Act". The authority may own and control property, and one could be suspicious about how much property was contemplated in the legislation. The powers and functions of the authority are even larger than I have mentioned. The Bill gives the authority power to "co-ordinate all systems of public transport within the State and to recommend to the Minister the manner and means by which the powers and functions of any prescribed body, in relation to public transport within the State, may be assumed and exercised directly or indirectly by the authority". That provision gives the Minister strong control, but clause 12 (d) empowers the authority:

to perform such other functions—

- (i) as may be necessary or incidental to the foregoing,
or
- (ii) as may be assigned to the authority by the Minister.

That is the crux of the issue. The Minister has power to do anything he wants. If he instructs the authority to do something, the authority must do it. His power is so wide that, in the hands of the present Government, we can contemplate that the Government will pursue its policy of complete and ultimate control of the public transport system in this State and that it will go further into the field of freight and of the road haulage system.

We will not get what we consider should be the ultimate in a transport authority, or a transport advisory board (as probably it should be termed). That would be a board to co-ordinate, plan, develop and work in conjunction with various departments, such as the State Planning Office, and also work in national fields, such as road safety. In that way, all aspects would be co-ordinated under one body. Under the Bill, if the South Australian Railways or the M.T.T. wants to do something and the authority rejects that, there is no right of appeal, whereas there should be such an appeal.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: An appeal to whom?

Mr. BECKER: There should be the right to appeal to the board of the authority.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is an appeal from Caesar to Caesar.

Mr. BECKER: A department will be set up under the authority, and recommendations can seriously affect the operations of the South Australian Railways, the M.T.T., or some other form of transport. A wide field of public transport comes under the Transport Control Board, one such field being taxi-cabs, but I will not mention taxi-cabs, because we know that the Minister does not like

them. He has a problem with them that is too difficult to handle. When he was considering dial-a-bus, all he had to do was give radio-taxi operators authority to multiple-hire, and he would have been more successful.

Today we have been told that the Bee-line service has cost about \$18 000 to operate and that it has carried about 540 000 passengers. That service has proved that there has been a gap in our transport system between North Terrace and Victoria Square. It has proved that we must either extend the bus service along King William Street to that part of the city or ultimately build an underground railway for the metropolitan Adelaide transport system (as we have always advocated), linking all forms of transport. I have used the Bee-line service to go to Victoria Square, and I have been surprised to see so many messenger boys having a free ride. The service must be costing private enterprise a large amount of money, and the service has had an effect on taxi-cabs.

One taxi operator told me this morning that we are going through a phase and that he considers that, whilst some people will use the Bee-line service, other people will prefer to use a taxi-cab, because of its flexibility. An example is that the taxi driver is able to wait for a passenger. The taxi-cab operators in this State are not getting a fair deal at present and, under this Bill, if the transport authority considered that the taxis in this State should be controlled by the State Government, that would be done, and I will bet London to a brick that it will happen.

Taxi-cab operators are experiencing difficulty in carrying on their business at a fair and reasonable remuneration for their service, considering the amount of capital involved and the hours that they work. The benefit of amalgamating could help keep fares reasonable but, if the taxi-cab operators are not allowed to increase fares, they will be in the position that the private bus operators were forced into, namely, that of having to quit rather than carry the large losses which they had incurred in the past 12 months and which they could foresee in the future.

Doubtless, the legislation is poor. It should contain clear definitions now about whether we have public transport on one side and goods and freight on the other. We want to know whether the policy of the open road will be preserved in this State. We want to know what type of transport planning will be introduced. What will be the position with regard to the co-ordination of road transport and other forms of transport, including those that will operate soon, such as the hovercraft across the gulf and other types of sea transport to serve Kangaroo Island? We believe that it would be advisable for the Government to withdraw this legislation and redraft it. As I believe that, in the interests of common sense and of obtaining a better deal for the people of South Australia, the Government should withdraw this legislation, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): This Bill represents the culmination of four years of incompetence by this Government. It is all very well for the Minister to laugh. On no occasion on which members have raised the important matters of public transport and transport generally throughout the State have we received from the Minister a clear and precise explanation of what the Government is thinking. On all occasions the Minister has resorted to two courses of action: either he has tried to shout members down or he has attempted to turn the arguments around so that he can make a personal attack on Opposition members. After looking at the Minister's second reading explanation, which he gave to the House last week, all I can say is that he is asking us to buy a pig in a poke. He is saying, "Give me this power and I will tell you afterwards what

I will do with it." That is a completely irresponsible course of action for any Government to adopt. This Government has failed completely in administering the transport systems of the State. The first words in the Minister's explanation are as follows:

In July, 1973, the Government appointed a committee to advise the Minister of Transport and of Local Government on the means of establishing a single transport authority to control the activities of certain existing bodies operating in this State.

If the Minister and members of the Government have had the opportunity to study this report, why have not all members of Parliament (we all represent the people) also had that opportunity? If it is good enough for the Minister to examine the report and make recommendations to Parliament, it is good enough for members on this side to see that report, too.

Mr. Mathwin: What about open government?

Mr. GUNN: The Government's action completely contradicts the professed policy of the Labor Party of open government.

Dr. Eastick: That's only a public statement.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, the Government wishes to keep the people and their representatives completely in the dark, while the Minister tries to put through this Parliament irresponsible controls aimed at destroying the road transport system as we know it today. In his explanation, the Minister said that the Government had had the opportunity of studying the recommendations of the committee. I ask him: whether he will make this report available to all members of Parliament, including those in another place, so that we can all study it. I believe that this debate should not continue further until all members have been able to consider the recommendations; that is the proper action to take. Obviously, the Minister is not concerned about the attitude of Opposition members or about what the public thinks: he wants to get the Bill through Parliament as soon as possible. As I want to give the Minister the opportunity to make this report available to all members, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member seeks leave to continue his remarks. Is leave granted?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No.

Mr. CUMBE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you said, "Leave granted."

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You asked whether leave was granted, and I said "No".

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You did not say (and I believe all members would bear this out), "Is leave granted?"; you said only two words: "Leave granted." I believe that, in those circumstances, the Standing Orders will indicate that leave has been granted and the debate thus terminated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What I said was, "Is leave granted?" The honourable Minister of Transport has refused leave. I therefore call on the honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Clearly, the Government wants to keep the people of the State completely in the dark. The Minister has continued with his arrogant and high-handed attitude. He has no concern for the little people of the State whom he claims to represent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill before the House.

Mr. GUNN: My remarks are relevant to the legislation we are considering, as it will affect everyone who

travels on a road or uses public transport. If you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, read the terms of the Bill and understand them, I cannot help but think that you will agree that the Bill will affect all sections of the community, especially the little people, who will be disadvantaged by the arrogant attitude of the Minister. This Bill is a continuation of a plan put into effect by the Minister in a previous session when he tried to have the Transport Control Board brought under direct Ministerial control. Only the wise action of another place prevented the Minister's being given this power. He has now decided to achieve the same ends through a back-door method. He wants to set up an authority and give himself power to make regulations, thus bringing in the high-handed and socialistic controls that he is so apt at introducing. He hopes to strangle private transport operators in the same way as he has strangled the metropolitan operators. His basic reason for doing this is that he wants to enforce compulsory unionism so that the Australian Labor Party coffers can benefit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about compulsory unionism. I ask the honourable member to stick to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: There is a lot about the Minister in the Bill. Under the Bill, the Minister has power to make regulations. I particularly refer to clause 5 (2) (f), as follows:

The authority—
(f) shall have the powers, duties, functions and authorities conferred, imposed or prescribed by or under this Act. That provision gives the Minister and the authority complete power. I am willing to predict that all employees employed under this authority will have to join the appropriate union. That is part of the Government's policy.

Mr. Mathwin: Or else!

Mr. GUNN: Yes. We have already seen, on a previous occasion, the Minister's action in sending out a direction. In addition, we saw what he did to private bus companies when they refused to enforce compulsory unionism. I say without fear of contradiction that every person employed by the authority will have to belong to a union, so that the A.L.P. can benefit from the sustentation fees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Some time ago, I directed the honourable member's attention to his remarks about compulsory unionism. There is nothing in this Bill concerning compulsory unionism. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: Doesn't the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member for Heysen reflecting on a decision of the Chair?

Mr. McANANEY: I will rise on a point of order, then. Does an honourable member have to sit down while you, Sir, are sitting down? I understood that, when you were speaking from the Speaker's Chair, you had to stand up and the member speaking had to sit down.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Standing Orders provide that, when the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker is addressing the House or calling an honourable member to attention, the honourable member speaking must resume his seat. If the honourable member does not accept that ruling, he can move to disagree to it.

Mr. McANANEY: I have raised a point of order. The precedents during my time as a member of this House have been that the Speaker has stood up when he wants a member to sit down. You, Sir, have not done that and, therefore, I object to your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the honourable member objects to my ruling because I was sitting down, I ask him to put his objection in writing.

Mr. McANANEY: I will do that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the member for Heysen is one that cannot be ruled upon under Standing Orders. However, it is customary but not an obligation on the part of the Speaker to rise when he calls a member to order, but it is an obligation on the honourable member to resume his seat. When the Speaker is addressing the House he is then obliged to stand. Therefore, I cannot accept the point of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Having lost about seven minutes of my speech time whilst the Chair decided on a course of action, I shall continue. Before the interruption I was referring to the problems faced by employees. The Minister has wide-ranging powers under this Bill, and he will be able to enforce compulsory unionism as well as allow the Australian Labor Party's coffers to be swelled.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has been ruled out of order twice by the Deputy Speaker when referring to this matter, the most recent ruling causing the problem with the member for Heysen. The honourable member is again pursuing this topic, and I ask you to require him to speak to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders any member has the right to speak, if he confines himself to the Bill under discussion. That ruling applies to all members, including the member for Eyre, and he must speak to the Bill being considered.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, Sir. If this Bill is not political and does not contain political material, I do not know what it does contain. Nevertheless, I am happy to accept your impartial ruling. I have made my point and the people of this State will know what is contained in this measure. Under the provisions of this Bill it seems that the Minister will have control of the Transport Control Board, a control that he has tried to get before. The *South Australian Year Book* of 1973 gives a brief outline of the powers and functions of the Transport Control Board, and page 493 contains the following passage:

The board has power to declare roads outside a radius of 10 miles from the General Post Office, Adelaide, to be controlled routes.

I believe that this aspect is the crux of the Bill. The Railways Department is operating at a tremendous deficit and the Municipal Tramways Trust is building up a deficit, but the Government is not willing to accept the challenges and has failed every time where it should have shown courage. It wants to obtain control of private bus operators throughout the State: these operators give a tremendous service to the people they serve that is cheap and reliable, unlike the service provided by the Railways Department. One cannot blame the Railways Department, because the Minister and his Government have failed to give this department the chance to act in a way in which it should be allowed to act. The Minister in his wisdom (and I am sure he will regret it) commissioned Mr. Lees from the Railways Department and his colleagues to inquire into the activities of that department, and they have provided a most enlightening report. I think the committee made 198 recommendations: how many of them has the Minister had the courage to put into effect?

Dr. Eastick: How many has he side-stepped?

Mr. GUNN: Every one of them, because the Minister is under the complete direction of the unions.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Ha, ha!

Mr. GUNN: I challenge the Minister to say why the previous Railways Commissioner did not continue for a further term. We know on this side, but the Minister is not saying much now. Let him tell us the reasons.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No, you tell us!

Mr. GUNN: The Minister knows, and he should have the courage of his convictions. I say without fear of contradiction that the former Commissioner was sick and tired of the Minister and the incompetence of the Minister's Government, which failed to give him proper direction and assistance. Let us consider the problems that will be created if the Transport Control Board comes under the direct jurisdiction of the Minister. We could have a situation again that existed for many years, in which people were off-loaded at Port Pirie and in which road transport was prevented from competing directly with the South Australian Railways. We all recall the attitude of the Walsh Government in 1965 when it tried to cripple the South Australian road hauliers by that obnoxious Bill which fortunately was defeated in another place. That type of policy has been a complete failure in every other State. If we examine the reasons for this Bill, we see in the Australian Labor Party's rules, as amended in June, 1973, the following:

All public transport systems to be co-ordinated and subject to the control of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Jennings: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Can we see a copy of your policy?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo. They have not got a policy.

Mr. GUNN. We have a policy and foremost in it is the maintenance of an open-road policy. It was Governments on this side of the House that maintained an open road—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: There has never been a Government on that side of the House.

Mr. GUNN: I refer to Governments of our political persuasion. The Minister is the first one to use a slip of the tongue in order to take a point, but he has a lot to answer for. For 4½ years he has administered transport in this State and what a sorry state of affairs it is in! What concrete recommendations can he put before this House? The vague statements on policy are deliberately designed so that the Government has a completely open policy and so that the Minister can deliberately set out to destroy private transport at the behest of the transport unions in this State and of others as well. If this Government had put before the House during the past four years responsible and concrete proposals, members on this side might not be so suspicious of its and of the Minister's attitude. The member for Hanson said rightly that the Bill should be withdrawn. I support that, because it is vague and the Minister is asking us to buy a pig in a poke. One could look at many other points in relation to transport, and I have previously raised the matter of providing on the country railway services bulk superphosphate facilities in order to encourage people who use that commodity to have their super freighted by the railways, but on every occasion the Minister has run away from his responsibilities. In country press advertisements, under the name of the Railways Department, we see facilities for superphosphate displayed but I believe those advertisements are misleading, because these facilities are provided by private enterprise in the South-East. If the Minister wants people to use the railways to help reduce the deficit why does he not provide facilities and a service which would attract custom rather than compel people to use the service without providing better facilities? I hope the Minister will consider these points.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I do not think he has hit the nail on the head.

Mr. GUNN: I am aware that the Minister does not understand much.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo. Never mind; *Hansard* will be able to make a good speech out of one of your worst!

Mr. GUNN: I will ignore the interjections, particularly the reflection the Minister casts on *Hansard*. I certainly hope that the Minister will bring to this Parliament some proper policies in relation to the operation of the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Railways Department and that he will not try by the back-door method to destroy road transport by getting control of the Transport Control Board. I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I think it is an interesting-looking Bill which consists of six pages, and the important part of which deals with the setting up of the State Transport Authority. Many of the provisions of the Bill are similar to other provisions in Acts which set up authorities, and we have seen enough of those measures introduced into this House in the past few years. A totally open document, the Bill contains no specific provisions except in the widest possible terms. The member for Hanson has already referred to the formation of a committee in July, 1973, to investigate the possibility of setting up this transport authority. This is a course of action we have come to expect from this Government, particularly in relation to transport matters. We have had a rash of committees over the past four years but in connection with transport this has been quite exceptional. Committees have been set up to report on committees. In fact, the Minister is on record as saying, I think in relation to dial-a-bus, that he was going to set up a committee to examine the feasibility of setting up a committee to examine the feasibility of dial-a-bus. When I spoke on the Government's performance regarding transport, in a debate in 1972, I canvassed the idea that the Government had not been able to make up its mind on many things at all.

Mr. Payne: How did you vote when a transport matter was before the House last year?

Dr. TONKIN: That is an interesting question: I did not vote, because I was not in the House. I do not think that really matters though, because I think an entirely different principle was involved at that stage. Nobody in his right mind would take any action of this kind as worthy of support in any shape or form when it came to transport. In connection with this short Bill we are being asked as members of this responsible Parliament to endorse an open cheque which will give the Minister absolute authority. Clause 4 defines "prescribed body" as being the M.T.T., the South Australian Railways, the Transport Control Board (which has the most widest connotations), and "any other person or body whether corporate or unincorporate for the time being prescribed as a prescribed body for the purposes of this Act". One can read anything one likes into that definition: anything that has anything remotely to do with transport will be included.

Having established that, I reiterate that this Bill will apply to the widest possible concept of transport. It establishes an authority with seven members appointed by the Government on the recommendation of the Minister. It does not say who they will be, how they will be appointed, or whence they will come; jobs for the boys maybe, although we do not know. It is wide open, and the only formal provisions (Part II) of the Bill are those which usually set down the requirements for the appointment of members to a board or to an authority of some sort. There is nothing more. It is wide open; it could be

anyone. In clause 12 (b) we see that the functions of the authority are, among other things:

to recommend to the Minister the manner and means by which the powers and functions of any prescribed body, in relation to public transport within the State, may be assumed and exercised directly or indirectly by the authority. In other words, we are being asked to sign an open cheque for a take-over, and a total monopoly by the Government.

Dr. Eastick: And fix the terms afterwards.

Dr. TONKIN: What terms? We are not even sure there will be terms.

Dr. Eastick: Exactly.

Dr. TONKIN: It could be totally unconditional. This worries me, especially in relation to clause 13, which provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the authority shall, except where it makes or is required to make a recommendation to the Minister . . .

There is a world of difference in the two spheres of influence: the authority can make a recommendation to the Minister, but the Minister does not have to follow it. Clause 13 provides that the Minister shall have the direct general control and direction of the authority; in other words, whatever the authority decides, in its wisdom (and we are presuming it will be a wise body), the Minister can, if it pleases him, completely override that authority.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you oppose that concept?

Dr. TONKIN: I think it is a terrible concept, one which has been coming into this House more and more, with total control in the hands of the Ministers. It is not good enough. It is too greatly subject to political influence.

Mr. Payne: Where should the control be?

Dr. TONKIN: The control could well remain with the Parliament itself.

Mr. Jennings: Isn't that the same thing?

Dr. TONKIN: There is a slight difference, as we have found to our cost over the past few years. If it were for nothing other than clause 13, I would oppose the Bill, but I am concerned at the wider ramifications and at the fact that we are now being asked to sign a blank cheque for an open monopoly and a take-over, and that we are asked to give the authority the power to take over every aspect of transport, whether private or public. The fact that we are to create this Government monopoly seems particularly significant at a time when the State Government is planning to receive from the Commonwealth Government special grants in relation to transport, among other matters. This is one of the spheres in which the Commonwealth Government is intruding more and more into the affairs of the State. There is no doubt in my mind that this action we are being asked to endorse is but a preliminary, not to the take-over of transport authorities by only a State authority but to the take-over of all transport functions in this State by a Canberra-based authority. It is the two-stage take-over all over again.

We are being asked to support that, and I will not do so. Before we know where we are, the members of the authority, directed by the Minister, will have no option but to act merely as local branch managers in South Australia for the Canberra-based transport authority. The policy will be directed from Canberra, and the Minister will be one of the first to direct the authority to do what it is told by the central authority in Canberra. As I do not support the creation of Government monopolies or the take-over of private facilities, including the take-over of private transport facilities, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose this Bill, although I am not totally opposed to all co-ordination of transport. However, the Bill is so vague (and the Minister has not

given any reasonable explanation of what it means) that it is impossible for us to support the concept, for example, of taking over and directing the Transport Control Board. We have heard much discussion about the private bus services that were taken over recently, and we were told that the operators asked for this to be done. However, the private operators had the least economic routes to operate, while the Municipal Tramways Trust had an easy way out, because millions of dollars has been written off and the trust did not have the capital depreciation problems, and so on, that the private bus services had. In spite of this, the private bus services operated at a profit. However, immediately the trust became subsidized by the taxpayer and departed from the principles of free competition, it was impossible for private enterprise to compete. If this is co-ordination of transport, it is also the elimination of honest competition.

What do the people of Australia want? We are supposed to live in a democracy, but in every type of Government or business activity, by indirect means and through the inefficiency of Government, more and more controls have been imposed, and we will finish up with Government ownership. A recent Gallup poll revealed that only 18 per cent of the people of Australia wanted the Commonwealth Government to take over and run more industry. Members opposite say that is not happening, but we are creating conditions under which private enterprise cannot exist, and then the Government says it must take over the operations of the enterprise concerned. Only 3 per cent of the people of Australia want Government ownership of mining, while 2 per cent want Government ownership of transport.

Mr. Becker: What about the A.L.P.?

Mr. McANANEY: The Australian Labor Party voters were against nationalization, too. Only 2 per cent favoured Government control of motor vehicle manufacture; 1 per cent favoured control of banking, while 4 per cent favoured control of other industries. The great majority of 68 per cent said that private enterprise should be left in charge because it was more efficient. These figures, of course, include Labor supporters. The Government would make a mess and lose money. The average citizen, although he does not read the Auditor-General's Report, knows from the papers that the Railways Department is costing South Australian taxpayers \$30 000 000 a year, and that in the first seven months of this financial year the department was \$3 000 000 further in the red than for the corresponding period last year. How long can this continue?

There is not a great deal of difference in the opinions of men and women: they are all opposed to Government ownership. Of A.L.P. voters, 48 per cent did not want any take-overs, while 32 per cent wanted take-overs, and 20 per cent were undecided. Our democracy is running down and the Government is creating conditions under which we must finish up ultimately with the nationalization of industry. It is interesting to note that 90 per cent of the people of Australia do not want a 35-hour working week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting off the track when he speaks about people wanting a 35-hour working week and refers to the nationalization of industry, unless he can link those remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: We already have a 35-hour working week in the power industry, which is one industry that the people did not want to be nationalized. However, I will heed your ruling, Sir, and return to the matter of transport. How much will this Bill affect the Road and Railway Transport Act, which sets out the powers of the Transport Control Board? In 1964 road transport was controlled by

the Government and could operate only along certain routes. The Act was then amended to provide that, apart from licences that already existed, there would be an open go on our roads. This has worked successfully, as road transport is providing a cheaper service than is the railways, despite the latter's being so heavily subsidized and despite the fact that road users have to provide all the money for road construction, maintenance and so on. Also, they must provide money for the Government coffers to be used to subsidize the railways.

One is amazed at what the Minister says at times regarding the railways being neglected in relation to finance. He has said road users are spoon fed, and that sort of tripe. This is a deliberate lie by the Minister. Indeed, if one examines the Highways Fund one can see just where this money comes from: it comes from those who use the roads and, to a limited extent, from council rates. The latter provisions may be out of date now: it may be better for us to have a petrol tax from which road costs could be paid rather than that this money should be obtained through local government. There are no local roads now, because one sees as many city people as country people using country roads. We must retain some degree of competition in our road transport system if it is to survive and if we are to get a cheap, efficient service.

This State needs some co-ordination in its road transport system, with its administration vested in the hands of a responsible Minister who is not a declared Socialist. However, as the Minister believes in the Government's running every possible avenue of transport, I will oppose the Bill. I have disagreed with certain things that the Transport Control Board has done. Had the board done its job effectively and ensured that there was a reasonable alternative bus service, the railway line to Victor Harbor would have been closed. However, the board did not do so and the line is still open. As a result, the Government has been losing \$400 000 a year on the line. In the meantime, roads to Strathalbyn and Victor Harbor have been built, and these will benefit road transport rather than the railways. I am not opposed to railways. Indeed, I think much money should be spent on the main lines and that they should be made more efficient. Money should be used to speed up railway services so that people living in the metropolitan area will use the railways. The slow-moving services around Adelaide should be speeded up to attract people to them. What this Government has accomplished in this respect could have been achieved in six months.

In the past, departmental experts have advised their Ministers, who have generally followed that advice. Surely, we must have Ministers who are able to pick out the commonsense aspects of a scheme referred to them by their departmental experts. In one instance, experts said that an expressway should go through Mount Barker, and that the town should develop to the west. However, they were 20 years behind the time, as no-one in the world would build an expressway right through a town. This would have been a sorry state of affairs, as those employed by industries in the town would have had to go straight down the main street to get on to the expressway. This is where we need a Minister who can put into common sense what the experts say. Although I listen to experts, I still think this commonsense aspect needs to prevail. I say that because those involved are experts in a certain field only. One therefore needs a wider knowledge, especially regarding what the people want, as it is only in this way that proper co-ordination will be achieved.

The Minister wants to transfer certain parts of the railways to the Commonwealth Government. Under what terms and conditions will this happen? Until this occurs, what will happen to the roads? Will they be handed over to the Commonwealth Government? At present the Transport Control Board makes certain decisions in this respect, and these are subject to the scrutiny of the Public Works Standing Committee. In future, the public will have no say regarding what will happen to our railways. Indeed, the Minister has not told us what he contemplates in this respect, although I know that he is carrying out delicate negotiations. If we had open, reasonable government, the people would be told of the Government's intentions. Although I may have a suspicious nature, I wonder what the Minister is doing when he puts aside every question asked of him on this matter. There must, for instance, be co-ordination between the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Railways Department, particularly regarding suburban services. If this Bill was limited to that extent, and it was stated in black and white that it was intended to achieve this, no-one on this side would oppose it. Is it better to retain the slow train service that runs to, say, Semaphore than to have an express bus service that would take half the time to get there? There should be this co-ordination to bring the buses to the trains. At Semaphore, the railway line used to run along the middle of the street; \$40 000 a year could have been saved by closing that line and having a one-man bus to link with the railway service. That sort of co-ordination would be good. I think I speak for my colleagues when I say that co-ordination between the Tramways Trust and the Railways Department would find favour with them.

The Minister says: "This is only a beginning. The next step will be to widen it." How can one widen it other than by bringing private transport under the Minister's control? I believe the trend is the other way. There has been control in New South Wales for years, and the cost of running the railways there is becoming greater and greater, so they are going back to road transport to have more freedom. We must have fair competition between the various types of transport if we are to get the most efficient results. I know now that the word is, "We will run every public service at a loss, it does not matter—the taxpayer will make it up." That is where we have gone wrong in modern society, where there is so much dissatisfaction. The people are not satisfied with their Governments because those Governments are getting away from making people pay for the services they get. There should be no hand-outs or injustices; there should be no discrimination between people, whether it be one group of workers earning \$200 for a 35-hour week or another group earning \$80 for a 40-hour week.

It is this type of artificial interference with general supply and demand in our activities, without competition, that people will not accept. If there is competition, the people will accept it if the system breaks down or does not function so well, provided it is fair competition; and we finish up with an efficient service, at no cost to some third party. Surely, the freedom of the individual must go to the extent that one does not have to pay for someone else getting some added advantage. To me, that is basically what is causing most of the trouble in the world today, when we eliminate reasonable competition.

I repeat that, if this Bill was set out more clearly, stated precisely what it meant, and was not a threat that we are only at the beginning of a major co-ordination (the implied threat being that there will be a take-over, which will eliminate reasonable competition), it would be more intelligible.

There is the Overland express, which goes to Melbourne. One can also go to Melbourne by bus, which is cheaper than travelling by rail. But, while a person is travelling on the bus to Melbourne, he is paying a tax to make up for the heavy loss on the Overland, and he has not a buffet car where he can get a drink and generally enjoy himself. The poor unfortunate chap sitting in the bus, with some discomfort and no opportunity to get a drink, is paying a tax for those people who are travelling in luxury on the train. He is paying for the benefit of someone else. In this world of ours now, there are so many bountiful and good things that we are getting away from the basic freedoms of life and the basic freedom of being able to compete. If a person is good and efficient at competition, he should benefit from it rather than have to make up for the Minister's mistakes. I have never heard a man talk so much and flare up in the House. The Minister is like a balloon: he lets the air out with a certain amount of noise, and that is about as effective as he is in the House.

Let him tell us what he is co-ordinating. What does he want at this stage? How will it affect the road transport legislation as it exists today? Does this Bill override it? We want to know this from the Minister. However, he will get up later, rant and rave, and will not tell us a thing; and that is not good enough for those of us here who represent the average citizen in this State. I do not think the average citizen is a person who wants to have benefits paid for by some other able-bodied person. That is what we shall have with a co-ordinated road transport service run by a declared Socialist. He will use every opportunity to take control of road transport and eliminate the conditions under which private industry in road transport can exist, and then say, "Look—they ran to me and asked me to take them over." That is the most hypocritical statement I have heard in my few years on this earth.

Therefore, I oppose the Bill. Let it be redrafted and let it come back into the House with specific terms setting out what degree of co-ordination is needed. Will those responsible get together and draw up an efficient urban transport service? Will they extend the free service offered on the Bee-line bus, which is one of the better things the Government has done? Will they extend it further and say, "Let everyone ride for nothing. We will bring the people into the city from Semaphore, and the taxpayer will pay again"? The Bee-line bus service has worked well. However, some of the services, even if free, would not be used because they do not run quickly enough to their destinations. This Bee-line bus provides a service. Overall, the passengers who use the trains should pay in some way or other at the end of their journey for this free service. We cannot simply add the cost on to the railway fare and expect everyone, even the black fellow from Oodnadatta, to put in his cent for someone else riding on the Bee-line bus. That would be an injustice to the Aboriginal. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have thought for a long time that the Minister of Transport does not know where he is going, and I think that view has been confirmed by this Bill. I have searched through the press clippings of the last year or two concerning the Minister's statements to find out just what is proposed for transport in this State. He has made various radical statements from time to time criticizing the policy of previous Governments, saying how they have been completely rejected, but we are still without a glimmer of what the Minister plans for the transport system of Adelaide and the State in the long term. A perusal of this Bill does not throw any further light on this matter. In a press statement in the *News* of August 2 last year the Minister referred to this legislation, which was then

impending. I think that press statement was more precise than the fairly vague second reading explanation. The report states:

A single transport authority for all State Government services will probably be set up this year. The Roads and Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, said today a State Transport Authority would control railways, tramways, and Government and private bus operators and would be subject to his control.

Mr. Mathwin: That's good stuff.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the position is stated more clearly there than in the terms of the Bill. The Minister was addressing the Bus Proprietors Association. The next part of the report is interesting. It states:

While overseas for the next five weeks the Director-General of Transport, Dr. Derek Scrafton, and I hope to learn a great deal more about establishment financing of a transport authority, he said.

Mr. Becker: That would be the greatest joke of all time!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know how much the Minister gleaned overseas but whatever it was is not in the terms of the Bill. We are completely in the dark. I have read the second reading explanation a few times, and our attention has been directed to some of the clauses, but what is proposed in the legislation is not clear to me or to other Opposition members. I doubt that that is clear to even the Minister: it seems that the Government is establishing a transport authority to find answers for the Minister.

All that is clear is that the Minister will have complete control over transportation in this State, and the fears expressed by the member for Eyre about what will happen to our open roads policy are extremely significant. The Minister should be addressing himself to that type of question, not introducing vague legislation. With due respect to the Minister, the explanation does acknowledge that the Bill is vague and that the Government does not know what will happen, but it is less than realistic to introduce a measure like this and expect us to support it. Our attention is directed specifically to clause 12, and in his explanation the Minister states:

Clause 12 sets out the proposed powers and functions of the authority, and this clause is commended to members' close attention particularly in the light of the introductory remarks on this measure.

I have given the introductory remarks my close attention, and all they disclose is that a fairly powerful authority will be set up. Clause 13 provides that that authority will be under the Minister's control. I do not know what the proposed powers and functions are supposed to be, but the Minister has told us little, and he is not being realistic if he expects this House to give him an open cheque to take charge of transport in this State without telling us what it is all about.

We have heard nothing about his trip overseas. The Minister stated that he hoped to learn much about transport but, if he did that, he has not said so in the explanation. All I can see that the Bill does is set up an authority and say to it, "Tell me how I can take over these three instrumentalities." This is one of the vaguest measures introduced in my time in this House. I was interested in the remarks made by the member for Heysen in his thoughtful speech this afternoon. We have heard the Minister interject about fare increases and say that we must not increase fares. However, the Government has overlooked that someone must pick up the tab.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you think fares should be increased?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let us say that someone must pay and, if the service is costing more than the fares, is

it right that the general community, from taxes, must subsidize the operation? That is the type of question the Minister should be addressing himself to. It is apparently all right to give the M.T.T. between \$1 000 000 and \$2 000 000 a year to subsidize operations and to give the South Australian Railways \$27 000 000 a year! The Government takes the attitude that it is not costing the community anything and says, "We will not increase fares: we are getting the money for nothing." That reasoning is completely stupid.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: So, you say increase the fares?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister expects the private bus operators to compete with the heavily-subsidized M.T.T., he is being completely unreasonable in expecting them to stay in business on those terms. It is all very well for the Minister to say that the private bus operators asked to be taken over. If they are placed in an impossible situation, as they have been, they have no option: either they are taken over or they go broke. In those circumstances, the whole question of policy in providing a service is of the utmost relevance. The Minister seems to think that, because the Government takes something over, it becomes more efficient. However, in my view, it becomes less efficient.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a disgraceful reflection on M.T.T. officers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a reflection on this Minister's administrative efficiency and that of Government instrumentalities in general.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know you are reflecting on M.T.T. officers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister was willing to give, from general revenue, the sort of support that he gives these instrumentalities, the private operators could operate more efficiently than operators in the Government sector. I am not casting reflections: I am stating facts.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's an ideological attitude on your part.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It may be ideological. The basic difference between my Party and the Government is that the Government believes in Government control and we believe in private control where it can be shown to operate efficiently in the public interest.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Get back to the M.T.T.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister directed me up that lane and I was pleased to take the matter up.

Mr. Becker: You have touched him on a sore point.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: More need not be said about the Bill. It is vague and the Government is being unrealistic if it expects us to support the measure as introduced. It should be withdrawn and redrafted and the Minister should take us into his confidence if he knows where he is going (which I doubt).

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill, which appears to be a replica of the legislation the Minister introduced last year in an effort to place transport entirely under his control. He was successful in placing the railways under his control, but he failed in trying to place the Transport Control Board under his control because of the surveillance of another place. I hope that members of the other place will do their homework if this legislation finds its way to their Chamber. The legislation now before us, which tells us nothing new, is vague. I believe it is just a part of the Government's big policy of Socialism. We have already had an instance of this, because it was announced last week that the payment of water rates was a socialistic move; so,

this legislation is part of the Government's policy of Socialism.

When the Government gets into difficulty in introducing something it uses the back-door method, and that is the situation with the Bill now before us. In his second reading explanation the Minister announced that a committee would be set up: yet another of the many committees that have been set up by this Government as a way of getting around a situation. When a committee is set up we find invariably that its report happens to be exactly what the Government wants. As has been said by many speakers this afternoon, the Government, in order to get its way with regard to transport, makes things so difficult for private enterprise that it has only one thing to do in the end, namely, bail out. I wonder where, in the implementation of this Government's socialistic policy, we will finish up.

Although the Bill deals with transport, I wonder about the bread and butter of the country, too. We could live under the co-ordination of transport, but we could not live on love alone, and sooner or later we must know who will do the work in the country and provide the wherewithal to live. The cost of living under the present socialistic Government is constantly rising; one has only to bear in mind prices, which are continually rising in every field. I thought that when the Labor Government came to office it would make some effort to contain the situation. It said that it would do so in its policy speech, but what is the Government doing? Things have gone to glory, transport costs are increasing, and the Government is unable to handle our primary produce efficiently.

The Minister was keen to zone all the silos in the State. If the Government had done this during the last harvest there would have been nothing but a shemuzzle throughout the entire State because of the inability of the railways to handle the State's harvest at harvest time. In the Kimba area, where rail movement took place seven days a week during the delivery period, a considerable quantity of grain was moved. However, if the Minister controlled the silos throughout the State, farmers would still be delivering their grain to the silos. My Party's policy is the co-ordination of transport, which has worked exceedingly well in the past. When we were in Government, with the Minister in another place, transport worked well. It is disappointing to the Opposition to find that this Government slowly but surely by its policy is trying to phase out the private operator so that everything will be placed under the Minister's control. Although the Minister said that the committee to be set up would be answerable to Parliament, it will be under Labor domination and answerable to him. One honourable member said today that the Minister went overseas for the sole purpose of investigating transport. He may as well have stayed at home, because it appears from the legislation that he did not pick up any useful ideas. For these reasons the Opposition views the whole transport situation with concern.

One speaker referred to the activities of the Bee-line buses. It would be most amusing, if it were not so serious, when Government members talk about transport; they say that, if something does not pay, rely on the taxpayer to make up the loss. I recall this Government's policy on transport and its activities regarding water rates: because country water schemes did not pay, the Government required its users to pay an additional \$6 000 000 in revenue. Why should the Government discriminate between country and city people? The Government, which provides a free bus service from the railway station to Victoria Square (and people are using it), should be consistent in

its policy. I believe that the only railways activity that is showing a profit is the tavern at the Adelaide railway station, which appears to be a popular place and which has had to be enlarged to cater for its additional patronage. I oppose the Bill. I am concerned with Socialism in this State and the way in which the Government is drifting. I believe that now is the time, with regard to transport, to take a definite step to halt Socialism here.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): This is a most unsatisfactory debate from all points of view.

Mr. Nankivell. Coming from you, it is more so.

Mr. HALL: The member for Mallee seems to have some preconceived ideas about my offering in this debate. I do not intend to refer to him, because he never seems to speak in any debate. However, I intend to refer to his Party collectively later on. This is a most unsatisfactory debate because the Minister has not explained to the House what he intends to do and the Liberal and Country League members have not explained why they want to oppose the Bill, except that they have one very large prejudice. No member has said how we should accept the challenge of the growth of cities, which is one of the greatest challenges facing civilization today, and our challenge is in Adelaide's growth. Certainly the L.C.L. is putting it all outside the city boundaries and looking around the countryside to see why it should oppose the co-ordination of city transport. The member for Hanson may laugh, but he has not given any solutions to all the committees his Party has been setting up for so long.

No solutions have been given in the House about how we should meet the challenge. The member for Hanson will join the illustrious ranks of those who have made up nearly all of his Party in the past and do so at the present. Clearly, city transport must be properly co-ordinated. However, the Government has the ability to do that, without the necessity for this Bill, as all forms of city transport defined by the Bill are subject to subsidy from the Government. In granting that subsidy, the Government can ask that its plans be adhered to whether they are put forward officially by a co-ordinating body, such as that provided for by the Bill, or whether they are given by Ministerial direction when funds are disbursed.

It is ineffectual to argue that the Minister should not have this power. In fact, the member for Heysen argued that he should have the power. He said, in effect, that experts are so often wrong that the Minister should ultimately tell them what to do. Therefore, the member for Heysen, whom the member for Kavel congratulated on his speech, made out one of the best cases for Ministerial control of this authority that has been heard in this debate, as a study of *Hansard* will show.

Obviously, what is needed is some authority to co-ordinate transport in the city. I should like to hear any member deny that need and say that the Tramways Trust can go its own way, the Railways Department its way, and some new form of transport (which the Minister will miraculously call down in the future as a substitute for what was proposed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan) its way; there must be co-ordination. We have had the most haphazard growth in the expenditure of public money that could be imagined. All that is worrying the L.C.L. is that a Labor Minister of Transport at present is in power and in charge of these developments. That is all L.C.L. members have said. They have given no reason for opposing the general provisions of the Bill except that they do not have the power and, with their attitude and the way they continue to demonstrate it, they will never have that power.

The Minister has not told the House how far he intends this legislation to go in relation to private authorities. In his second reading explanation he has not set out the meaning of "public transport". I can find no definition of this in the Road and Railway Transport Act or in any other Statute at which I have looked this afternoon. When he speaks again, the Minister should certainly define what he means by "public transport", because that is the governing consideration.

Clause 12 (1) (a) provides that the function of the authority is to co-ordinate all systems of public transport within the State. However, I can find no definition of "public transport". If there is such a definition in other relevant legislation, I should like to see it. The Minister certainly owes it to the House to give this definition. However much Government members support this Bill (as they inevitably will), they should also ask the Minister for this definition, because we should all know what is meant; we should argue the matter on the basis of fact rather than on the basis of prejudice. In Committee, I will ask the Minister what he means by the term "public transport". I take it that it means Government or semi-government authorities (the South Australian Railways, and the M.T.T., as we know them today). For the purpose of my supporting the second reading of the Bill, I will take that to be the meaning. However, in Committee, I should like the Minister to confirm what I have said and to allay any other fears I may have.

The Bill fails, since it applies to the whole State. This new authority does not need to apply to all of South Australia in order to meet the challenge of the growth of metropolitan Adelaide. The Minister may counter what I have said by saying that the Railways Department operates about 2 000 miles (3 200 km) of line in country areas that must be co-ordinated with metropolitan train movements. However, by virtue of subsidies, the Minister is so much in control of the railways that he can ensure co-ordination in the few areas of contact involved. Perhaps more to the point is the fact that the Minister has said that he intends to give away the country railway system to the Commonwealth Government, so that the authority in the Bill would not apply anyway. Therefore, there is no need to extend the provisions of the Bill to deal with areas other than the metropolitan area as defined in the Planning and Development Act. At the appropriate time, I intend to move an amendment to have the Bill apply only to the metropolitan planning area. If that amendment were carried, what most L.C.L. members have said in opposition to the Bill would no longer apply. The very suggestion of the amendment shows the shallowness of L.C.L. members in directly opposing the second reading of the Bill. If the Bill is changed as I suggest, those who vote against the second reading will, in effect, vote against city planning. If the Bill is not amended as I suggest, L.C.L. members would be justified in voting against the third reading, but they have no justification for voting against the second reading. On that basis, I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill. The member for Goyder has just referred to shallowness, while himself making a most shallow statement, saying that when we speak of public transport we should concern ourselves only with the metropolitan transport. How narrow can one get?

Mr. Venning: It's the Senate election soon.

Mr. EVANS: That could be true. I know that his attitude is to denigrate L.C.L. members as much as possible, now that he is at the end of the line. He said we should be concerned only with the metropolitan area.

I point out that the new city of Monarto will be outside the metropolitan area as defined in the Planning and Development Act. We all know that this city will need a planned and well designed transport system. Planning is also needed for Port Augusta, Whyalla and other gulf towns.

The member for Goyder says that he has wide interests, but he has shown that he has no interest whatever in the areas to which I have referred. How shallow can his arguments be? He has said he will move some type of amendment by virtue of which the Bill will apply only to the Adelaide metropolitan area. This is the man who has said he would like to represent all the people of the State; he even hopes to organize a group that will represent all the people of the State. However, this afternoon we have seen how narrow is his philosophy. He does not have any interest in the people of the State; what he has proved clearly this afternoon is that his interest is in his own political ends. I oppose the Bill for the same reasons as have been stated by my colleagues. If the member for Goyder had stayed in the Chamber while they spoke he would have heard their reasons; if he stayed in the Chamber now, he would hear my reasons, but he is leaving.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you think—

Mr. EVANS: It is Tuesday and we are lucky to have the member for Mitcham here for a change. He is seldom here: he seldom sits in the Chamber and listens to a debate. As he did not hear all the members who spoke earlier this afternoon in this debate, he cannot comment on those speeches until he has read them in *Hansard*. What has the Minister really told us in his explanation? First, we are told that an inquiry has been carried out into transport in this State. The Minister was not satisfied with the first inquiry, which was unsatisfactory from his point of view or from his Party's point of view. The report contained some very good recommendations. Leaving that aside, I point out that the Minister belongs to a political Party that has said nationally, even internationally, that it believes in open government.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that he had set up a committee, but he has not disclosed any details of that committee's report. The people of this State paid for that committee to consider its terms of reference and to issue a report. The committee's findings, if implemented, will have a direct bearing on the lives of the people of this State. If the findings are not implemented, the people should know why, and the only way they can know why is to know the contents of the report. My colleagues have asked the Minister to bring forward the report so that they, as representatives of their electors, can form opinions on it.

The member for Goyder has said that we do not know what the Minister has in mind. The member for Bragg previously made that point clearly, but the member for Goyder was not present at the time. Indeed, the Minister himself in his second reading explanation said that he did not know what action it would be necessary to take later. The member for Eyre also referred to this matter. Parliament is being asked to set up a transport authority, but we do not have a clue about the plans for it in the future. The Minister admits this, but his colleagues say nothing. As a result, the Opposition and the man in the street are denied the opportunity of knowing what is in the report and what the Minister's thinking is.

Mr. Payne: Be careful! One of these days you may bump into one of those men in the street.

Mr. EVANS: Members may laugh, but many people in the community do not use public transport at present: first, because they do not have any confidence in it; secondly, because it does not offer the services they require; and, thirdly, because they find their motor cars more convenient. We can laugh about the man in the street, but it is he who has put us here. When Government members talked about open government some people actually had faith in those words: they are part of the platform that got the present Government into power. Why is the Government backing down on its promise of open government? Why is it not fronting up to its promise?

My colleagues have said that it would be wise to redraft the Bill and say clearly what are the Government's intentions. The member for Goyder said that he could not see any definition of public transport, but I point out that it is not only a matter of public transport: the authority can step in and take over any form of organization, whether it be public transport or even freight transport. Clause 12 (1) provides:

The functions of the authority are as follows:

- . . . (b) to recommend to the Minister the manner and means by which the powers and functions of any prescribed body, in relation to public transport within the State, may be assumed and exercised directly or indirectly by the authority.

All the Minister has to do is frame regulations that name other organizations, thereby bringing them under the control of the authority. I object to giving any Minister total control over an authority such as this. I shall be honest: I do not trust giving absolute power to any man, whether he belongs to the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or any other group—I never have and I never will. That is one reason why a certain gentleman attacks my Party on every occasion; he is not a member of it now. That is one of the philosophies that clashed: there is no room for dictators in a democracy, and that is what this Bill provides for.

Let me give an example. There has recently been a change in the rail fare structures, involving transfer tickets in the metropolitan area. Tickets permitting passengers to transfer from train to bus cut out at Eden Hills, even though people living at Bridgewater and Belair are considered to be in the metropolitan area. If those people use their motor vehicles in winter they have a hazardous journey because of the rain and fog, especially in the Blackwood, Belair and Crafers areas. Surely we should encourage them to travel by train, yet transfer tickets are not made available to them.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At this stage¹ Do you want an answer to the point you are making?

Mr. EVANS: I am saying that one section of the community has been given a benefit that another section has been denied.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why don't you grow up? You are showing how weak your argument is by being so childish.

Mr. EVANS: The Bee-line bus service is free, and no-one objects to that. However, when we consider the changes in rail fares we find that to travel from Cheltenham to Adelaide, a distance of 6 miles (9.6 km) as the crow flies, costs 25c; but to travel from Belair to Adelaide costs 40c, and to travel from Blackwood to Adelaide costs 35c. Why is the Minister discriminating against the people of Belair and Blackwood? The Minister has been given power over the Railways Department, and a section of the community is being discriminated against. That is the type of thing that will happen when we set up a single transport authority under the control of one man. If

any authority makes recommendations to a Minister which he continually refuses to accept, eventually the authority falls into line with the Minister's thinking, regardless of the political Party involved. I do not accept the argument advanced by the member for Goyder that we are worried because the present Minister is in power. I do not care who is the Minister: we should not give any Minister this total authority. We have the case of private bus operators who are not allowed to operate in the metropolitan area. That is definite: they are gone.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's untrue, like much of what you are saying.

Mr. EVANS: Only about four private bus operators are left, and they know the axe will come down on their necks. For all practical purposes they are gone, and will not survive.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They will go.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That will be their choice.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: We will subsidize the M.T.T. and give it all the benefits in the world: we will buy buses that will be over-width and operate them on roads on which private operators have not been allowed to operate in the past. The base of these roads will not be strengthened, but that was the argument used to prevent private bus operators using their buses on these roads. However, I predict that the trust will drive these massive over-width and over-weight vehicles on these roads within four years.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You hate the M.T.T., don't you?

Mr. EVANS: I hate double standards, and the Minister's colleague, the Minister of Education, used to be the greatest attacker of double standards. The Minister of Transport says that, if private bus operators go, it will be by their own choice: but it will be a matter of economics that puts them out in the long term, because their only competitor will be the Tramways Trust, which will be subsidized to the hilt and jacked up in every way from administration to vehicles operating on the routes. I know that public transport must be supplied, but we should consider those who pioneered many routes over which the Tramways Trust could not operate its vehicles because the roads were not sealed. These people pioneered routes in new communities and new suburbs, and A.L.P. members, like me, represent some of those districts. If we are considering a total transport policy, we should consider a form of subsidy to private operators that is somewhat equal to that received by the Tramways Trust.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are suggesting that we should subsidize shareholders of private enterprise with taxpayers' money?

Mr. Venning: What's the difference?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is that what the member for Rocky River wants? If so, I am pleased that it will be reported in *Hansard* to show people what the honourable member really thinks.

Mr. Venning: Why not allow them to increase their fares?

Mr. EVANS: If we have true competition in our society, the only choice is to offer the same benefits to all sections. I do not care whether it is a matter of shareholders in a company or an individual operating one bus. As the Minister of Education knows, in my district people have been operating school buses at a total loss. They have lost every year on that operation, but no increase in fares has been approved. This group offers a good service to the community and is willing to lose something on this operation. However, this would have been their last year, as they told the Minister earlier that, unless an increased payment was made, they could not continue to carry

children to the local schools. That situation should never have arisen. The Education Department cannot operate its buses as economically as can private enterprise in that area, and the department admits the truth of that statement. It knows that taxpayers' money is being spent, anyway.

I now refer to taxi-cab operators. I suppose all members know that some drivers drive cabs for owners and receive only 45c in the dollar of the total fares they collect. Such drivers are fortunate if they can earn the average weekly wage by working 10 hours a day; most of them work 12 hours a day or more. I do not think any road hazard is caused through the tiredness of these drivers because these men and women (and there are some women driving taxis) can take care of themselves.

Let us be honest. The taxis, under the control of the taxi board, offer a good service. I clashed with that board once over its decision to increase licensing fees for taxis. However, I do not consider that a sufficiently high charge is made for taxi services, either for the operator or for the driver. Public transport could be improved by offering taxi operators the opportunity to receive better returns for their services. At the same time, I have always supported multiple hiring, by which the first hirer of the taxi agrees to allow other passengers to share it with him. By encouraging this service, we could lessen the number of private vehicles on the road, while at the same time increasing the efficiency of the taxi service and of public transport generally. It is a matter that should be looked at keenly.

I am not satisfied that we can have a Minister saying, "I hate you as private enterprise, and I will subsidize the M.T.T." I have no grudge against the administration of the M.T.T. but, without strict control and the commonsense approach of competition from private enterprise, eventually we will have apathy, the attitude that the trust is a Government instrumentality and that, if it wants a few

new buses (\$8 000 000 worth at the moment), it can write to Cabinet, through the Minister, saying it wants \$12 000 000 for new buses and it will be sure to get \$8 000 000. This practice goes on within councils, within school councils, and in every Government department. Quite often, in the month of May, departmental officers are saying, "Where can we spend our money quickly to use up our allocation?"

Giving this absolute power to the Minister will not help public transport. I should like to see the Bill redrafted, and I should like the Minister to say why he wants to create a transport authority and, in particular, to say what is wrong with the report of a committee, as presented to the Minister, on which report the Minister must be basing his decision to introduce this Bill. What is wrong with saying to the people who elected us, "Here is the report. You may read it. Tell us your views. We are still acting on this because we believe that is the right action, but we are open to public criticism."

I remember a Government that took such action over the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, which was made available for six months. That Government may have committed political suicide in making the plan available, but it got no praise from the press or from members of the present Government. The decision brought tremendous political consequences. I challenge members of the present Government, and especially the Minister, to have the same courage. The Minister knows they would not have that courage. He may laugh, but what I have said is true and it is on record for those who wish to read it, because they will never read it anywhere else. I do not support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, at 2 p.m.