

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 28, 1969.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:  
Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act  
Amendment,  
Supply (No. 2).

### QUESTIONS

#### TRAFFIC LIGHTS

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport an answer to my question of Tuesday last about the rephasing of traffic lights at the intersection of Currie Street and West Terrace?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At its meeting of August 21, the Road Traffic Board approved an Adelaide City Council proposal for rephasing the traffic signals at the intersection of Currie Street and West Terrace, which prohibits right turns from West Terrace into Glover Avenue. This will eliminate the undesirable conflicting movements that exist at this intersection under present control conditions.

#### PARKING

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about parking facilities for paraplegics?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I recently discussed the whole question of parking arrangements for disabled persons with the Town Clerk, Adelaide City Council. As a result of this discussion I am of the opinion that the council shares the same concern at the difficulties of parking by such people as has been expressed by the honourable member.

It seems that the problem of the Adelaide City Council is to reconcile the needs of the physically disabled with the other activities of a busy city. The Adelaide City Council is sympathetic to the needs of disabled persons but believes that, with the co-operation of all concerned, alternative arrangements off the street can be found in most cases. It has therefore divided the problems of the disabled parkers into three categories.

The first is the working person who requires all-day parking. In these cases the council, when approached, contacts appropriate people in the vicinity of the workplace, to see whether

some off-street privilege can be accorded the person in question. In some cases, when the problem is brought to the attention of the employer he can make satisfactory arrangements.

The second is the person who wishes to shop, conduct some personal business or visit a doctor or physiotherapist. In this case the council has set aside two parking spaces in each of five off-street parking locations (Grenfell Street, Wyatt Street, Topham Street, Light Square and the Central Market) for two hours' free parking.

Although 30 people would have been entitled to use these spaces, only 10 have applied. The facilities have been used nine times to date. The council proposes to be flexible as to period of stay and numbers according to experience.

The third problem is that of a severely disabled person who wishes to visit the doctor and who cannot move to any degree without assistance. The council generally makes special arrangements for those persons upon telephone request.

The Town Clerk conferred with other capital city councils recently regarding this problem of city parking for the handicapped, and it is of interest to note that what Adelaide has done is far in excess of any assistance offered in any other Australian capital city.

Melbourne is the only other city that makes any special provision. It has set aside an area in Flinders Street, near the corner of Market Street (the equivalent in Adelaide would be North Terrace near Morphett Street) where nine metered spaces are reserved for handicapped people. A maximum of 55 permits are issued annually for the occasional use of the spaces. In Hobart one person has the right to have one parking ticket a week cancelled. In other cities no special facilities are granted.

Undoubtedly the Adelaide City Council has a great awareness of and considerable sympathy for the problems of the disabled and has gone further than any other Australian city to help them. The Town Clerk has said that if he is able, in any particular case, to assist in obtaining some alternative arrangement he will use all his endeavours to do so.

It is apparent that the Adelaide City Council is trying to help in a situation where many conflicting demands exist. Facilities exist for the handicapped, and particular situations brought to the attention of the council are treated sympathetically.

### ABORIGINES

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It was reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* that an outbreak of influenza had occurred at Marree, that the school there had been closed, and that the District and Bush Nursing Society nurses were coping with the situation with difficulty. The Aborigines in this centre are likely to be in much more trouble than are the white people, because the former are living under very disturbing conditions and are much more prone to respiratory infections of all kinds than are the white people. Also, their children, through no fault of their own, are in a poor state of nutrition and are living in circumstances in which it would be impossible to give them adequate care in case of sickness.

This all adds up to what could be a very serious emergency which, unless met with forethought, could cause serious loss of life among these people, and particularly loss of children's lives, as has recently been reported as happening in other States. Can the Minister therefore find out from his colleague what steps the Government has taken to meet this serious threat to the Aborigines at Marree and other centres, particularly those where the Aborigines are living as poor fringe dwellers?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the matter to my colleague in another place.

---

### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 1233.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): During his second reading explanation, the Minister gave a considerable preamble before referring to the relevant clauses of the Bill. Most honourable members would agree that this Act requires amendment. Indeed, one of the prime reasons for bringing the Act up to date is, as other honourable members have stated, to overcome certain difficulties that were detected at Millicent during the last State election.

The second reading explanation refers to the phrase "by reason of illiteracy", and it goes on to give reasons why a person should be allowed certain latitude because of illiteracy. I suppose it would be fair to say that many of the unfortunate incidents that occurred

during that last election happened because of illiteracy. It is surprising how little people know about electoral matters, particularly at election time.

The South Australian public is never slow to criticize politicians and everything pertaining to Parliament, but many members of the public have no conception of their own responsibilities in relation to elections. Apart from the need to simplify the Act wherever possible, that is perhaps one of the main reasons why it has been necessary to bring the Act up to date.

Other honourable members have indicated that this is largely a Committee Bill, with which I agree. I do not therefore intend to discuss the Bill at length. However, I should like to refer to one or two clauses, the first of which is clause 4. It amends section 18 of the Act, which provides for the use of a computerized roll. The computerized roll was introduced during the term of office of the previous Government, and there is no doubt that it results in some convenience and that it is economical to have a computerized single roll.

I sometimes wonder whether the real reason for introducing the computerized roll was neither of those that I have given but rather that it was perhaps introduced with an ulterior motive, because there is no doubt that with the present single roll we have (as some other members have indicated) largely done away with voluntary voting for Legislative Council elections. When we look at section 18 we find no indication that the roll we use today is applicable to the Legislative Council. I take it that this roll is the one that should be used, in accordance with the Act, for Legislative Council elections. However, I would have thought that perhaps there was some necessity to make some provision in section 18 indicating that the present computer roll is the roll to be used for Legislative Council elections.

I believe that if we are to have a truly voluntary vote for the Legislative Council, an election for this Council should be held at a different time from that of an election for the House of Assembly. I think a good deal of the need for many of the provisions in this Act would disappear if we had purely voluntary voting for both Houses of Parliament. It has been said by some members that there is voluntary enrolment for the Assembly. Very few people in the State, of course, would understand this, and virtually enrolment for the Assembly is compulsory by virtue of the fact that there is compulsory enrolment for

Commonwealth purposes, and as we use the same roll for both Commonwealth and State elections one automatically becomes enrolled for the Assembly. Unless one indicates that one does not wish to enrol for the House of Assembly, it virtually becomes a compulsory vote.

I believe that perhaps we were ill advised when back in the early 1940's we changed from voluntary voting to compulsory voting. If we had not had compulsory voting, perhaps there would not have been any necessity to use this term "by reason of illiteracy", because it would only be people who were vitally interested and who took an intelligent interest in the State's affairs who would go to the trouble of exercising their vote.

Clause 5 amends section 38 of the principal Act to give returning officers added powers to alter the roll. I have had some experience of the need for altering a roll. When one does a little bit of work trying to get people enrolled, particularly on the Legislative Council roll, one finds many errors in the roll. I have known cases where two brothers have had their surname spelt differently. I also know of a case where two people had identical Christian and surnames, and one of those persons had his name deleted from the roll because the returning officer took the view that there had been a duplication.

This occurred in the early stages of the combined roll, and perhaps this particular error will not occur so often in the future. However, I came across at least two cases where people with identical names found that one of the names had been deleted from the roll. It must be agreed that there are a number of occasions when it is necessary to alter a roll. Section 38 (1) contains an interesting point, and I quote:

In addition to the other powers of alteration conferred by this Act the returning officer for the State may at any time, and notwithstanding the issue of the writ for an election, alter any Council roll, and a registrar may alter any Assembly roll kept by him . . .

Now that a combined roll is used, I wonder whether that section is correctly worded? We refer to the right of the returning officer and the registrar to alter a roll. No doubt the Parliamentary Draftsman has studied the section, and I take it he is satisfied with it. However, I raise the point because it appears to me that there is some reason for bringing it up to date.

Clause 14, which alters section 73, appears to me to contain an inappropriate term. The relevant part of the clause reads:

Section 73 of the principal Act is amended—  
(a) by striking out paragraph (e) of subsection (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

(e) is, by reason of his membership of a religious order or his religious beliefs—

(1) precluded from attending at a polling booth;

I am not sure of the meaning of the term "religious beliefs"; and how wide is its meaning? I would have thought the appropriate term to use would have been "religious affiliations", because many people have religious beliefs that could be put forward as reasons for not attending at a polling booth on polling day.

I believe all honourable members agree with the amendments so that an application for a postal vote may be lodged as soon as an election is obvious because of the need for the application to be made in ample time to reach a returning officer, who would then issue the postal voting papers, thus allowing a voter to exercise his right to vote and return the papers to the returning officer. That is necessary because extended time is not allowed for a returning officer to receive such postal votes under the provisions of the present Bill, and it is necessary for the postal vote to be in the hands of a returning officer for a district prior to the close of the poll.

Clause 15 makes alterations to section 74, which deals with the duty of a witness. In addition to signing his name in his own handwriting, a witness must set out his occupation and the address of his usual place of residence. That is necessary, as can be seen by examining clause 19, which amends section 80 relating to authorized witnesses. The present list of authorized witnesses has been repealed, and the new provision reads:

Any person over or apparently over the age of 18 years is an authorized witness within the meaning of this Act.

I suppose, now that the ballot-paper must be in the hands of the returning officer before the close of the poll on polling day, the importance of an authorized witness is perhaps less than it was previously when there was an extended time for lodging a postal vote. However, the authorized witness must also witness the application for a postal vote, and this is just as important as in the past.

I question the need for the amendment in relation to the authorized witnesses. One would have thought there would be sufficient people in the previous list over the age of 21 years (though not necessarily over the age of 21 years because the list includes certain people

who need not be over 21) available to act as witnesses. It will be hard to check on a witness if we accept the provision as it reads at present. Anyway, why leave it at 18 years of age? Twelve-year-old children can read and write, and perhaps some of them even have their Intermediate certificate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A 12-year-old would be doing well to have his Intermediate certificate.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Some of them may have a far greater interest in election procedure than some of the 18-year-olds. In fact, they may not be indoctrinated to the same extent as the 18-year-olds, so they may be less biased. Therefore, if we are to alter this provision, I am not too sure whether we should not include the 12-year-olds as well.

Clause 40 deals with section 155b of the principal Act, which relates to the use of posters, banners and advertising material. Previously, the size of a poster could be 120 sq. in. We have increased that size tenfold at one stroke of the pen. This is one of the occasions on which I agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I realize, too, that there is a need to make provision for exempting cinema screens, which of course are larger than 120 sq. in. I appreciate that by increasing the maximum size to 1,200 sq. in. we are bringing ourselves into line with what is laid down in the Commonwealth Act. However, on the one hand we are bringing ourselves into line with the Commonwealth Act but, on the other hand, we are making our provisions more stringent than those in the Commonwealth Act, because that Act allows for the receipt of a postal vote posted on the Monday after the election day, provided it bears the appropriate postmark. On the one hand, we are restricting our electors and, on the other hand, we are making concessions. We should have some consistency in these matters. This is one clause I should like to look at further before I agree to support it.

The other clauses with which I agree are those relating to the Court of Disputed Returns. As other honourable members have indicated, the previous Court of Disputed Returns consisted of a puisne judge plus four members of Parliament. The members of Parliament were, perhaps, an adornment thought necessary at one stage but, giving the matter more mature consideration, we have come to the conclusion that the inclusion of members of Parliament in the Court of Disputed Returns is of no great importance. Therefore, I agree with the

amendment excluding the four members of Parliament from the court.

There are other matters in this Bill to which I could address myself, but it is largely a Committee Bill and I will give further consideration to the other clauses when the Bill is in Committee. With those few remarks, I support the second reading.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister of Roads and Transport:

(For wording of motion and amendment, see page 883.)

(Continued from August 27. Page 1240.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): When last session the Government yielded to some pressure and decided there would be a debate on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan in both Houses of Parliament, I must confess I wondered just what kind of debate would be possible on a proposal like this. I could see it becoming either a very scrappy, superficial affair or, alternatively, a political issue. Now that the debate is almost over, both these aspects have manifested themselves.

Although I think that most of the speakers in this Council (and particularly from this side of the Chamber) have made the very best of a difficult task and have brought forward some important values connected with the plan, they have received little publicity so far. I thank the Chief Secretary for his contribution to the debate. The saving of life and limb as a result of the introduction of freeways has not been denied, but little emphasis has been placed on it until now. There is no doubt that considerable benefits will flow from the reduction of accidents. In many ways, the M.A.T.S. plan is almost undebatable. Here we have a very detailed study that took five years to complete, at a cost of \$700,000, with the combined thinking of the best experts we could find. What can an ordinary member of Parliament say about such a plan? We are all laymen with little technical knowledge. We are not even consistent in our views of what the result will look like. It seems to me that a general summary of the consensus of opinion is that we think (1) that a transport plan for the future is essential; (2) that the plan must be balanced and co-ordinated; (3) that some freeways are essential; (4) that acquisition

of property should be kept to a minimum; and (5) that compensation for property loss should be as fair and generous as possible. That, as far as I can see, sums up what most people agree upon.

Given this general consensus of opinion, there are yet honourable members who say, "We do not like the plan; something else must be substituted." The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that there are alternatives, but he did not give any details. As I understand it, he said that that was up to the Highways Department to work out. The Labor Party says it does not support the plan and then criticizes the Government for having deferred certain sections of it. Opposition members asked what was meant by "deferred", as if it had some sinister portent. I ask them what is meant by their word "withdrawn" in the amendment. If this word means what I think it means (that the plan must be put in the bottom drawer and that the planners must start all over again) I cannot support that attitude. There is no guarantee that any plan would satisfy Opposition members, who have tried to make all the political capital they can out of this issue.

Despite the very clear details of proposed expenditure given by the Minister, the Hon. Mr. Bevan has said that as a result of this plan little work will be done on country roads and that the cost of living in the country will increase. I have never before heard the honourable member so solicitous for country dwellers. The truth is that opposition to the M.A.T.S. plan has come from two main sectors of the community. There is nothing surprising about this, because opposition from similar sectors has appeared in other parts of the world when new highways plans have been proposed.

The main opponents of the plan are, first, the people whose houses lie in the path of the proposed freeway or road-widening schemes and, secondly, a very intelligent group in the community that is concerned principally with aesthetics (town planners, architects, and people whom I may describe as various kinds of philosopher). I have sympathy for the feelings of both these groups, which are really at opposite ends of the pole. The people whose houses are threatened are directly concerned with the very concrete issue that their houses are to disappear or to be reduced in value. The idealists and philosophers, on the other hand, are the dreamers and planners who would like to see our urban life very different from what it is and who produce

plans and concepts from time to time that would give rise to a new way of life.

Some aspects of our way of life in Australian cities are soul destroying and visually ugly, but they cannot suddenly be changed. I have read many of the statements issued by opponents of the M.A.T.S. plan, and most of them propose a new and more concentrated plan of urban development as an alternative (that is, high-rise living and a network of fast public transport, etc.). I believe we need these kinds of alternative to be held out to us from time to time, but are they likely to eventuate within 20 years? The complaint is that the M.A.T.S. proposals work out a solution of today's difficulties but do not raise our eyes to new horizons. This is more than a criticism of the M.A.T.S. proposals: it goes much deeper. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill made such a criticism when he said:

M.A.T.S. is a plan superimposed on a town plan and thus becomes part of the town plan. The trouble with M.A.T.S., the fundamental problem with the plan, in my opinion, is that it is purely and simply a traffic engineer's plan and not a town planner's plan.

Many voices have been raised along this line, saying that the Metropolitan Development Plan is not a good plan; some say that it is not even a plan at all. It is said that it is a mere tidying up and sorting out of various forms of land use. So, many people who are critical of the M.A.T.S. plan are just as critical of the development plan on which it is based. If this is so, then we are really not making much progress. The development plan may not be a satisfactory plan within the concept of certain schools of architecture or town planning but, after all, it has been written into our legislation under the terms of the Planning and Development Act, and we cannot put the clock back.

The M.A.T.S. plan very drastically reduces the freeway proposals in the Metropolitan Development Plan. I am sure that all honourable members had no hesitation in approving that reduction; in fact, I have heard no voices anywhere saying that we should return to the concept of freeways in the original plan. So, when we ask what type of study the M.A.T.S. plan was designed for, the answer is simply that it was designed for the type of study in the authorized development plan. The overall development aspects in that plan and the transport proposals now before the Council are to be developed concurrently, and the requirements of the one, as I understand it, influence the requirements of the other. In reply to the criticism that

the M.A.T.S. plan does not have the support of town planners, I point out that the South Australian State Planning Office has issued the following statement about the M.A.T.S. plan:

The State planning authority is of the opinion that the M.A.T.S. proposals are based on sound premises. The State adopted the land use proposals and forecasts of the Metropolitan Development Plan, which had been recognized by Parliament in the Town Planning Act Amendment Act, 1963, and which subsequently became the authorized development plan for the metropolitan planning area by virtue of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-67. The State planning authority considers the recommended transport plan to be consistent with the provisions and objects of the current Metropolitan Development Plan.

Incidentally, I pose the question whether more high-rise development would mean that significant changes could be made in the M.A.T.S. plan. I would have thought that high-density development meant greater concentration of people, which in turn intensified the traffic problem. As one drives around Adelaide on any day of the week one sees hundreds of examples of five, six or more motor vehicles standing on blocks of land where only one vehicle stood before. I refer to the many home unit blocks that have been erected, to say nothing of the tall blocks of flats. As a matter of fact, there is a block of flats on land alongside my own home. The previous owner had one motor car, but now there are about 30 motor cars there. I know that those flat dwellers make many more trips than do people living in single detached dwelling houses.

By the terms of the motion we are being asked basically to endorse principles; when one does this the principles are usually in broad terms, with the details to be worked out and agreed upon subsequently. We have the Minister's assurance that the details will be brought before Parliament from year to year for discussion. It does not really matter whether this is done as a separate item or whether it is done as part of the debate on the Loan Estimates or the Budget; we will have as much opportunity to discuss the progress being made under this plan as we have to discuss any other item of Government expenditure. True, there will be very little that any private member of Parliament can do about any particular work proposed, but at least he will be put in the picture as the work progresses.

Because of this I am somewhat doubtful whether it is necessary to particularize the various works or proposals set out in paragraph (b) (ii) of the motion. This is perhaps going a bit too far, and the effectiveness of the motion might

generally be improved if its contents were somewhat reduced.

I will deal with the details of the motion because, pursuant to paragraph (a), this Council can endorse the principles underlined in the report. We are asked in paragraph (b) (in fact, we have no option but to do so, really, as we have already enacted the Metropolitan Development Plan) to endorse the principles relating to the co-ordinated development of private and public transportation and ancillary facilities. I believe that the better integration of public transport facilities will do much for the city of Adelaide.

Perhaps we have not had the most efficient use by the public of our railway system as we could have got; I have no doubt that the construction of a linking underground railway is the very thing that will improve the efficiency of the railways and improve the public patronage thereof accordingly. Whether one comes from the north or from the south, it is not always convenient for one to be landed at the Adelaide railway station. Many people who work in the southern section of the city would certainly consider using public transport if they could be dropped within easy access of their work.

Although some doubts have been cast upon the necessity for the construction of an underground railway and upon its financing, the concept behind the scheme is good. Indeed, it may be the very thing that will improve the patronage of our railway system. Until the Hon. Mr. Hart spoke yesterday, I was wondering what had become of the important matter of the transportation of goods in our community. Everyone has mentioned the necessity of having freeways and public transport systems for the mass movement of men and women going to and from work, but what about the carriage of goods? After all, that is one of the most important of our transportation needs, and I was pleased to hear the Hon. Mr. Hart make a good point on this aspect yesterday.

Not only the carriage of goods by trucks and delivery vans is involved: if a private motorist takes his suit to be dry-cleaned and picks it up from a shop in a shopping centre he is engaged in the process of delivering and picking up goods, and a tremendous amount of this occurs daily in our community. The public transportation system does not help solve the problem of goods transportation.

I am pleased that, pursuant to paragraph (c) of the motion, the Metropolitan Transportation Committee will annually make a

written report to each House of Parliament, an aspect to which I have already referred. It is good that we will be able to examine and debate those reports from time to time. With regard to the second part of paragraph (c), I am convinced that the Government is sincere in its desire to provide just compensation in the widest possible terms for persons affected by the M.A.T.S. proposals. I am pleased to hear that a special jurisdiction is to be given to a court to hear and determine matters of this kind; this is a desirable reform.

I cannot support the Hon. Mr. Bevan's amendment, because I do not agree that the M.A.T.S. Report does not adequately provide for the development of transport movement in metropolitan Adelaide. If anything, the provisions of the report are more than adequate. Indeed, the general complaint I have heard is that the report goes too far in this direction.

Also, I cannot agree that the plan should be withdrawn, if that means scrapping it and starting all over again.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is no other construction you can put on it, is there?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I do not think there is. I cannot see how any new plan could be more properly integrated regarding roads and public transport; nor can I see how any new plan could be more financially feasible. With some doubts whether the wording of the motion should be as detailed as it is, I am prepared to support it and to vote against the amendment.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 2, at 2.15 p.m.