

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 25, 1971

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Citrus Industry Organization Act Amendment,
 Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Act Amendment,
 Holidays Act Amendment,
 Industrial Code Amendment (Pensions),
 Kingswood Recreation Ground (Vesting),
 Land Tax Act Amendment,
 Local Government Act Amendment,
 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Betting),
 Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment,
 Sewerage Act Amendment,
 South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act Amendment,
 Stock Exchange Plaza (Special Provisions),
 Succession Duties Act Amendment,
 Superannuation Act Amendment,
 Supreme Court Act Amendment (Pensions),
 Waterworks Act Amendment,
 West Lakes Development Act Amendment,
 Wheat Delivery Quotas Act Amendment,
 Medical Practitioners Act Amendment,
 Apprentices Act Amendment,
 Commonwealth Places (Administration of Laws),
 Dangerous Drugs Act Amendment (General),
 Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act Amendment,
 Harbors Act Amendment,
 Marine Act Amendment,
 Mincs and Works Inspection Act Amendment,
 Nurses Registration Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF TRANSPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what the Government intends with regard to the appointment of a commissioner of transportation (I think the title given by the Minister is "director-general of transport")? In the last few days the Minister has announced that the Government

intends to appoint a director-general of transport, and that advertisements calling for applications for that position have appeared. This seems to be in contradiction of the policy announced by the Premier of not creating or filling new positions and, so far as I know, no details regarding the job specification, the salary involved, the staff to be provided, or the precise duties to be undertaken by such an appointee have been made known to the public. These are the things that, I suggest, are of very great interest, not only to this House but also to the public.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said in the House on Tuesday that the Government, as a matter of policy, had determined that it would implement as quickly as possible that section of the Breuning report that recommended the appointment of a director-general of transport. We have taken preliminary steps already to have this position advertised, as I think I also said on Tuesday. Regarding the other matter that the honourable member refers to in relation to the statements by the Premier, when the honourable member suggests that what we are doing in this field is contrary to what the Premier has said, that is, of course, not correct. If the honourable member cares to read the Premier's statement, he will realize that there is not a blanket embargo on the appointment of officers or the creation of new positions. We consider that it is in the best interests of transport in South Australia and, more particularly, of the people who are transported that there be a co-ordination of public transport as quickly as possible. To achieve this, we agree with the Breuning report recommendation that there should be a director-general who would be responsible for transport and, accordingly, we are proceeding along these lines.

PORT ADELAIDE TRAFFIC

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain from the Highways Department a report about future plans for easing the traffic burden on the section of road from Grand Junction Road up the diagonal road, where it links with the Lower North Road, over the railway crossing and to the overway bridge on the Lower North Road before the Elizabeth turn-off? I ask this question because many of my constituents who work at General Motors-Holden's and at other places at Elizabeth have complained bitterly about the terrific traffic congestion they encounter on their way to work each

morning. It is no good saying that they can leave home earlier to avoid that traffic congestion, because on many occasions travelling less than a mile takes much more than half an hour. There is a railway crossing at the boiling-down works, there are traffic lights at the intersection of Grand Junction Road and Churchill Road, and there is a double-lane highway up the diagonal road to within about 50 yards of the Lower North Road, where the road changes to a single-lane road. These people then have to get into the traffic coming up Lower North Road. They have to cross a railway crossing, where considerable shunting takes place, and then cross the bridge. In view of these complaints, will the Minister obtain a report on future plans regarding this highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. HALL: I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether Dr. Breuning was provided with a copy of the last State Australian Labor Party policy speech.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer is "No".

BILLS OF SALE ACT

Mr. McRAE: Will the Attorney-General consider the Bills of Sale Act in two respects, namely, regarding the right of persons to enter property and the control over loans? The Bills of Sale Act authorizes commercial bailiffs and inquiry agents, as well as police officers, to break into premises in the absence of occupiers in order to obtain goods. This has caused numerous recent complaints, including complaints about the removal of goods not the subject of the bill of sale, and unnecessary damage to the household. Similarly, there seem to be unrestricted lending rights, and lack of proper notice of repossession and of other notices required under the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act. In view of this, will the Attorney-General consider both aspects with a view to stating Government policy on the matter? Also, can the provisions of the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act be translated into the Bills of Sale Act and, in the matter of repossession, can it be made clear that only police officers, and not commercial bailiffs, are to be allowed to carry out what I term this legalized breaking and entering of unoccupied premises?

The Hon. L. J. KING: These matters, together with other aspects of the law relating

to consumer credit, are being studied in the light of the information and assistance given by the Adelaide Law School report on consumer credit, and policies that will ultimately result in the introduction of legislation concerning consumer credit are being formulated. When considering these matters I shall give particular attention to the problems referred to by the honourable member.

SCHOOL AID

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Education say whether grants have been made from the \$250,000 allocated this year for independent schools on a needs basis? In the Unley District several independent schools are hoping that some financial assistance will be available to them, as they need help.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The report of the committee appointed by the Government to make recommendations on this matter will be presented to me tomorrow morning. I will take the recommendations to Cabinet on Monday, and I hope that, in the normal course of events, I shall be able to make a public announcement on Monday about what can be done in 1971.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister for Conservation say what priority the Government is giving to acquiring areas for national parks? I noticed in yesterday's *Australian* an article by Ian Moffitt about disappearing native wild life and the proportion of the areas allotted by various States to national parks. This ranged from .5 per cent in Western Australia and 1.1 per cent in New South Wales to 4.4 per cent in Tasmania, but the figure for South Australia was not given. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am grateful to the honourable member for asking this question, because I saw the report in the *Australian* and thought it was a pity that South Australia had not been referred to, because we should be pleased with the way attention has been given to acquiring national parks in this State, particularly in the last 10 years. At present there are 86 national parks in South Australia, and other areas are being considered. Since November last, 10 areas, totalling 117,370 acres, have been added. This means that at present 8,471,694 acres (or 3.48 per cent of the State) is dedicated either as national parks or as national park reserves. Whilst, as I pointed out earlier, I think this percentage is satisfactory, when we consider

that by world standards the proportion of the countryside dedicated to national parks is normally accepted as 5 per cent, we believe that representative samples of each section of the State should be dedicated as national parks and that we should be aiming towards dedicating 5 per cent of each different area of the State as national parks.

**CENSURE MOTION: MINISTER'S
STATEMENT**

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What is the motion?

Mr. HALL: The motion is as follows:

That this House censure the Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) for misleading the House in the following way:

By reporting to the House on August 5 as follows:

To make him aware of the attitude of the Government, Dr. Breuning has been provided with a copy of the policy speech delivered prior to the last State election by the Premier—

and today reporting the direct negative to that same proposal.

The Minister of Roads and Transport has lied to the House, and this is a most serious matter in Parliamentary Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader cannot discuss the motion: he can only explain his reasons for suspending Standing Orders. It is not permissible to discuss the motion.

Mr. HALL: I have read to the House the basis on which I wish to censure the Minister and to have this House discuss that censure. It is, as I have said, on a matter of his lying to the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Leader is debating the motion.

The SPEAKER: I was rising to point out that the Leader was starting to debate the merits of the motion. He can discuss the matter only in relation to suspending Standing Orders.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Let's have a Royal Commission—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: —so that we cannot discuss it!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is in charge of this House and when I call for

order I mean order. I will ask members to stop interjecting. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr. HALL: The basis, therefore, of my wishing to discuss the censure of the Minister is contained, first, in his statement to the House on August 5 last year, when he said:

To make him aware of the attitude of the Government, Dr. Breuning has been provided with a copy of the policy speech delivered prior to the last State election by the Premier.

Today, I asked the Minister another question, namely, whether Dr. Breuning had been provided with a copy of the last State A.L.P. policy speech, and the Minister answered shortly "No". One of those statements is a falsehood. Without entering into the merits of the matter, we are dealing with a transportation proposal of immense importance to South Australia, and I say no more than that at this stage. But you, Mr. Speaker, and other members know that it concerns an enormous amount of planning in this State and that the matter needs to be discussed freely in this House and among the public with full knowledge and in detail. In this regard, the Minister has deliberately tried to mislead us through either the first statement or the last statement.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition, in debating the suspension of Standing Orders, is starting to debate the question by using terms such as "the Minister has deliberately done this or deliberately done that". Mr. Speaker, I put it to you that the Leader is out of order, in discussing such a motion to suspend Standing Orders, in debating the merits or otherwise of the motion that he ultimately intends to move.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. The Leader of the Opposition must confine his remarks to the motion before the Chair, and must not debate the merits of the substantive motion.

Mr. HALL: I will leave the merits, as they stand out for themselves and need no more reference from me. There is a direct conflict in them, and the House can judge the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House is to judge the suspension of Standing Orders, which is the motion now before the Chair. I ask the Leader to confine his remarks to that motion.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Sir. I am bound by Standing Orders, and I do not criticize you for interpreting them in that manner. If I cannot proceed further to discuss why I want

to move this censure motion, the matter will have to be left there for the present. However, my reason for bringing this matter before the House and the public is a most serious one, and I hope the Government accepts the challenge to debate the matter, details of which I have already enumerated and which involves, as I have said, a lapse of Ministerial responsibility that is of great concern to me and my Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to speak to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have counted the House and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: That the motion be agreed to—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to speak, pursuant to Standing Order No. 470.

The SPEAKER: It is not mandatory that any member shall be permitted to speak on the suspension of Standing Orders. Standing Order No. 470 provides:

The mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension and one other member may be permitted to speak, subject to a like time limit but no further discussion shall be allowed. The other member, referred to in that Standing Order, could come from either side of the House. I intend at this time not to allow any more members to speak on the motion for suspension.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh gosh, why not?

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye", against "No".

Mr. Slater: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary for the House to divide.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. SLATER: Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw my call for a division?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to withdraw his call for a division. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Therefore, the suspension of Standing Orders is agreed to.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House censure the Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) for misleading the House in the following way:

By reporting to the House on August 5 as follows:

To make him aware of the attitude of the Government, Dr. Breuning has been

provided with a copy of the policy speech delivered prior to the last State election by the Premier—

and today reporting the direct negative to that same proposal.

Really, there is little to say: the facts are in the motion. To put things on the right basis, I will again refer to August 5, 1970, when the Minister of Roads and Transport, in answer to a question I put to him, added at the end (without my invitation) the following:

To make him aware of the attitude of the Government, Dr. Breuning has been provided with a copy of the policy speech delivered prior to the last State election by the Premier.

Today I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport whether Dr. Breuning was provided with a copy of the last policy speech of the State Labor Party. There were no tricks: this was a straight-out request for information, following the Minister's denial about this last evening by way of interjection (he brought this on himself). Last evening he called us liars for reading previous answers that he had given in this House. He called my colleagues liars in the very teeth of his statement on page 498 of the current *Hansard*. What type of Government have we sitting opposite? What will its members, who are bound by Party discipline, say about a Minister who lied to the House either in the first statement or the second statement he has made on this subject? We do not know which statement is untrue. Presumably one is true—or will the Minister slip in between, saying that he knows because someone else told him? How will he get out of the deliberate lie he told the House?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The term "lie" implies a conscious attempt to mislead the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —and is unparliamentary. In the circumstances, the Minister concerned has not been given an opportunity to give an explanation. Until he has had that opportunity, it is completely and utterly unparliamentary for the Leader to use the term "lie" in relation to the Minister. Even the Leader would want to hear an explanation before he reached any such conclusion. Even the Leader's colleagues would be charitable enough to wait for that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As the term "lie" is unparliamentary, I ask the honourable Leader whether he would be prepared to

withdraw that term, in view of the exception taken to it.

Mr. HALL: I always comply with Standing Orders whenever I can, according to my conscience, and I withdraw the term, but I wish that the same strictures had been placed on the Minister last evening. When the member for Torrens said last evening, "We knew full well that when Dr. Breuning came here he was given a copy of the Labor Party's policy speech and told what to report on," this dual-role Minister interjected, "That's a complete lie, and you know it." The occupant of the Chair did not deny the right of the Minister to call my colleague a liar.

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members had taken exception at the time (this remark might have passed unnoticed by the occupant of the Chair), the Chair would no doubt have upheld the objection, as it has upheld the objection taken today. I ask the honourable Leader to confine his remarks to the motion; it is entirely out of order to discuss something that happened last evening. Any objection should have been raised at the proper time. To comply with Standing Orders, I ask the honourable Leader to confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. HALL: I will not press that point, having made my protest about the statement of the Minister today and about his previous statement on August 5. Of course, other aspects of the Minister's behaviour have come to our attention during his tenure of office. Earlier this session, unfortunately, I had to move a motion censuring the Minister. Therefore, this is the second time this session the Opposition has felt compelled to move a censure motion, and this motion carries the gravest overtones. This Minister, who is misleading the House, is responsible not only to the Premier, the Cabinet and his Party, but also to the public. Wherever the British Parliamentary system operates, the action of which this Minister is accused is regarded as one of the gravest offences a Minister can commit. We will see what members opposite say about these negative and positive statements of the Minister; we will see whether they support this misrepresentation.

I now turn to the importance of the measure on which the Minister has made his misleading remarks. We are dealing with one of the most substantial construction programmes which the State has seen and which will involve us in all types of change in the next decade. Leaving aside whether the Breuning report is

good or bad, surely we must have an honest report from the Minister. Honest reports must be the basis of argument. Whether any member agrees with me on my view of transportation does not matter in the context of the argument that I am bringing forward now, which is that we cannot take any worthwhile stand if the Minister misleads us. On this basis he fails the House and the public, and he obviously embarrasses his colleagues. No person and no Party would dare defend this type of misrepresentation. Members on this side believe that the alterations proposed to the M.A.T.S. plan have been proposed without any substantial argument from the Minister, except for the type of information about which I have spoken, which may be extremely pertinent to any findings and decisions this House and the Legislative Council may make about future plans.

The denial made by the Minister last evening is the trigger-point of my inquiry. Obviously he has misled the House throughout the debate, as far as it has gone, with this type of information. Perhaps he is right in what he said today but, if he is, he is entirely wrong in what he said in August last year. I ask this House to give the Minister what he deserves and what the public would like to see him get for his misdemeanour in this matter, and that is the censure of the whole of this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition must be heard without interjection.

Mr. HALL: This type of administration of his portfolio ties in clearly now, it would appear, with the type of statement which, as I have said, was made previously to the member for Eyre, when the Minister said emphatically, "We are not proceeding with M.A.T.S., and you can get that into your head," yet two months later the Minister has announced to Parliament, in reply to questions that he is spending \$12,800,000 on it in the current financial year. I say that this was a strange statement?

Mr. McRAE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This material, I say, is completely irrelevant to the motion before the House. The motion deals with two apparently conflicting statements, and we are now hearing a speech on the whole general issue of the Breuning report, and I ask you to rule on that.

The SPEAKER: I have asked the honourable Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to the motion, and I again ask him to do that.

Mr. HALL: Yes, I will not pursue that, Mr. Speaker. I understand the embarrassment of the member opposite at the falsehoods promulgated by his Minister. I say no more, except to remind this House of its responsibility to the system of Parliament, as well as to the people it serves, and I ask the House to emphatically censure the Minister, who has deliberately misled this Assembly.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to defend myself against the vicious attacks that the Leader of the Opposition has made. I think it was on Tuesday evening, in another debate, that I commented, in reply to an interjection, that when I made a mistake I was the first to admit it. I have read the statement to which the Leader refers and which I made on August 5 last, and it is obvious from that statement that it was a prepared statement and, as I have said, I would vouch for its accuracy.

Having made such a statement on August 5, 1970, I do not think it is exactly unreasonable to say that I am not able (nor, I would suggest, would the Leader or any other average person be) to maintain in my mind every minor detail associated with a statement made about eight months ago. Quite obviously I see, in reading this statement, that the reply I gave the Leader today was not a correct one but, as I have said before, I hope that, when it can be shown that there is some discrepancy, I shall always be man enough to stand in my place and acknowledge it, without the viciousness that is associated with the Leader.

I thank the Leader for turning his venom on to me, as an elected representative of the people in this Parliament, and taking his venom away from a man who is many thousands of miles away and cannot answer for himself in this Parliament. I do not consider that there is much more to be said about this. The point has been taken, quite rightly, but I think it is so insignificant and has so little bearing on another debate taking place in this Parliament that, if this is the best the Opposition can do to try to justify its vicious attacks, the Opposition must be extremely bereft of sound reasoning.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I second the motion of censure on the Minister and I do it now with as much conviction as I had before he spoke.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You've never been wrong?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order and the honourable member should not reply to them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have often been wrong. I was wrong in something I said in this House yesterday (inaccurate, anyway), but that is irrelevant. I must say that, when the Minister rose a moment ago to reply to the Leader, I thought he would withdraw and apologize to the Leader and I also hoped he would apologize to the member for Torrens, my colleague, whom he called a liar last evening—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —for saying what the Minister now says is correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham is entirely out of order in referring to incidents that occurred last evening. The Standing Orders provide that any exception taken must be taken at the time, and if the honourable member continues in that strain I will have to rule him out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether or not the Minister misled this House deliberately the fact is that, on a matter of very great importance to the people of this State, he misled the House, as he has now admitted. I do not accept what he says, that this was an insignificant matter having little bearing on a matter of grave importance that is before this House. I remind every member that the Breuning report, which has been adopted by the Government, is intended, apparently, to set the pattern of development for this city and for this community for a considerable time to come. It is therefore a most important matter and I point out that the terms of reference given to those who wrote that report are of crucial importance.

Sir, the Minister, when he moved the motion out of which another debate has arisen, quoted from the policy speech of his Leader at the last election and now, in trying to excuse himself, he has said that this matter has little significance and little bearing. On Tuesday last he did not think that. I am indeed pleased that we can debate this matter now, because the reliability of the Minister is at stake. He cannot have it both ways: he cannot make two unequivocal statements, one of which is a contradiction of the other, and still retain the confidence of members of this House or of the public of South Australia.

It is unbelievable that the Minister could have forgotten what he had said on August 5 on a matter which has been close to his heart and which has been a matter of controversy

in South Australia not only since this Government has come to office but for many years before that. However, that is what the Minister would have us believe. Whether or not the Minister forgot, the fact is that a Minister should not forget matters of importance that are being debated.

Mr. Jennings: But ex-Ministers can! You did yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled previously that interjections are out of order, and this debate will be conducted on a high standard. I warn members that, if they interject again, I will not necessarily warn them again. They know the consequences.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is noticeable that members opposite, by interjecting, have been doing their best to protect the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to provoke other members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether or not the Minister deliberately misled the House, he deserves the censure of the House. The information that he presumed to put before this House by way of an interjection last evening and in reply to a straight-out question today was wrong and it was wrong in a material way, and on a matter that is being decided by the members now. Therefore, I have very great pleasure (although one does not like to have to censure anyone)—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—in supporting the Leader's censure motion and I hope that members will deal with it irrespective of Party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): We have heard an extraordinary exercise so far this afternoon. Since I have been a member there have been various things said concerning my membership of Actors' Equity. I think I should be issuing a few tickets this afternoon in that organization, because if ever there was a piece of ersatz anger and rage permeating the Opposition it is what we have witnessed on the front bench opposite this afternoon. Let us turn to what is the basis of the simulated rage that we have seen. Members opposite, having had a reply last year that Dr. Breuning was provided, amongst other material, with a copy of the policy speech of the Government as to its attitude on certain matters, have asked today whether, in fact, that policy speech was given him, having had a reply last year.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about last evening?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with that in a moment. I hope that the

honourable member will accord me the same courtesy that the Speaker has asked from honourable members on this side.

Mr. Coumbe: You would get a role in *Oh! Calcutta!*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think I have the physique, but I thank the honourable member for his compliment. Last evening the member for Torrens said not only that Dr. Breuning had been provided with a copy of the policy speech but that he was told what to report on, and it was after that phrase "was told what to report on" that immediate objection was taken by the Minister.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And rightly so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, because Dr. Breuning was not told. The Minister said that was a lie and that Dr. Breuning was not told what to report on, and it is untrue to say that he was told what to report on. In fact, from memory the honourable member accepted that that was so and went on to express himself differently. What happened today was that the Leader came in here armed with a statement of last August 5. In view of what was obviously the state of the Minister's memory last evening on this issue, the Leader asked him a question in order to get a contradictory statement out of him in respect of August 5, and then said that he was deliberately misleading the House. The Leader has had some coaching from the member for Mitcham, because this is the sort of thing that barristers tend to do at times.

Mr. Millhouse: Come now!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For any members opposite to suggest they have been misled on this issue is untrue: they have not been misled. The fact is that, obviously, the Minister did not remember that a prepared statement was made and a copy of the policy speech, amongst other material, had been given to Dr. Breuning, so he gave a reply to the best of his knowledge, ability, and memory and expressed that to the House. This is not particularly new or unusual in this place, and several members opposite on the front bench have had to do precisely that at times in this House.

Dr. Eastick: But they have apologized.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but they have not been subjected to the kind of personal and vicious attack to which the Minister has been subjected this afternoon, only for the purpose of public consumption.

In fact, the Minister was clearly not deliberately misleading the House, and if that is so, he is not deserving of censure if he corrects what has happened, and that is what he has done. However, as soon as that happened the Deputy Leader tried to get a debate on other issues. The credibility of members opposite has not been improved by their performance this afternoon, and I suggest that they desist from what has been an extremely empty exercise.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): Any tendency I might have had to feel soft towards the Minister of Roads and Transport has been dissipated by the remarks of the Premier. The fact is that many times the Labor Party has demanded unconditional apologies from people on our side of politics, whereas I have never heard (and I say this emphatically) a Labor man apologize for what he has said about someone on this side of the House. I have never heard the Premier or the Minister of Roads and Transport apologize for anything. This is described by the Premier as a personal and vicious attack only for public consumption. May I remind the Premier that when the Minister moved a motion earlier this week about adopting the Breuning report he made a personal and vicious attack on the Leader of the Opposition, and said that his word was not worth taking. I took a point of order in this House at that time and the Acting Deputy Speaker ruled that it was in order for the Minister to say that—

Mr. Ryan: You made the same statement last night yourself.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —yet the Premier gets up now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There seems to be a self-appointed Speaker in the back seats. I want to warn honourable members that I am the Presiding Officer in this House and any interjections purporting to be the Speaker's will be severely dealt with if they occur again.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier now describes this as a personal and vicious attack. When the Minister was moving a motion to adopt something as Government policy, the main part of his motion was a personal and vicious attack on the Leader of the Opposition. When I spoke in the debate at that time I said that it was undignified, and I repeat that. The Premier now says that this is a personal attack, but this comes rather weakly after the events of the last few days. The Premier also drew attention to the comment of the member for Torrens, who

said, "We knew full well that when Dr. Breuning came here he was given a copy of the Labor Party's policy speech and told what to report on." The Hon. G. T. Virgo then interjected, "That's a complete lie, and you know it." The Minister's comments might well have been directed to the part of the sentence about being told what to report on. I do not know whether the Premier has read the *Hansard* pull, because Mr. Coumbe then said:

Is the Minister denying that Dr. Breuning was given a copy of the A.L.P. policy speech? The Minister interjected, saying:

He was not given a copy of any policy speech.

Mr. Hall: What does the Premier say now?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That was said last night, and that is why the Leader of the Opposition asked a question today in exactly the same terms as previously referred to last August, the Leader receiving 100 per cent difference in the reply. That is why the censure motion has been moved. If one cannot obtain 100 per cent accuracy in a reply from a Minister, one is excused for moving a censure motion and should not be accused of being personal and vicious for doing so. The fact is that the Minister gave a completely wrong reply and, when given the opportunity to say something on this censure motion, instead of saying, "I admit I was wrong; I apologize," he did nothing of the sort.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He said, "I was wrong."

Mr. Hall: He made light of the whole matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On a point of order. When I replied to the vicious attack the Leader of the Opposition made on me, I withdrew; I acknowledged the fact that I made one statement on August 5 and a contrary statement this afternoon. I acknowledged that I had made two different statements and that the statement of August 5 was correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has asked that his remarks be strictly observed, and I would uphold the point. It is alleged that a mis-statement was made and the motion relates to a question of accuracy.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was interrupted by a comment just then by the Minister of Roads and Transport under the guise of a point of order. The fact is that the Minister had a clear opportunity to do the right thing, namely, apologize. Also, he might have included my colleague, whom last night

he called a liar. He had the opportunity to make an apology, an apology that I do not think he is capable of making. He had that chance, and he has not taken it. Therefore, for the Premier now to call it a mean and vicious attack is just ridiculous. If that is the best defence a Minister has, I think this Government will run into much more trouble in the future.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Briefly, I wish to join issue in this debate regarding some of the things said by Opposition members. I personally believe that on this issue we are tending to make a mountain out of a molehill. Without getting heated, let us look at the basis on which the Leader has moved the motion: in fact, it involves the conveying of the Government's policy on a certain issue to a person who was to investigate that issue, and I ask members opposite whether conveying that policy is not a reasonable thing. Last evening, during the course of the debate, reference was made to this matter and a denial was made by the Minister concerned. It is my genuine belief that if the Minister did not consider that what he was saying was accurate he would have checked on that point, and I am certain that he was man enough to get up in the House today and draw attention to the fact that he made the mistake.

That he replied to a question specifically asked of him by the Leader of the Opposition on this point and said "No" confirms my belief that the Minister of Roads and Transport honestly believed in what he said last evening. Had there been any doubt in his mind, I am certain that he would have checked that point, having had his attention drawn by the Leader to the fact that there was an inaccuracy. The Minister checked the pull to which the Leader has referred and was man enough to follow the Leader immediately and to point out to the House that he had, in fact, made a mistake. It would be difficult enough for the Minister to do that: it is not easy to have to admit to a slip of memory. Most of us like to pride ourselves on the fact that we can remember everything we do. The Minister would not have wanted deliberately to mislead the House on this issue.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What could I have achieved by doing it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is the point, and that is why I believe we are making a mountain out of a molehill. I think that the Minister having done all that is required

of him in this matter, the House should accept what he has said and carry on with the business that is, in my view, far more important to the future of this State than the matter with which we are now dealing.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I firmly press on with the censure motion I have moved. The public and this House will have to get used to the spectacle of the Premier, if he can, turning every argument into a personal one. This is a typical reaction to which we have become accustomed. I am moving this motion in order to safeguard Parliamentary democracy in this State. Members may laugh if they wish, but there are famous precedents around the world on what happens to Ministers who mislead. If anyone thinks it is a matter to be laughed off as a remark amongst others or as a matter to be defended in the retreat that the Premier made by a reference to half of what was said last evening, he is taking too lightly the freedoms of this country. One can admire the loyalty of the Minister's colleagues but they have said nothing that excuses them today: nor has anyone suggested anything that amounts to an excuse.

It is entirely unreasonable that the Minister has previously been guilty of similar slips of memory. To be charitable, I point out that he could not remember whether or not he had signed the directive relating to compulsory unionism. Is his administration to be chequered with this type of lapse of memory? Is the public to be subjected to his powerful orders through his department and administration, bearing in mind that he has a lapse of memory? I suggest that if he has a lapse of memory so frequently he is unsuitable: if that is the only reason, he is unsuitable to hold this position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Premier recalls, and I repeat, the remark made by my colleague, whom I did not relish being called a liar last evening, when he put this question again to the Minister: "Is the Minister denying that Dr. Breuning was given a copy of the A.L.P. policy speech?", the Minister having denied it. The Minister knows that he made this statement and so last evening and today he denied the statement made on August 7.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: August 5.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Minister is clutching at straws, but the honour and integrity of the

Government are at stake. We know that the Government will win this vote, but if there were to be an independent arbiter watching this debate and listening to the Minister's remarks, we know what the decision would be: the Minister would be censured. Having a tremendous respect for the Parliamentary system which can be upheld only by those who also respect it, I move this censure motion, hoping against hope that the motion will be carried, despite Party lines.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

Mr. Hall: What about Question Time?

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders were suspended to permit the Leader's motion to be debated. At that time all questions had expired. Following the taking of the vote, I called for papers, in reply to which the Ministers got up. I deliberately looked over towards Opposition members because I presumed that, if Government members had any questions, they would raise their hands before Opposition members. However, no hands were raised, and then when I called for papers, no hands were raised. I know it is easy for one to be criticized, but I definitely looked towards Opposition members and could not see any hands raised. If some hands were up, I apologize. However, I ask honourable members to co-operate a little more than they do, as I deliberately looked at the Opposition side realizing that, if they had any questions, hands would have been raised.

Questions resumed:

MURRAY SALINITY

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works say what action has been taken or what consideration has been given by Engineering and Water Supply Department officers, who are under the Minister's control, to the recom-

mendations made in the 1970 River Murray Commission report on salinity, particularly those on page 61, which deal with cases relating to South Australia? If he does not have the information now, will the Minister ascertain for me what has been done or is likely to be done in this regard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following the availability of the Gutteridge report, which was studied by my departmental officers, I called for a further report from my department on the problems which were confronting South Australia and which were referred to in the Gutteridge report. My officers worked extremely hard on the matter and only three or four weeks after I called for the report it was submitted to me in two parts, the first dealing with the area from the border to Renmark, the second dealing with the section of river between Renmark and Loxton. Following the receipt of that report, while in Sydney on negotiations concerning the Chowilla dam I spoke to the Minister for National Development (Mr. Swartz) about the possibility of this State's applying to the Commonwealth for financial assistance to be provided to the State by the Commonwealth on the same basis as that on which Victoria had been provided finance to deal with the Barr Creek system. Following those discussions, the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister a detailed submission on the matter. I understand that either this month or early next month officers of the Commonwealth will pay an informal visit to South Australia to examine the proposals we have put forward in this submission. I might add that the report I have from my officers is that a much greater sum than is foreshadowed in the Gutteridge report will be needed to control adequately salinity in the Murray River in South Australia. I believe the honourable member would be fully aware that there is a great salinity problem in the Murray River on this side of the border. From the time water enters this State until it gets to Waikerie (and this is not a great distance), the salinity level doubles. This fact indicates the magnitude of the problem within this State. I will look at the details of the submission, discussing with my officers whether I can make it available to the honourable member. As the matter is before the Commonwealth for consideration, I do not want to do anything that would jeopardize these negotiations. If it is possible to give the honourable member specific details of the submission, I shall be happy to supply such details.

ASBESTOSIS

Mr. McRAE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether, in the proposed workmen's compensation legislation, the Government will deal with the industrial disease known as asbestosis, which has caused great problems in other countries? In South Australia, in the industrial complex that uses asbestos and allied products, the disease has caused many people much harm. It is a medical condition related to asthma and similar complaints and, at present, it is not compensable. Requests have been made by people in asbestos and related industries to see whether it will be covered in the new Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The matter having been drawn to my attention, the Government intends to deal with this situation in the Bill to be introduced.

CONTRACEPTIVE PAMPHLET

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say whether he or officers of the department have heard about, seen or given their approval in regard to a pamphlet dealing with the use of contraceptives that the Women's Liberation Movement has announced it intends to distribute to girls in secondary schools? Like other members, I have received several complaints about the intention to distribute this pamphlet, so there appears to be much concern in the community about it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member will appreciate, we have not seen the pamphlet to which she refers. As I am sure she will appreciate, too, we have not given our approval of it. Our information is at the same level as that of the honourable member and of any other member: we have seen only what has been in the press. The Education Department has complete confidence in the ability of our headmasters and headmistresses to exercise discretion on matters such as this. The distribution of pamphlets outside school-grounds is a matter over which the department has no control: it is a matter for local councils. For example, regarding the Brighton area, it would be necessary for the member for Davenport to make representations to the member for Glenelg, who is a member of the Brighton council and who I am sure would know whether or not that council intended to introduce any by-laws. However, I think there may have been some exaggeration in the story that appeared in the newspaper yesterday.

I seem to remember seeing some suggestion this morning that it was not intended that the pamphlet would be distributed outside secondary schools. The only other thing I wish to say is that the department permits the Family Life Movement to operate inside the schools and in joint activities with school committees, mothers' clubs and so on. The way in which the Family Life Movement works in conjunction with the Education Department is much appreciated, and we are most happy with the kind of work it is able to do on this kind of matter.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General consider amending the law to prohibit the distribution of pamphlets outside school premises in the State? I know that this type of request is extremely difficult to legislate for and that the type of action to which I refer is difficult to control. However, many parents are concerned because their schoolchildren are being given pamphlets of which the parents disapprove and, in some cases, of which the children disapprove and perhaps destroy. Regardless of whether the pamphlets may deal with contraception, politics or commerce, the parents object, and it can be foreseen that in future, with the lowering of the age of majority (and it seems evident it will be lowered), it will be possible for commercial interests to distribute outside high school premises literature advertising goods that the students may buy. I know the difficulties involved in legislation of the type parents have requested but will the Attorney consider the legislation and say whether he thinks it possible or feasible to give effect to this request?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I realize the problem that the honourable member has mentioned. I think it is a matter of considerable concern to parents to know that their children are sometimes exposed to this sort of solicitation at school gates. I do not know that this is a frequent occurrence; it has not been so in my experience, and it has not been said to be so in any reports I have received. However, one knows that it happens, and it is certainly a matter for concern. Of course, there are great difficulties, as the honourable member has acknowledged, in legislating to prohibit the distribution of material near schools, and great difficulties would arise if we tried to discriminate between one type of material and another or tried to classify the material. However, I shall consider the problem that the honourable member has raised and see whether it is possible to deal with it by legislation.

DRAINAGE RATES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say whether any decision has been made regarding alternative means of paying drainage rates, following an examination by a committee appointed to investigate the payment of drainage levies in the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have with me a statement made by my colleague in another place and, I think, released to the press. Because of my concern for the area in which the drainage has been developed, I obtained this statement. I realize that the member for Victoria has an interest in this matter, as has the member for Alexandra who, as the former Minister, appointed the committee. The Minister of Lands states:

The financial provisions of the South-Eastern Drainage Act have been under consideration for some considerable time and were last discussed at a conference between representative landholders and officers of the Lands Department on Wednesday, February 17. The committee set up to examine these provisions has given extensive consideration to possible solutions, and it concluded that there were only four alternatives that might be availed of to resolve the problem. These are as follows:

1. To retain the present system of assessment and rating with full recovery of rates and capital charges of about \$300,000 per annum.
2. To retain the present method of assessment with the Government agreeing to a sum less than \$300,000 as a return from drainage.
3. To discard the present method of assessment and adopt the land tax unimproved land values (U.L.V.) as the assessment and on this basis collect about \$300,000 as a return from drainage.
4. To adopt unimproved land values as the basis of assessment and collect a lesser sum than \$300,000.

After considering the alternatives, the committee placed a proposal before me to which the Government indicated that it would be willing to agree. These measures would provide that:

1. The present method of assessing drainage liability be abandoned.
2. Repayments of capital charges for scheme and petition drains and betterment would no longer be required.
3. Depreciation charges would not be recoverable from landholders as part of maintenance costs.
4. Land tax unimproved land values would be adopted as the basis for assessments.
5. Drainage contribution be made by all lands within a defined area.

The Government has indicated that a contribution of about \$100,000 would be required as a contribution to drainage and this is estimated to represent about \$3 for each \$1,000 based on

the current 1971 land tax unimproved land value assessment. A plan showing the proposed area for assessment has been prepared, and there is a copy that honourable members may inspect.

I should like to point out that about \$20,000,000 has been invested in drainage in the South-East and that, as part of this proposal, the Government is prepared to forgo the collection of about \$6,500,000 in capital charges, betterment and depreciation plus future replacement of structures. In consideration of the money that has been spent and the amount that it is prepared to forgo the Government considers that an annual contribution of \$100,000 should be made by landholders towards drainage. This figure is based on present-day costs. Settlers were informed by the investigating committee of the foregoing proposal with the suggestion that they should examine it and bring forward modifications or any alternative proposals they could make. It was stressed that any modification or alternative proposal must be acceptable and workable and that, should the landholders come up with a scheme, this would be thoroughly investigated and considered by the committee before a final recommendation is made to me.

NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Highways Department to reconsider its decision regarding the projected cessation of work on the North-East Road through Ridgehaven and Tea Tree Gully, with a view to proceeding with the project without delay, and adhering to the previous expected completion date or reducing the time for the work, if possible? The Highways Department informed the Tea Tree Gully council on January 20 that road construction work on the widening of the North-East Road would temporarily close following completion of the road to a point near Lines Street. The reasons given in the correspondence were that this would be necessary to allow major relocation of services and substantial accommodation works to be completed and also to enable land acquisition to be finalized well ahead of the construction work. The correspondence further stated that, by doing this, it would be possible to carry out the actual roadworks with greater speed than had been possible on the section between Smart Road and Golden Grove Road at Modbury and that it should result in less disruption to traffic and the general public. I point out to the Minister that this projected delay concerns the Tea Tree Gully council as it concerns me, and I draw his attention to the traffic hazard that now exists in the sections of the road still to be widened, because of the heavy flow of traffic, which will

continue to increase owing to the growth of population in this area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will discuss with the department whether it is possible to speed up the work before the roadwork is continued, and bring down a report for the honourable member.

NOARLUNGA MEATWORKS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to request Health Department officers to visit the Noarlunga meatworks to try to eradicate the odours that emanate from that establishment from time to time, and also to determine whether these odours constitute any menace to health? During the recent hot spell, a constituent telephoned me, stating that the meatworks were "a bit on the bugle". Having had occasion two evenings later to drive through the Port Noarlunga South and Noarlunga areas, I can substantiate that gentleman's words. I realize that the meatworks takes an extremely responsible attitude about its waste, and so on, and I consider that the company would be anxious to do something to eradicate this nuisance.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer the matter to my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

WHEAT POOL

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what amount of money is in the 1968-69 wheat pool and when dividends will be payable? I understand that the wheat from this pool was sold some months ago, but only a first advance has been made, and many farmers are inquiring why payment for wheat from this pool has not been made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall take up the matter with my colleague and get a reply for the honourable member.

BERRI INDUSTRIES

Mr. CURREN: Will the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, make officers of the Industries Development Branch available to conduct a feasibility study of a possible project to breed and raise pigs and to fatten cattle, using the feed lot system, in the Berri district and also to investigate the possibilities of exporting the resultant meat products to Japan and other overseas markets? Fruit-processing plants in Berri have a two-fold problem, namely, disposal of waste products from processing operations and disposal

of waste water used during processing for cooling and cleaning purposes. Large areas of land are available adjacent to each of the two factories to grow fodder and coarse grains, such as maize and grain sorghum, that could be used in the project. A further advantage would be gained by using marked fruit, which at present is thrown on the ground during picking operations. During discussions I had this week with representatives of a large Japanese importing firm, I was given to understand that it would be possible to develop a market for meat in Japan on a long-term fixed-price basis, provided the correct channels were used.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall certainly have the matter examined immediately to find out what help we can give to promote the project.

LAND VALUES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Government has prepared a summary of the values hundred by hundred recently changed to unimproved land values, and whether the mean value of the individual hundred is available for comparison with the mean value for the 1965 valuation? With the alterations that have taken place to valuations (and I refer particularly to rural valuations), it is difficult to obtain a comparison of valuations that seemed to exist in previous periods between properties in two hundreds at the point where they are adjacent. There would seem to be a marked difference, for example, between a vineyard in the hundred of Nuriootpa compared to a vineyard across the river in the hundred of Barossa, and my question is asked in order to determine whether a comparison is possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the appropriate authority.

HOSPITAL INQUIRY

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier make available to members the conclusions of the committee of inquiry into hospital communications? I am fully aware of paragraph 21 on page 7 of the report which has been tabled and which states:

Because of the confidential nature of the evidence the committee believes that this report should not be published in full.

However, some sweeping recommendations are made in this report, not the least important of which suggests that the post of Medical Superintendent, presumably at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, should be abolished or at

least redefined. This is a matter of concern to all members of the community and particularly to the medical staff at the hospital, and I believe the community would be better served if the conclusions on which the recommendations were based, or some explanation, could be released for the guidance of the public and people concerned. I should be grateful if the Government would consider doing this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member has said, the report of the committee is explicit on the release of the total report to the public, particularly as the report contained much confidential information. The committee recommends that the release be confined to two sections of the report, the recommendations and method of operations. The Government believes it cannot go beyond that in public release of the material contained in the report, but the decision of Cabinet was that, if the honourable member wished to view confidentially and privately the material in the whole report, we would make it available to him on a confidential basis and on the understanding that the material would not be released by him. I can make that available to him outside the House, but apart from that the most the Government can do is follow the recommendations of the committee, and we have already published the method of operation and the recommendations.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government has considered extending pensioner bus concessions to country bus routes? I understand that the cost to the Government would be small in relation to benefits extended to pensioners in country areas, and would only amount to the cost of running the Moratorium Royal Commission for 2½ weeks, and the cost—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. He is not permitted to comment, and should ask a question.

Mr. GUNN: I have asked my question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question of concession fares for pensioners on country bus services has been carefully considered by the Government and, regrettably, because of the economic situation, the Government is sorry that it cannot extend concessions beyond those already applying. The information of the honourable member that the cost of extending this concession would be small is not accurate. From memory, a large sum is involved, and the present financial position will not permit an extension in this way. However, if the

Commonwealth Government were to provide the pension that should be provided concessions would not be needed.

MINISTERIAL DELAYS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport expedite a reply on a matter that I communicated to him? In November last I approached the Minister concerning a constituent of mine. On November 5, I received a letter from the Minister stating that he was investigating the matter and would tell me of any decision. On January 17 and February 18, I wrote to the Minister pointing out that I had not received his decision. Up to the present, I have not received a reply to either of those letters. As it is now almost four months since the matter was first raised would it be asking too much for the Minister at least to reply to my letters? I should be pleased to let the Minister have details of this case.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member will tell me the reference number and the name of the person concerned, those details will help, and I shall be pleased to check on the matter and not only provide him with a reply but also explain the delay. As a former Opposition back-bencher I know how frustrating it is when replies are not received.

NEPABUNNA SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Education consider installing a 32-volt water-cooled air-conditioner at the Nepabunna Mission school? I visited this school last on Tuesday of last week in a temperature of 106°F: there was a hot easterly wind and it was necessary to open the windows of the school to let the air circulate. It was distressing to see the children's heads wet with perspiration. The teacher and the mission manager asked me whether a 32v. air-conditioner system could be installed. A 240v. plant is installed at the school, but to install a 240v. air-conditioning system it would be necessary to run the motor all day. However, as a 32v. system is already installed at the teacher's residence, it would require only a few yards of wire across the road to install a 32v. air-conditioning system.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting: he may explain the question but he must not comment.

Mr. ALLEN: At the mission there is ample water to run this type of unit and labour would be available to install it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is still debating the matter.

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister treat this matter as urgent so that the people at this mission may obtain relief from the hot weather during the latter part of this summer?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be happy to look into the matter and, if the honourable member wishes to supply further details on the matter, I shall be happy also to receive those.

COURT INTERPRETERS

Mr. MATHWIN: In the interest of justice, I ask whether the Attorney-General will inquire into the position concerning interpreters available to the courts. I refer to the recent case in the Adelaide Magistrates Court in which Mr. D. F. Wilson, C.S.M., discharged three Yugoslavs because no interpreters were available. I am sure that many people in the community, particularly people from Europe who may have a command of two or three languages, could help in this respect.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I read the press report to which the honourable member has apparently referred, that charges were dismissed in relation to three Yugoslavs who had appeared before Mr. Wilson in the Adelaide Magistrates Court, because no interpreter was available. Having no other knowledge of the facts, I have sought a report on the circumstances in which that occurred, and when I have obtained a report I shall be better able to inform the honourable member. The practice, as long as I can remember, has been for the Police Department to employ interpreters to assist in police work in respect of persons who do not speak the English language, and those interpreters were available to the courts when charges were being heard against people who did not speak English or where witnesses could not speak English adequately. I had had no information, prior to reading this report, that difficulties had arisen. I have since learnt that the interpreter who undertook the Yugoslav work (Mr. Mihailovich) recently retired from the Police Department, and his retirement may well have produced the difficulty that has apparently arisen. However, I am having inquiries made to ascertain the nature of the problem and what can be done to solve it.

NORTH-SOUTH FREEWAY

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say where the North-South Freeway will be situated? In the M.A.T.S. plan, the North-South Freeway is styled the Noarlunga-Salisbury Freeway. My constitu-

ents and friends living close to the proposed Noarlunga Freeway under the M.A.T.S. plan must know where they stand in relation to future acquisitions, and they demand that the Minister confirm its location. I understand that the Minister desired the Noarlunga Freeway to be deviated along the Sturt River at Marion, but this is not now possible because of the establishment of the Road Safety Centre on Government land near the Sturt River at Oaklands. Will the Minister make a definite statement regarding the North-South Freeway, in view of the Premier's comments that this freeway and an expressway to Glenelg are necessary?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a statement on this matter in the Breuning report. When that report was publicly released, I made a press statement that further amplified the position. The location of freeways or expressways, or other facilities of this nature, is not within my province to determine: it is in the hands of the State Planning Authority, which is currently reviewing the Adelaide development plan.

ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture why the Adelaide abattoirs has not been granted a licence to kill stock for the American market? It is now almost seven months since I received a reply to a question I asked about the Adelaide abattoirs, and to the best of my knowledge no clearance for the market has yet been announced. The reply which was forwarded to me by the Minister states, in part:

The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board reports that improvements in sheep dressing and handling procedures are being implemented progressively at the Gepps Cross works in efforts to meet the requirements laid down by the United States authorities. The board expects to be in a position shortly to apply for re-inspection of its premises with a view to the granting of a clearance for export to America.

This is an important matter, because stock cannot be held indefinitely while those concerned wait for the present situation to be rectified.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague and to ascertain for the honourable member the cause of the delay. I suggest that the greatest cause stems from the fact that the Americans probably do not want our meat and do this sort of thing so that they will not have to take it.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends either to introduce amendments to those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act relating to abortion or to allow an individual member to do so at some stage during the remainder of the present session? Early in November, a newspaper report was given considerable prominence that the Minister of Works intended to introduce (it was not clear whether as a Minister or as a private member) amendments to those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act dealing with this matter. Subsequently in the House, I asked the Premier (and then on the next day of sitting, I think, the Minister of Works) whether there was any substance in the report, but I was not given a clear reply by either gentleman. Since then, the House has been in recess for some weeks and during that time in at least one of the political gossip columns it was reported that the Minister of Works intended to move amendments. As this matter is of great public interest and was the subject of a long and good debate in this House in 1969, I ask the Premier what the Government intends during the remainder of the sittings.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Leader is incorrect in saying that he did not get clear replies from the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: I have just looked at them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is always obtuse when he wants to be.

Mr. Clark: And sometimes when he doesn't want to be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That happens, too. The Government does not intend as a Government to introduce a measure affecting those sections of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act relating to abortion. What I said on the last occasion was that, first, in relation to private members' business one further afternoon would be made available during the remainder of the session to clear up private members' business.

Mr. Millhouse: That is business already on the Notice Paper?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It concerns what is already on the Notice Paper. It is possible for members to get something on to the Notice Paper before a private members' day occurs, but there are severe limitations in regard to dealing during one afternoon with something that gets on to the Notice Paper for the first time. I also made clear that any member, either on the Government benches

or on the Opposition benches, could introduce as a matter of his conscience a measure relating to this section of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. However, if he did so, he would take such action as a private member, and no member of the Government would receive any more privileges than any other member in relation to that matter; nor would he seek them.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you say what date that is likely to be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say what Wednesday afternoon it will be, but it will be a Wednesday afternoon before Easter.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General made any progress regarding alterations to the method of appointment of justices of the peace? In reply to a question asked earlier in the session, the Minister said that he foresaw difficulties, and that he would be considering those difficulties before introducing a Bill or making a statement to the House.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter is still being considered, and I cannot make a statement at this stage.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to expedite the presentation to Parliament of the Bill ratifying the rural reconstruction scheme? In reply to my question, the Minister of Works said yesterday that this Bill would be introduced this session. However, that could be any time within the next six weeks. This is indeed an urgent matter, and I and most of the other members representing country districts have had representations made to us by farmers urgently requiring help. As the respective Ministers met in Canberra some weeks ago, could not the presentation of this Bill be expedited?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will pass on the honourable member's comments to my colleague and see what can be done about hastening the preparation and introduction of the Bill. The honourable member would no doubt have read sufficient to realize that the proposition made by the Commonwealth Government to the States will not allow many people who should be eligible for assistance under the scheme to receive assistance. Sadly, the States will act as agents for the Commonwealth Government, and will have to take the kicks for the latter. Again, the Commonwealth Government is escaping its real

responsibility in this matter. However, that is irrelevant to the honourable member's question.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several separate and unconnected amendments to the Local Government Act. Two aspects of the Bill are of considerable importance and of wide-reaching effect on local government. The first is that it is designed to introduce full adult franchise into local government.

I firmly believe that Government at all levels should be based on the principles of democracy as enunciated by Abraham Lincoln many years ago and accepted throughout the free world. My Government, prior to the last election, proposed that local government elections should be brought into line with this standard. Local government elections are not in accord with the principles of democracy, in that people resident in a council area are denied the right to vote and, further, are not permitted to nominate for election.

The purpose of this Bill to provide full adult franchise is completely in accord with time-honoured principles of democracy, in that it provides for government of the people for the people by the people. In our three-tier system of Government each has its functions and responsibilities and each is answerable to the electors. In South Australia, local government has occupied a position of inferiority to the other two tiers, and it is the purpose of the Bill to rectify this undesirable situation. Local government must continue to be regarded as the poor relation of society unless and until it enjoys the same franchise as those applying to the other two Governments. It is untenable that people who are entitled to vote for Commonwealth and State Parliaments are denied the right to vote for local government. This is a travesty of democratic right and personal dignity that should have been rectified years ago, and it is astonishing that in the 1970's, when the Government seeks to rectify this injustice in respect of State Parliament, opposition should arise. However, in local government the situation is worse:

not only are many people denied the right to vote, but privileged people are given multiple voting rights based purely on the wealth or possessions that they have. People should be regarded for what they are, rather than for what they own. The very basis of democratic thinking revolves around the principle that people are the most important factor in society, and the poorest person in our society should have no less and no more say in the election of candidates for any form of government than the most affluent.

The Act at present permits a person to cast a number of votes depending on the property he owns. Even worse, a corporate body is entitled to have votes cast on its behalf, dependent on the value of the property owned. In respect of absent owners, a person may speculate in the land business in an area in which he has little or no interest other than waiting for the capital gain that will almost certainly accrue by holding the land for a period, yet he is given voting powers in that council area that many genuine residents are denied. We must decide in this question of franchise whether the "one man one vote" principle, to which the Government is committed, should apply, or whether the basis of local government franchise should continue to be wealth and privilege. Over 100 years ago in England in certain elections a person could have multiple votes according to the amount of rates he paid, and a person who was both owner and occupier of a property might in some cases double his voting rights by voting as an owner and then voting again as an occupier. The arguments against a franchise that excludes a section of the public apply equally to a system that creates a privileged class by other means. This system in England was abolished in 1870 because of a belief that people ought to have equal electoral rights.

It is a disgraceful anachronism that South Australia's local government franchise of 1970 has not caught up with England's of 1870. This change in England was made because property ownership became unacceptable as a measure of one's stake in the community. Men and women then got a vote because they were men and women. In Government men and women represent other men and women, not blocks of land, houses, or farms. When we relate voting rights to what we happen to own, we lower our capacity for self-government.

Since the announcement of the Government's policy in respect of full franchise, there have been cries that those who do not

pay rates will be able to have a say in affairs, that costs will increase, that politics will enter local government. We are convinced that the principle of democratic government of the people by the people and for the people is the paramount decider in these matters. Local government is not something that is provided for the people who directly pay rates: it is for everyone; it affects everyone; it provides facilities for people of all ages and classes; and it binds people to local laws and requirements. Everyone may not pay direct rates, but everyone would do so in some indirect way.

If we study franchise in other places we find it is decided by citizenship, age and residence rather than who owns what. This is true in Queensland, in New York, in Britain, in Holland and in Denmark, to mention just a few. In the past few months, a considerable number of councils have spent money to circularize ratepayers regarding the Government's proposals, asking them to consider the possible effects of the policies. We have heard much of this, but what have we heard of the comments received by the councils? Just how many are against the Government's policy? Let me quote just one set of figures. Of 79 replies received by the District Council of Pinnaroo, 43 were in favour of full adult franchise. I am led to believe that, in the Walkerville council area, an intensive campaign has been waged, with prepared letters addressed to the Minister of Local Government being supplied to people, who have been asked merely to include their name and address and to send them to the Minister. I have received only four.

In September last year, the Mayor of Mount Gambier, in a news item, severely criticized the projected introduction of adult franchise and compulsory voting, to which I will refer later. Yet in July of the same year, the same Mayor said the Government might well consider making voting compulsory, because of the low voting figures from Mount Gambier. However, in his September pronouncement, he said that compulsory voting could not improve this situation. Just what does he want?

Mr. Gunn: Ratepayers don't want it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The very point I have made is that the voice of the ratepayers has not been heard on this issue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're kidding yourself.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government believes that the task of deciding the

merit of its proposals is for Parliament rather than for those councillors elected under the present restricted provisions of the Act. The report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee has been studied, and its recommendations of extensions to the present franchise is not far short of full franchise. The Government considers that any system which promotes a privileged class, which disfranchises so many people and which eliminates the right of so many women to vote is archaic. The Bill is designed to remedy this.

The second of the two aspects I have referred to relates to compulsory voting in local government elections and polls. Like the Mount Gambier Mayor's first pronouncement, but unlike his second, it is believed that compulsory voting will encourage voter interest. People must be encouraged to take an interest, and compulsory voting will promote this. What sort of a result is obtained in elections with a vote as low as 6 per cent of those entitled to vote and generally a vote of about 15 per cent? We take strong issue regarding the claim that compulsory voting will lead to the introduction of Party politics into local government. Just how would this occur? Critics of Government policy have relied on rhetoric rather than reason. The proposed franchise no more lends itself to Party politics than the existing franchise. Party politics already plays a part in certain councils. The L.C.L. has nominated candidates for years.

Mrs. Steele: So has the A.L.P.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The A.L.P. does not nominate candidates, nor does it intend to. It was said in this House only last year that South Australians were first compelled to go to the polls and have their names marked off the roll for the 1925 Commonwealth election. This was introduced by Stanley Melbourne Bruce: a Government calling itself Nationalist, the South Australian wing calling itself Liberal. In the State sphere, it was introduced at elections in 1944, under legislation that was introduced by the then Thomas Playford Government, calling itself L.C.L. Following the announcement of the Government's policy on compulsory voting, some councils have raised objection to the proposal. The Government has considered these objections in the light of democratic principles and has decided to legislate to enable councils to adopt either compulsory or voluntary voting. In addition, so that the electors will have the right to express their wishes, provision is made for them to demand a poll on the question. This is in

accordance with the recommendation of the Local Government Act Revision Committee and is in accordance with the system applying in Victoria.

The Bill provides for several other matters of considerable importance that I shall explain while dealing in detail with provisions of the Bill. Clause 1 is a formal provision, and clause 2 alters the arrangement of the Act. Clause 3 inserts definitions of "authorized officer", who is to assist the returning officer in the conduct of an election or poll, "elector" and "the Returning Officer for the State". Clause 3 also makes other provisions to which I will refer later. Clauses 4, 5, 10, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 62, 63, 64, 76, 82, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 100, 101, 113, 116, 117, 122, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139, 140, 142, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, and 160 make consequential alterations in the present terms "ratepayer", "voters' roll", "deputy returning officer", "poll clerk", "owners of ratable property", and insert the terms "elector", "electoral roll", and "authorized officer".

Clauses 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14 amend or repeal sections 25, 27, 27a, 30, 32, and 33. These sections at present deal with petitions from ratepayers for constitution of areas, severance and annexation of areas, and provide for petitions to be signed by ratepayers, owners and occupiers and in some cases refer to the value of property held by the signatories. These provisions are altered to provide for petitions to be signed by a majority or specified percentage of electors. Clause 15 repeals section 51 and inserts a new section providing for mayors, aldermen, and councillors to be elected by electors and from the electors.

Section 52 at present provides for the qualification of council members. Clause 16 amends this to provide for the qualification to be an elector for an area. Clause 18 repeals paragraph IX of section 54. This section provides that non-payment of rates by a member created a vacancy in the office of that member. As monetary matters are not to be a basis for a person to be a member, this provision is no longer required. Clause 19 enacts a new section 77, which provides for electors to elect aldermen, in lieu of owners and occupiers electing such members, as at present.

Clause 20 repeals subsection (2) of section 78. This is a consequential amendment caused by the repeal of section 115, which is mentioned later. Clause 21 repeals Part

VI of the Act, being sections 88 to 101a. A new Part VI is inserted. New section 88 provides for the following:

- (1) A person qualified as an elector for the House of Assembly and resident within an area shall be entitled to be enrolled as an elector for the council area in which he resides.
- (2) A person who owns or occupies property in more than one area or ward may elect to enrol in respect of any one area or ward where he has property. If he fails so to elect, he cannot be enrolled otherwise than for the area where he lives.
- (3) If a partnership or corporate body owns or occupies property in an area, a member of the partnership or a person with a substantial interest in the company, which is defined, may elect to be enrolled for the area in which the partnership or company property is situated. If no such election is made, the person shall not be enrolled otherwise than for the area where he lives.
- (4) Elections under section 88 must be renewed annually with the Returning Officer for the State, and an election may be cancelled.
- (5) A person enrolled as an elector shall be entitled to vote at all elections, meetings and polls for the area or ward for which he is enrolled.

New section 89 requires the Returning Officer for the State to compile an electoral roll for each area. Such roll shall include the names of applicants who satisfy the Returning Officer for the State that they are entitled to be enrolled and the names of persons on the House of Assembly roll. The Returning Officer for the State is empowered to fix fees to be payable by councils for the rolls. New section 90 empowers the Returning Officer for the State to declare a date for closing of the rolls. New section 91 provides for rolls to be available by councils for public inspection and for the supply of copies on payment of a reasonable fee.

Clause 22 repeals section 102 and inserts a new section 102, which provides that the returning officer for any council election shall be the Returning Officer for the State or a person nominated by him. Provision is made for councils to pay fees to returning officers. Clause 23 repeals section 103, which is unnecessary in view of the provisions of new section 102. Clause 24 amends section 105

regarding nominations for council office, as follows:

- (1) The use of the present form 2a of the fifth schedule (nomination of company nominees for office) is deleted. Other amendments make this form unnecessary.
- (2) Paragraphs VI (concerning non-payment of rates as a prevention to nomination), VII (concerning the list of persons who have not paid rates) and VIIa (concerning the period for which a name has appeared in the assessment book) are repealed. The adult franchise makes these provisions unnecessary.
- (3) Provision is made for candidates to lodge deposits of \$20. The present provision applying only to the city of Adelaide is repealed, and the new provision applies to all councils.
- (4) A new subsection (3), providing for any disputes in nominations to be settled by the returning officer, is inserted.

Clause 28 repeals existing section 109 and inserts a new section requiring the Returning Officer for the State to provide a roll for the area or ward at each polling place. Clause 29 repeals section 111 and inserts a new section empowering the returning officer to appoint officers to assist and to fix fees to be paid to such officers by the council. Clause 31 repeals section 114 and redrafts it to include the new terminology.

Clause 32 repeals section 115 to 117 and inserts new sections 115 to 117. New section 115 provides that every elector shall be entitled to one vote at an election. New section 116 provides that voting at elections shall be compulsory or voluntary, as determined by the council. Provision is made requiring councils to make such a determination within three months of the commencement of the amendment act and to give public notice thereof. Within one month of such notice, 100 or more electors may demand a poll to determine whether the council's determination is supported by a majority of electors voting. The poll may be voluntary or compulsory. A determination once made cannot be altered within five years. New section 117 refers only to elections where voting is compulsory and provides as follows:

- (1) The returning officer shall prepare a list of persons who did not vote and within three months send to such persons notices calling upon them to

give valid, truthful and sufficient explanation of their failure to vote.

- (2) No such notice need be sent if the returning officer is satisfied that a person is dead, ineligible to vote, or had good reason not to vote.
- (3) Within not less than 21 days the person is to return a form stating the true reason for not voting. Any person not able to complete the form may have the form completed by some other person on his behalf.
- (4) The returning officer shall endorse on the list of non-voters his opinion on whether an explanation is valid. Endorsement shall be made in respect of forms not returned. Such list shall be *prima facie* evidence in proceedings.
- (5) Failure to vote without valid reason or failure to return the form referred to or the giving of false explanation shall be an offence and subject to a penalty of between \$2 and \$8.
- (6) Proceedings for an offence shall be instituted by the Returning Officer for the State or by a person authorized by him.

Clause 33 repeals section 118, which refers to payment of rent by an occupier. This section is unnecessary, in view of the new franchise provisions. Clause 34 repeals section 119 and inserts a new section requiring the returning officer or authorized officer to remove all votes from each ballot box at the close of voting and to exhibit the box empty. Clause 35 makes consequential amendments to section 120. Paragraph I is repealed, and a new paragraph provides for the conduct of elections to be under the control of the returning officer or authorized officer. Paragraph IV is repealed, and a new paragraph provides for an elector to present himself to an authorized officer and state his name, residence and occupation. Paragraph V is repealed and a new paragraph provides for an authorized officer to place a mark against the elector's name on the roll.

Clause 36 makes consequential amendments to section 122 to the questions that may be asked of an elector by an authorized officer. Subsection (4) of the same section is rendered unnecessary and is repealed. Clause 38 repeals section 124 and inserts a new section empowering the returning officer to adjourn an election if for any reason it becomes impracticable to proceed with the election. In such a case, any votes cast prior to the adjournment are disregarded. Section 141 at present provides that

a justice or special magistrate may arrange an election if a council fails to do so or if there are no members of the council. Clause 45 amends this provision to give such power to the Returning Officer for the State.

Section 142a at present refers to the deposits lodged by candidates for office with the city of Adelaide. Clause 46 amends the section to make it applicable to all councils. Section 190 at present refers to a poll of owners to decide whether a council can introduce land value assessing and provides that a certain proportion of owners must vote in favour. Clause 49 amends this provision, provides for a poll of electors and requires a majority to be in favour of the change in the method of assessment.

Clause 50 repeals subsection (2) of section 193, which refers to the voting entitlements for owners in a poll to change to land value assessment. These provisions are now unnecessary. Section 197 refers to a poll of owners to change back to annual values. Clause 52 amends this to provide for a poll of electors. The voting entitlements for owners at such a poll as contained in subsection (2) of section 198 are repealed. Clause 54 repeals section 200 regarding non-payment of rates by owners in connection with a poll to change the method of assessment. These provisions are now unnecessary.

Section 218 empowers a certain proportion of ratepayers representing a certain proportion of assessed value to present a memorial for specific works to be carried out. Clause 59 amends this to provide that a majority of electors in a portion of an area may present such a memorial. Clause 60 makes consequential amendments in respect of memorials to section 219. Clause 61 repeals section 222 (1), which refers to separate rates as mentioned in memorials. This is rendered unnecessary. Section 229 at present refers to ratepayers in a municipality submitting a memorial for lighting of streets. Clause 64 amends this provision so that "electors", not "ratepayers", may present such a memorial.

Clauses 65, 66 and 67 make consequential amendments to sections 230, 232, and 233 regarding the contents of such a memorial and the rating powers of the council if the council agrees with the memorial. In such cases, councils will be able to declare separate rates for a limited period. Clauses 68 and 69 repeal sections 236 and 242. These sections at present provide a scale of votes in certain polls depending on the assessed value of properties. Provisions such as this, which provide for

multiple voting, are not, as I have previously stated, in accord with democratic principles.

Section 312 at present provides for registers of public streets to be open for inspection by ratepayers. Clause 81 changes this so that such registers are open for inspection by any person. Section 336 at present provides for an owner, or a majority of owners, to apply for the provision of crossing places from the property to a street. Clause 83 amends this to provide for any person to make such a request, and for the council to recover the cost of acceding to the request of that person. Clause 87 amends section 425 to provide that statements of loan expenditure by councils shall be open to public inspection, not just to the inspection of ratepayers.

Section 427 provides that a poll of ratepayers to approve borrowing by a council shall be defeated if a majority of votes cast is against and the number of votes against is 10 per cent of the votes that could have been cast. These provisions are repealed by clause 88, thus requiring a poll with a majority of electors either way. Clause 89 repeals section 428, which provides for the scale of voting, previously referred to, now applying to polls on loans. Section 710 at present provides that complaints against the title of a council member and other proceedings may be laid by a council, a ratepayer, or interested person. Clause 106 amends this to provide that complaints may be laid by a council, the Returning Officer for the State, a ratepayer, an elector, or interested person.

Clause 110 repeals section 754, which at present makes it an offence for a person under 21 years to vote or to hold office. The proposed provision for electors to be those on the House of Assembly roll (whatever age might apply there) makes this provision unnecessary. Section 763 at present refers to offences against electors or voters. The words "or voters" are now rendered unnecessary and are repealed by clause 111. Clause 112 repeals section 767 regarding an illegal claim by a person to have his name in the assessment book or voters roll. This provision is rendered unnecessary. Clause 114 repeals section 777 regarding the inclusion or omission of names in a voters roll. This is now unnecessary.

Clause 118 redrafts section 796 regarding the procedures to be followed at a meeting of ratepayers. The new section refers to similar provisions at a meeting of electors. At present if a poll is demanded it has to be held not later than 21 days after the meeting. This is

altered to not later than 60 days, which accords with other types of poll, and provides for the Returning Officer for the State to be informed of the poll date. Clause 119 amends section 799 to provide that polls shall be conducted by the Returning Officer for the State or his nominee. Provision is also made for fixing of fees by the returning officer. Clause 120 repeals section 800, which at present enables a returning officer to appoint a person to act in his stead when he is absent or ill. This section is now unnecessary. Clause 121 repeals section 801 to provide that the returning officer may appoint such staff as is necessary as authorized officers, and to fix fees.

Clause 123 repeals sections 807 to 810, which at present refer to the provision of a voters roll and the non-payment of rates as a bar to voting. These sections are unnecessary and are replaced by a new section 807, which requires the returning officer for the State to provide rolls for use at polls. Clause 124 repeals section 811 and inserts a new section providing for the returning officer or authorized officer to remove votes from a ballot box at the close of voting and to exhibit the box empty. Clause 125 repeals section 812 and inserts a new section providing for only the returning officer, authorized officer, scrutineer, or voter to be in a polling place without specific authority. Clause 120 amends section 813 to provide that the returning officer or authorized officer shall place marks against a voter's name on the roll and initial voting papers. Subsection (4) of the same section is amended to delete the words "or votes", as no person will have more than one vote.

Clause 127 amends section 814 to delete the reference to a voter having more than one voting paper. It also redrafts section 814 (2) regarding the deposit by a voter of his vote in the ballot box. Clause 128 repeals sections 816 (which refers to the archaic scale of votes), 817 (regarding joint owners' and occupiers' voting rights) and 818 (regarding voting by attorneys). These are now unnecessary. Clause 129 repeals section 819 regarding voting qualifications and provides that new sections 115 to 117 shall apply to polls. These refer to one vote a voter, determination by a council of compulsory or voluntary voting, and procedures that shall apply to polls conducted under compulsory voting. Clause 130 makes consequential amendments to section 820 regarding questions that may be asked of a voter at a poll. Clause 131 amends section 821 to delete reference to a voter having more than one voting paper.

Clause 136 repeals section 828 (2), which relates the term "elector" in section 130 as "a person entitled to vote at a poll". This is now unnecessary. Clause 138 repeals section 830 to empower the returning officer to adjourn a poll if for any reason it becomes impracticable to continue. In such a case, all votes then cast shall be disregarded. Section 832a refers to a demand for a poll of rate-payers. Clause 140 amends this section to provide for a poll of electors and to delete the requirement for inclusion in the demand the address of property that forms the basis of qualification for the ratepayer to vote.

Clause 141 repeals section 832b, which provides that, in postal voting, the term "ratepayer" shall include a company nominee. This is now unnecessary. Clause 143 repeals subsection (2) of section 833a regarding unauthorized delivery of postal vote application forms. This is now unnecessary with the conduct of elections through the Returning Officer for the State. Clause 145 amends section 835 to delete reference to the possibility of a voter having more than one postal voting paper. It also provides for postal voting papers to be initialled by the returning officer or in a manner approved by the Returning Officer for the State. Clause 147 makes consequential amendments in terminology to section 838.

Clause 149 amends section 840 by providing for electors to be authorized witnesses in lieu of ratepayers. The clause also repeals section 840 (2), which prevents a candidate's being an authorized witness. This restriction is inserted in subsection (3). Clause 154 amends section 846 (2), which at present provides that the returning officer shall accept postal voting papers that have been received by post. The amendment provides that the papers to be accepted are those received by post up to the close of the poll. Clause 155 repeals section 847 (2), which is rendered redundant. A new subsection is inserted to provide that disputes as to postal voting shall be decided by the Returning Officer for the State. Clauses 161, 162 and 163 make consequential amendments to schedules 5, 18 and 19.

I now turn to the amendments that are not connected with franchise or voting. Clause 3 amends the definition of ratable property in section 5 as regards Government-owned dwellinghouses. At present Government buildings are ratable if occupied as a dwelling. This is considered to react harshly upon councils in some instances, and the amendment provides for Government dwellings,

occupied or not, to be ratable property, with the exception of dwellinghouses acquired only for the purpose of demolition.

Clause 7 makes an important amendment to section 26, which concerns the amalgamation of two or more councils. At present, to achieve amalgamation, a petition must come jointly from both or all councils concerned. The amendment alters this to provide that a petition may come from any one or more councils involved. At present desirable amalgamations can be achieved only if all councils concerned agree. This joint agreement is difficult to obtain and has prevented amalgamations that would be desirable to achieve economy and efficient operation. The amendment means that amalgamation will not be automatic, but it will enable an interested council to have investigations commenced to reveal whether amalgamation is desirable or otherwise.

This matter is of considerable concern, and honourable members will be aware of comments made by the Auditor-General and other responsible persons on the desirability of amalgamation in some cases. Clause 7 also provides for a poll to be demanded and held on the question. This is not altered, although, if only one council petitions, that council may be responsible for the giving of the required notices. Clause 7 also amends the provision relating to the poll so that it becomes a poll of electors, not of ratepayers. At present at least one-third of ratepayers on the roll must vote against the proposition in order to defeat it. The amendment provides for a simple majority.

Section 27a refers to severance of an area from one council and annexation to another and contains provisions similar to those already mentioned, in that all councils concerned must be involved in a petition. Clause 9 amends this to provide that a petition may come from either of the councils concerned. Section 54 at present provides that the resignation of a council member, with the licence of the council, shall create a vacancy. Concern has been raised in recent years that councils have refused a member's resignation tendered so that the member, who is otherwise qualified, may contest a higher office in his council. This has meant that the council, and not the ratepayers (or electors in future) as the Act envisages, has to some extent decided who shall be mayor. Accordingly, clause 18 will alter section 54, paragraph VI, to permit a member to resign without licence. Sections 53, 139 and 752 require consequential amendments, and these are achieved by clauses 17, 44 and 109.

Section 157 requires district clerks and town clerks to be 21 years of age or more and an engineer 23 years or more. Clause 48 amends both these requirements to 18 years or more. This is in accordance with the Government's policy of age of majority and responsibility. The amendments will not affect the qualifications that such officers are required to possess. Clause 57 inserts a new provision (section 215a) which would enable a council to declare a garbage collection rate of up to \$10 a year. This would not prevent a council's absorbing such costs within its general rates, as many now do. However, some councils in the past have, under powers available to them in other parts of the Act, charged fees for removing garbage. These powers only permit the charging of persons from whose property garbage is actually removed. This has encouraged some persons, even though they are on the route of a service, to refuse such a service. This has caused a rubbish problem, in that garbage in some cases is being deposited in unauthorized places. The new provision will enable a charge to be made on all persons on the route of a service.

Clause 70 amends section 286 regarding signing of cheques. At present cheques, other than those made from an advance account, are signed by a member or members and an officer. Clause 70 provides for cheques to be signed by two officers, as well as by a member and officer. Particularly in large councils, where the numbers of cheques are considerable, it is extremely difficult to obtain a member's signature to so many cheques. The signing of cheques by officers only is in accordance with modern practices, provided adequate internal checking of procedures is installed. The approval of the Minister and council auditor will ensure this.

Clause 71 amends section 287. At present councils can spend revenue in subscribing to an organization whose principal object is the furtherance of local government in the State. This provision is extended to the furtherance of local government in the State and Australia. The Adelaide City Council, in particular, is a member of a local government organization relating to capital cities, and the extension of power is desirable. However, it is considered that such expenditure should not be unlimited, and accordingly provision is made for obtaining the Minister's approval.

Clause 71 also inserts a new power in section 287 that will authorize the expenditure of revenue on the employment of social workers. This is an important activity to

local government, but it is more particularly related to other powers relating to services to the aged and others, which I will mention later. Clause 71 also amends section 287 (1) (k), which empowers a council to spend revenue on promoting a Bill before Parliament. It is considered that this type of expenditure should not be unlimited. Accordingly, provision is made for the Minister's approval to be obtained.

Clause 71 also amends section 287 by providing a new overall provision to enable councils to pay the expenses of councillors in attending meetings of the council or committees and all expenses connected with a member's undertaking special business for the council. The present separate provisions in section 288 and 289, which are repealed by clauses 73 and 74, provide differences between municipalities and districts. Councillors in district councils can have travelling expenses in attending meetings reimbursed, but councillors in municipalities cannot. There is also some doubt about whether expenses of overnight accommodation can be reimbursed at present. This is unreasonable, for a councillor should not be out of pocket by reason of his being a councillor. Clause 72 inserts a new section 287a, which is of paramount importance. It will empower a council to spend money in the provision of homes, hospitals, infirmaries, nursing homes, recreation facilities, domiciliary services and other services for the aged, handicapped or infirm. The new section provides that:

- (1) A council may require a one-third donation of the cost of a unit from an incoming occupier. This is available to private organizations and it is important that councils be not in an inferior position.
- (2) After one such donation has been received, all further donations shall be paid into a fund to provide for infirmary or nursing home accommodation, or for other purposes approved by the Minister. A council may refund an amount not exceeding the donation if circumstances warrant it.
- (3) A council may charge rentals, and shall pay one-third into a fund to provide for maintenance and improvements. The first indication that councils might enter this field came when the Commonwealth Government amended its legislation in 1967

to provide that councils shall be eligible bodies to receive subsidies.

The Local Government Act Revision Committee has thoroughly investigated this matter and is more than satisfied that there is room and a need for local government in this field. In addition, the committee is satisfied that there is a need for councils to enter the field of domiciliary care. Existing organizations, such as Meals on Wheels, provide a wonderful service, but more effort is required from others. The committee is satisfied that councils should enter this whole field of welfare service and not just one facet of it. Councils will not have to enter this field, but many are anxiously waiting to do so. This is an exciting field of activity, and I particularly commend these provisions to members.

Clause 73 extends the investment power of councils by including trustee investment in section 290a. This is considered reasonable. Sections 292, 296 and 297 refer to the preparation of statements and balance sheets and their publication in the *Government Gazette*. Clauses 76, 77 and 78 amend these sections by deleting the requirements for gazettal, and provides instead that a council may publish them in any appropriate way and provide copies on request to electors, free of charge. Complaints have been received of the high cost to councils of gazettal. In view of the requirement of regulations for copies to be provided to certain authorities, and in view of the new provision for free supply to electors, the Government is satisfied that gazettal serves little or no purpose. Clauses 79 and 80 make consequential amendments to sections 301 and 305 caused by the provision of the new Land and Valuation Court.

Clause 80 also amends section 305 concerning resolutions of councils declaring streets to be public roads. The amendment provides that where the Registrar-General has made an entry in a register book or has issued a title in compliance of provisions in section 305, the land concerned shall be conclusively presumed to be a public street. This is necessary to cover the situation that occurred when a council inadvertently failed to issue a notice to a person and found it could not recommence proceedings. A person who might be involved in such a situation is protected by the amendment, in that he may apply to the Land and Valuation Court for compensation. Clauses 84 and 85 make consequential amendments to sections 415 and 420 as a result of the new Land Acquisition Act,

1969. Section 437 lays down that borrowing by councils shall not be subject to an interest rate of more than 7½ per cent. The highest current borrowing rate for councils is now 7.4 per cent and, whilst no-one wants to see it increase, it could conceivably do so some time in the future. Councils cannot be barred from desirable loan programmes, and therefore clause 93 repeals this provision.

Clause 94 amends section 454 to provide that park lands may be used for camping ground or caravan park purposes. In many council areas, caravan and camping areas are located in park lands, but a recent legal opinion indicates some doubt that this is legal. Such use is recreational and the use of park lands for such purposes is, we believe, reasonable. Section 459a of the Act empowers a council, with the Minister's consent, to dispose of reserves not exceeding half an acre in area if the land is not required as a reserve. Clause 97 removes this restriction of half an acre. In disposing of reserves, size should not be a determining factor, but rather the usefulness of the reserve for the purpose of public use or enjoyment. Buildings such as kindergartens have been established on some reserves. The Government does not want to see reserves used in this way. However, councils often have surplus reserves, or portions, that could be made available for such purpose. The amendment will permit the disposal of redundant reserves where it is appropriate.

Clauses 98 and 99 make consequential amendments to sections 471 and 483 because of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969.

Clause 102 amends section 530c concerning the provision of common effluent disposal drains. When councils provide such drains, as many have successfully done, they are empowered to recover costs by means of separate rates. Because of the nature of these schemes, it is more practicable in many cases to charge a fixed annual amount rather than a rate in the dollar. Because some doubt has been raised about whether a separate rate may include a fixed amount, clause 102 removes this doubt. Clause 103 amends section 666 concerning removal of vehicles left on roadsides and public places. The section at present requires the council to go through certain procedures of advertising and then sell the vehicle by public auction. These provisions are cumbersome and expensive, particularly as most vehicles left on roadsides are worthless, and rarely can a council recover its costs. The amendment streamlines these provisions and provides as follows:

- (1) The provision shall apply to vehicles left on roadsides, public places and property owned by or cared for by the council.
- (2) The council may sell the vehicle or dispose of it as the council sees fit.
- (3) Surplus proceeds, if any, to go to the council rather than State revenue.
- (4) Owners of vehicles to be responsible for costs of removal, custody, sale and disposal of the vehicle.
- (5) Councils will still have to take the required advertisement procedures.

Clause 104 amends the by-law making powers in section 667 to empower councils to make by-laws to regulate, restrict or prohibit parking of vehicles in park lands and similar places. Councils can and do permit parking for certain purposes, such as parking near kiosks and recreational activities, and they should have by-laws to control this. Clause 104 also amends section 667, paragraph (48a). The present provision permits a council to make by-laws regarding the escape of water on to roads. Owing to a legal opinion which holds that water does not "escape" on to roads, it is necessary that more appropriate wording be used, and clause 104 does this. Clause 105 amends the regulation-making powers in section 691. Power at present exists to make regulations, and regulations have in fact been made in respect of qualifications for clerks, engineers, surveyors or overseers. The power is extended to permit qualification regulations to be made in respect of other council officers if such should be desirable. It is stressed that this is a regulation-making power only and any regulations would have to be submitted to Parliament. I have received requests from general and traffic inspectors in councils that they be given an appropriate qualification.

Clause 107 repeals section 715. This section provides a fee of 50c for laying complaints and issuing summonses. The Chief Magistrate has pointed out that this sum is long out of date. He has also pointed out that it is unnecessary to have this provision in the Local Government Act as other legislation prescribes fees.

Clause 108 redrafts section 743a to widen its effect. At present, the section provides that proof that a vehicle was standing or stationary in a street shall be *prima facie* evidence that the owner was the driver at the time. This is known commonly as owner-onus. Clause 108 extends this principle to vehicles standing in other areas where parking is controlled—

for example, in park lands. Parking is permitted in park lands at such places as the Weir and Alpine Restaurants. These parking places are intended for patrons of the restaurants, but today motorists tend to use the areas for full-day parking. Owner-onus provisions, which have applied for some time to parking in streets, would be beneficial in the control of parking in these other areas.

Clause 115 amends section 783 regarding depositing of rubbish on roads and public places. Subsection (1) (a) refers to a person who deposits rubbish. Some years ago the wording of paragraphs (a) and (a1) were altered so that now the wording of both is very similar. Paragraph (a1) is not required and, therefore, is repealed. Section 783 provides a penalty of up to \$80 for depositing rubbish. In an endeavour to help stamp out this practice, the maximum penalty is increased to \$200 and a minimum penalty of \$10 is introduced. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

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

That this House—

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

and

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

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

(Continued from February 24. Page 3578.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): After the spectacle we had earlier today in the debate and yesterday, it is doubtful whether there is any need to continue with the Minister's fairy tale. Why he did not get to his feet yesterday, say "Mary had a little lamb" and then go on with the fairy tale I shall never know, because unfortunately the document he presented to us was and has been proved to be nothing but a fairy tale. Rather condescendingly, the

Minister indicated to the House, for the benefit of the young fry or those members who were new to the House, that he would put them straight on many issues. He then proceeded to give chapter and verse for a number of issues, many of which were shown to be incorrect.

If one refers to the *Hansard* pulls, it is easy to see that his Government remained in office until March 2, 1968. Is that fact? The Government went to an election at about that time but it did not yield the reins of Government until April 16. In fact, in *Hansard*, we see the transaction of business by the Government, led by the present Premier (and the Minister was a member of his Party) on April 16. I point out for the benefit of the new members that the report was presented on June 28. He failed again to tell the House about the factors that had occurred before. He failed to say that the report had been commissioned by members of his own Party. In fact, the Premier was a party to a discussion with responsible officers before the commissioning for presentation or production of the report was given.

From that point we have had from other members opposite much fantasy about the motion. The member for Mitchell said that money spent in research always paid a dividend; many an organization would like to believe that that was true. In many instances, research does pay dividends, but ample evidence exists showing that much money expended in research returns no dividends, as there is no practical use for the product concerned. The member for Mitchell was the first member to state that, if the persons responsible for turbo-prop aeroplanes had waited a little while, they would not have lost so heavily. In this connection he and other members have referred to the Lockheed Electra, saying that it was superseded by jet aircraft. The Lockheed Electra company is not the only aircraft manufacturer to use turbo-prop engines; and these engines are still being used to good effect. In fact, the Lockheed Electra company has found a practical way of using their aircraft by putting a sting in their tail and calling them "Orion", these planes being the Air Force version of the Lockheed Electra and playing a vital part in the defence of this nation.

Mr. Payne: They have to build about 400 to break even; they are able to sell about 128.

Dr. EASTICK: If the honourable member had this information, why did he not use it yesterday?

Mr. Payne: Because I did not want to waste the time of members, as you are doing.

Dr. EASTICK: I will not deal with that matter any further; the honourable member is putting forward only those snippets of information that he thinks will serve his own purpose. The member for Mawson said that we must be careful and tread warily. I agree that that course is always wise, but there is no purpose in standing still and not treading at all: we should make some progress. By asking us to support this motion, the Minister has asked us to stand still in regard to constructing the vital needs of the freeway system, whether the term be "freeway", "expressway", or the new term.

The Minister then said that documentation of new methods of transport used in other places was available to members. I do not deny this. In fact, the Minister failed to refer to some new and most effective methods of transport being used in Japan. Does the Minister believe that, with the density of population in Adelaide, we can meet the costs of these new methods of transportation in the same way as they can be met in the three towns to which he specifically referred? Does Adelaide measure up to Los Angeles, Paris and Amsterdam in regard to density of population? I will never belittle the future of Adelaide, but we must consider the density of population and the possible use of these forms of transport before we go overboard and accept them as a *fait accompli*.

It has been said (and I point out that I am referring again to the *Hansard* pull of the Minister's speech) that he already has the wheels of industry turning, and we find that the appointment of a director-general of transport is being considered. What a strange situation it is when persons are being asked to apply for appointment as a director-general of transport and no provision has been made or any indication given as to what salary level he will be appointed on! Are the applicants to write their own specifications? Again, we find considerable difference between the opinion of the Premier and that of the Minister in relation to whether the appointment will be made. This is well documented in the information that has been made available to the House. I do not intend to delay the issue any longer. I definitely do not support the Minister's motion and I do support the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, wish to speak in opposition to the motion and, of course, in support of the amendment. Since our election to this place, the new members have received many reports on various subjects. We have had reports on road safety and on the library system, and we have had the Auditor-General's Report, to mention but a few, but I say that the Breuning report is the first we have received that has been so patently phoney. I read the report one evening.

Mr. Venning: How long did it take you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It took me about an hour to read it and to get the gist of it. My first reaction to the report was, quite frankly, one of amusement. I was amused at this essay in transportation by this authority from America. However, after a week or two, having heard what the Government intended and the importance that it attached to this document, I am afraid my reaction became one of anxiety.

The M.A.T.S. report has been withdrawn and the Breuning report is to be substituted or is to constitute a revision of the original M.A.T.S. report. I listened with great interest to what the Minister said and I shall refer to his speech briefly. The first point he made of any substance is that this was a vital part of the Labor Party's policy speech. I will not quote all of the policy speech again, as did the Minister. However, he says, without equivocation, that the Labor Party will withdraw (the key word is "withdraw") and revise the metropolitan Adelaide transport proposals. Further on he says that, to do this, the State Planning Authority will be assisted by a team of investigators experienced in the new technologies of public urban transport. Later on he states that they will produce newer forms of flexible public transit.

I may say that the speech was delivered with more than the usual vehemence of the Minister. I, like the member for Flinders, have observed that the shakier the case the greater the volume of the Minister's voice, the more strident his tone, and the more overbearing his manner. I was convinced by the tone of the Minister again on this occasion that he did not have much to offer. I did not have to turn to the loudspeakers, as we normally do when the Premier is in a whispering mood, but rather to look for the ear plugs. The Minister proceeded to justify the plan of action in view of the fact that the Labor Party had an overwhelming majority of 51 per cent at the last State election! This 51 per cent seems to me to give the Labor Party *carte blanche* for

everything it proposes to do. Although that Party received 57 per cent of the number of seats in the House, that seems to be of no consequence in the argument of one vote one value.

Mr. Hopgood: What percentage of seats would you have got with 51 per cent of the votes: about 60 per cent, I suppose?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For years the cry of the Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the honourable member must speak to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am replying to the observations the Minister made in his speech, and I should like to answer points made by him. Originally, the Labor Party had a policy of proportional representation, but with the rise of the Democratic Labor Party it disregarded this policy and now we have the catch cry of one vote one value. As everyone in the Chamber knows, this is nonsense. The Minister claims that we must press on. Let us consider the history of this matter. What was the Labor Party's behaviour when it was in Opposition? It was to knock everything. The M.A.T.S. plan had been conceived over a long time by experts. Because it is human nature, some people were disturbed (as the Labor Party knows only too well) when properties were to be acquired. The Minister would know this because of his rather painful experience in Chain of Ponds recently; people are upset when their properties are to be acquired. The Labor Party's thinking was to cash in on this situation, and it thought that the only way it could do it was to knock out the M.A.T.S. plan. The vocal and shouting Minister wanted the M.A.T.S. plan to be withdrawn, but with what could the Labor Party replace it? It had to have a plan, and here it is! I have read the report two or three times but I cannot see any definite plan of action in it. The Labor Party policy has a remarkable similarity to the Breuning report, particularly in view of certain facts that have emerged today. In his speech the Minister said:

The report is a complete justification for the attitude of the present Premier as expressed in Labor's policy speech.

A new significance has been added to this statement in the light of proceedings this afternoon. One could be excused for being suspicious. I have been called a liar by the Minister when I knew I was speaking the truth. The suspicion of many people that the Breuning

report was conceived in the light of A.L.P. policy will be confirmed, as we have been assured that Dr. Breuning was handed a copy of that policy speech. Having read the report, I wondered what sort of a man Dr. Breuning was. I do not intend to denigrate him because I do not know him and have never met him. Judging by the photograph in the newspaper, if that is a true likeness, he looks a harmless enough individual. My only association with him has been in reading this phoney report. What is Dr. Breuning? He is a social technologist. Frankly, I do not know what a social technologist is, and I do not know what function such a person would have in society. However, having read the report I have my own ideas about that matter.

I realize that he has the qualification of doctor, although I also know that in America one can get a degree in home decoration! At any rate, Dr. Breuning is a graduate in social technology and he is, I believe, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which has a high reputation. Nevertheless, when one compares his qualifications with those of the many people associated with the M.A.T.S. Report (engineers, town planners, etc.) one must conclude that Dr. Breuning's qualifications are on the thin side. I do not intend to analyse his report in detail because it is so full of contradictions and it has been thoroughly dealt with by other speakers. Does Dr. Breuning's report constitute a revised M.A.T.S. plan? The M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn. Is this thin volume that constitutes the Breuning report to replace this very bulky volume that constitutes the M.A.T.S. Report?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not supposed to hold up exhibits in the Chamber. That is entirely out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Breuning report was conceived by Dr. Breuning and an associate over a few weeks and has replaced the M.A.T.S. Report, which was the work of a large team of experts whose concentrated activity was spread over several years. The report is preceded by a letter that is personable enough. In that letter Dr. Breuning says:

The future of transportation lies in the decisions made now.

That is the one statement in the report that appears to be unequivocal and has my complete agreement. However, every other statement is immediately qualified. The statement I have quoted has elements of both simplicity and truth, but there does not seem to be much

connection between it and what we find later. In his letter Dr. Breuning also says:

We have compared transportation plans and discussed the potential for the future with many professionals the world over.

I do not know whether this report represents the accumulated experience of Dr. Breuning over many years, or whether, having had a look around here and seen some families tumble out of their cars, he then went back to America and by telephone or some other means had long discussions. I frankly do not appreciate the full import of that statement.

Mr. McRae: Why don't you give him the benefit of the doubt?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is difficult to give him the benefit of the doubt, because that statement is typical of the many ambiguous statements appearing in the report. Nevertheless, this report embodies the benefit of the accumulated experience on which Dr. Breuning has been able to draw (I take it, after returning to America). The history leading up to this report is interesting. The Minister having dealt with that history, I will not repeat exactly what he said. Of course, the history of the M.A.T.S. Report goes back over many years. In 1962, the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide Development Plan was presented to the State Parliament, and in 1964 the then Minister of Roads (Hon. Sir Norman Jude) authorized the commencement of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study.

In August, 1967, the implications of the study were explained by the Dunstan Government, and this is an interesting point. There is no reason to disbelieve that the Labor Government decided, on the evidence presented to it, that the M.A.T.S. Report was worth printing and that it wanted to have it printed before the ensuing election. However, there was some difficulty in regard to printing it, and I believe the document had to be printed in Sydney. It has been said that this report cost \$700,000 to prepare. The Labor Government authorized the printing of the report at a cost of \$31,000, to be printed before the election but, unfortunately, this did not occur. The report came into the hands of the Hall Government, which decided, properly, to take action. However, as I have pointed out, the Labor Party seized on the fact that some people were to lose their homes and as dissatisfaction had arisen out came its policy here.

The Labor Government is now stuck with the difficulty of justifying its policy, and we

have seen this in other areas. In order to catch votes, the M.A.T.S. plan was withdrawn. However, that plan has not really been withdrawn: the submissions made to the Commonwealth Government recommended action in line with M.A.T.S. and moneys were granted accordingly. Indeed, over \$12,000,000 has been allocated to proceed with the M.A.T.S. proposals this year, yet the Minister proceeds with the myth that the Government is withdrawing M.A.T.S. and substituting the Breuning report. I think only two important matters arise from this report with which I shall deal.

Mr. Langley: One is how it affects your district.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Fortunately, we do not all think the way the member for Unley thinks. One cannot deny the fact that transport is allied to housing. I recall when the Labor Party was previously in office and the then Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan, who succeeded the late Hon. Frank Walsh) said that we must consider high-density housing, because the cost of providing services, including sewerage, was becoming prohibitive. I personally disagree with that point of view, and I think the Government has probably had a change of heart. The fact is that people have been coming to us from America and other places, and we know that this high-density housing is not the best environment in which to raise families.

One thing that the Breuning report does say is that Adelaide has developed its own style. On page 4 there is reference to "smog, slum and sprawl". There, Dr. Breuning is referring to the housing development. He continues: At the same time—

he uses that qualification with every statement he makes—

there is a sense of purpose here.

On the next page he says:

We are, however, convinced that the great majority of Adelaide's citizens do not want to give up urban life with its detached houses and bit of land they can call their own, plans and planners notwithstanding.

With that point I agree. I must confess there are two points in this report with which I agree. Having said that, it is in the light of this that the matter of transport must be solved. We shall not be involved in the immediate future, and in the future in which transport must be provided, with high-density housing or high-rise living. So we come to the great contradiction of the report: we shall not proceed according to the M.A.T.S. proposals but we must get these high-speed corridors.

Here again the Minister, to say the least, claimed on page 11:

Consideration could be given to providing—and that is with reference to what the Breuning plan will do to these outer suburbs—no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs.

I compare that with the whole chapter in the M.A.T.S. Report given over to the public transport servicing of these areas. The Minister said (and I agree with this point, too), "Public transport should and must be upgraded according to the finance we can give to it." The M.A.T.S. Report states that it must be complementary to travelling by motor car, and a whole chapter of that report is devoted to the development of public transport facilities.

How would Dr. Breuning service these outer areas? He agrees there will be this type of development which, on the one hand, he calls a "sprawl" and which, on the other hand, he says is what the people want anyway. He does say:

The steady increase in car density together with the overall increase in population results in a steady growth of vehicular traffic in Adelaide.

We cannot really quarrel with that. What shall we do about it? There is no objection to it. The future of the freeways is in doubt, but what are we to do in the meantime? The report states:

In the meantime, the land needed for these routes should be acquired whenever convenient to do so.

Very well—we are to acquire the land when convenient. That comes under the action recommendations. Further on, under the policy recommendations, he says we must press on. He says:

The proposed corridors include to the south the Noarlunga Freeway alignment; to the north-west the Port Freeway alignment; to the north the Salisbury Freeway alignment; to the north-east the Modbury Freeway alignment; and the necessary connections around the west and the north of the city—that is, the alignment through Hindmarsh, across the north of North Adelaide, and connecting to the north-east corner of Adelaide proper.

But how are we to do it; when will it be convenient? On page 21 of the report there is further reference to land:

We suggest that land in the right-of-way be acquired as it becomes available.

When does land become available? When will the properties required to open up these high-speed corridors become available? When someone wants to sell his house. We shall have to wait 100 years before people want to sell their

houses, so this will involve Government acquisition. That is what Breuning is really recommending, but he does not have what it takes to say so. He is saying that we will develop these high-speed corridors when it is convenient, but all this must happen within 10 years for, in 10 years' time, the transport systems will be developed. Therefore, we must prepare for this if the land becomes available and when it is convenient.

That is the most phoney thing I have ever heard. Everything Dr. Breuning says must be veiled, and that is the phoney thing about it. He knows that the Government is proceeding with the M.A.T.S. proposals, but he must justify the statement that the M.A.T.S. plan has been withdrawn. Of course, it has not been withdrawn. This is the irony of the situation. Breuning has been given the impossible task of saying that the Government is not proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan. Only a social technologist would have the qualification that would give a man the ability to handle this task of saying that the M.A.T.S. plan is withdrawn, that high-speed corridors are needed, that land must be acquired when it becomes available, that this must be done when it is convenient, and that it must be accomplished in 10 years. This aspect of the matter is of the utmost significance.

The second important point is to consider what action is contemplated in terms of this motion. Other than this rather nebulous reference to the acquisition of property, and the making available of some information, the only action contemplated by the Government is to establish a new department. Here we are on familiar ground with the Government: this is the Government's strength. The Government does not spend money to build something, or on something that will show a tangible result. The Government is not interested in keeping the State competitive in respect of products. The Government prefers to send a roving trade commissioner abroad to drum up trade. It puts such a person on the Government payroll, and is not concerned with what this costs, because it believes that such a person will make a sale. In this case, the Government does not wish to get cracking and build something or to take a positive step to provide an asset for the State. What it will do is to set up a department, and that will cost only \$5,000,000.

That is the sort of action from the Government that we are used to seeing. The Government establishes departments, building up an empire. The Minister intends to set up

this department. In view of what was contained in the Government's policy speech, the Government must do something about transport, and it has had to withdraw the M.A.T.S. plan. I suggest that what the Government is doing is in the nature of a face-saving operation, many such operations having been carried out already. In this case, the Government is setting up a new department, with the public of South Australia picking up the tab of \$5,000,000. Not one positive step will result from the Breuning report. I hope that during the time I am a member of this place we will not get another report as phoney as this one. As one of my colleagues has said, it is an essay in schoolboy semantics. If it were not for the action proposed by the Government, the whole thing would be a farce. However, the Leader has used the correct word: it is not a farce—it is a hoax.

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): I intend to change the atmosphere and to indicate my support for the motion. I was interested to hear the admission by the member for Kavel that he did not know what the term "social technologist" meant. For his benefit, I explain that it means a technologist who is interested in the needs of society. Perhaps it is understandable that a member of the Opposition would not understand such a term.

Mr. McRae: I should have thought that his students would know that.

Mr. CRIMES: Yes. The Leader of the Opposition chose to poke humour at Dr. Breuning and the type of verbiage he used in his report. Because of the acting pretensions of the Leader of the Opposition, I should have thought he would be concerned to elaborate on his own erudition. I should have thought, too, that he would understand that all the words in the dictionary are there to be used should any individual choose to use them, and perhaps we can amplify our own use of words by taking note of the kind of verbiage used by Dr. Breuning.

It is rather odd to hear these attacks on a person who is not with us and cannot answer them, when we realize that Dr. Breuning is the head of a private enterprise firm (perhaps one should refer to it as a free enterprise firm). Usually Opposition members are all out to defend private enterprise but on this occasion they can do nothing but smear and throw innuendoes at a man whose integrity and ability are undoubted. We know that most of the people in this community still use public transport and I hope that more and more will use it in the future, because private transport, in

the form of the automobile, will have extremely harmful effects on the community because of the emissions from its motor, and I am speaking now of the development of pollution.

The Breuning report stresses that public transport should be given preference on the streets. This hits hard at the ideology of the Opposition, which favours all things private as against the public welfare. The report also stresses the bringing in of more housing and buildings under public ownership through the purchase of land along transportation channels. The report suggests that the Housing Trust take over the administration of properties when requested to do so by other agencies.

Whatever criticism one may level at the trust (and I know that there has been much criticism because of the lack of adequate housing in the community) no-one can deny its ameliorative effect on the private housing agencies' exploitation of the community's housing needs. The benefits of the trust, if the recommendation in the report is accepted, can be expanded to the great benefit of the community at large. The Opposition states that the Breuning report is a delaying report. Well, sometimes it is better to have second or even third thoughts before we put into operation something which, as has been proved in other countries, produces transport problems and pollution. Perhaps it is as well to think these things over properly before we make the mistakes that have been made in other countries.

The report refers to land and property acquisition in the meantime. We know the report refers to a 10-year period, but the reference to providing for the acquisition of land in the meantime indicates that there will be activity towards the aim of improving transport facilities and avoiding the snarling of road traffic, which has eventuated in oversea countries. The time available for considering this report and for reconsidering the M.A.T.S. plan will give us the chance to have another look at the problems that beset New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. It seems that those responsible for the M.A.T.S. plan were mesmerized by the mistakes made in these cities. The Opposition's apparent determination to ignore the potential pollution that would be caused by the M.A.T.S. plan is well in line with the Commonwealth Government's recent indication that it will postpone tackling pollution problems on a national scale. The reference to such a delay contrasts oddly with the fact

that the M.A.T.S. long-range plan has financial implications that positively take a person's breath away. The Opposition advocates this plan and hopes that it will operate as soon as possible, and this at a time when we are experiencing a situation of Gorton-created financial stringency. I wonder how the taxpayer compares this with the current calls the Opposition is making for governmental economy.

I am especially concerned that there should be a rethinking of transport developmental problems, because the M.A.T.S. plan requires the erection of a giant interchange system in an area, part of which I represent—Hindmarsh. The application of the provisions of

the M.A.T.S. plan will virtually wipe out large parts of this old-established area. Also, if the M.A.T.S. plan operates we must face up to the need to shift people from one place to another on a greater scale than will be required if the Breuning report is adopted. I am concerned that in Hindmarsh it would entail the transfer of people on particularly low incomes. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 2, at 2 p.m.