

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 3, 1971

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

PETITION: ABORTION

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 43 electors, stating that they were unequivocally opposed to section 82a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Act, 1969, relating to medical termination of pregnancy, and that they were of the opinion that what might be considered as the psychiatric provisions in that section had been abused. The petitioners asked that the House take the necessary steps to review the law relating to abortion.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**SHOPPING HOURS**

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what exactly is the Government's policy with regard to shopping hours? I wish to quote from a transcript of a television programme in which the Minister appeared last Friday evening on a wellknown channel. The transcript of the interview shows that the Minister said several things, but I understand that generally throughout the programme he agreed with one statement, which was as follows:

We hope that we can legislate for a 40-hour week within five days and those that desire to work overtime to provide Friday night shopping or Saturdays, but this is entirely up to them and the unions to work out.

I will put to the Minister the inference that I draw so that he can correct me in his reply if he wishes. I infer from the Minister's statement that the Government will legislate for a five-day week from Monday to Friday and will legislate to allow Friday night shopping and Saturday morning shopping, with payment for Saturday morning work by employees made at overtime or penalty rates. I believe that this situation is generally attributed to the Minister, but there was some difficulty during the interview and I understand that the Minister was pressed at times, and he could not be criticized on the basis that his statements may have been a little conflicting.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are the one who is confused.

Mr. HALL: You would not allow me to pursue that line, at any rate, Mr. Speaker, but I am giving the Minister credit for the fact

that he may have been confused. The most significant statement is that the Government will legislate for a five-day working week, including Friday night, and that employees will be paid at overtime rates for Saturday morning. This matter is extremely important to traders, employees, and the House, and I ask the Minister whether he can explain it.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have told the Leader and other Opposition members several times that the Government is at present considering several proposals regarding this legislation, and I ask the Leader to be patient. Eventually, a Bill will be introduced in the House and the Leader will then know exactly what is going on.

Mr. Millhouse: But when will it be?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have said that it is being considered.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park.

OVAL AVENUE, WOODVILLE

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections must cease. I cannot hear when interjections are flowing across the Chamber. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 5 regarding Oval Avenue, Woodville?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Woodville council gave extensive consideration to the matter before adopting its proposals to close certain streets in Woodville South to through traffic. The council has been concerned for some time at the accident potential in this area and that certain suburban streets, including Oval Avenue, carry a considerable number of vehicles. Oval Avenue, in particular, has developed into a main thoroughfare through the middle of a good class residential area. It has many four-way intersections and constitutes a danger to the travelling public and to local residents. This type of treatment is supported by the recent report of the committee into road safety. I have no reason to believe that the council has not acted in accordance with the best interests of road safety and ratepayers.

CIGARETTES

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier ask the Prices Commissioner to investigate allegations made in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding cut-price cigarettes? It is alleged that some

supermarkets that are selling cigarettes at cut prices are selling special packages of cigarettes containing the equivalent of one cigarette fewer than packets sold at the normal rate. I am not concerned only about cigarettes: I ask the Premier whether he will have the Prices Commissioner investigate other allegations, which I consider to be well founded, that supermarkets are marketing goods in large cartons or large packages, without there being any resultant increase in the content. The prices are cut and the containers are marked "king size", "super-king size", or "family size". If these allegations are correct, this practice amounts to fraudulent misrepresentation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. WELLS: I ask that these allegations be investigated, because the housewife in this State has enough to put up with at the moment without being deprived of getting full measure.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the Prices Commissioner on this matter. If the honourable member can cite other cases of misleading packaging, I will ask the Commissioner to investigate those as well. I have asked for an opinion on whether, in the case cited by the honourable member, there is a breach of the provisions that we have already enacted in relation to misleading advertising.

PAYNEHAM ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the intersection of Portrush Road and Payneham Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Portrush Road between Payneham Road and Magill Road is to be widened by the Highways Department, and the acquisition of land from those properties affected is proceeding. Agreement has been reached in respect of two of the properties at the intersection of Payneham Road and Portrush Road, that is, the church property and the Commonwealth Post Office, and settlement is pending. There are no further requirements from the shopping centre property and acquisition from the Duke of Wellington site is not proceeding at this stage. Construction is scheduled to commence in July, 1972, but this will depend on the progress of property acquisition.

INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General have investigated the circumstances in which various motor car insurance companies have set up in South Australia in recent years and

then gone out of business after a brief and exotic existence? I have received from a constituent the following letter:

My case started a few years ago when I went to Insurance Brokers of Australia, for car insurance, and they insured me with Motor Marine and General Insurance Co. After several years I was approached by a representative of this company and urged to reinsure direct with the insurance company, and not through the brokers as they were in trouble with the law. Shortly after I.B.A. closed up, I believe several of the brokers involved with the company were charged with fraud. Then last year Motor Marine and General went into liquidation and a group of brokers under the name of Brecknock and Associates arranged carry-over insurance for M.M.G. clients with a company called Cosmopolitan Insurance Company registered in Victoria but with offices at the same address as Brecknock and Associates. Last week I received a letter from these brokers saying that, from rumours and articles published, this insurance company was now in difficulties, and forwarded a new proposal with another company. After phoning the brokers, they said they know little but the company has closed its Adelaide office and has gone into liquidation interstate. To date I have not had any direct notification of this from the company. But what has made me a little suspicious is that after a few inquiries I have learnt that at least one of the consulting brokers charged from I.B.A. is working with Brecknock and Associates. I think that this matter would be of considerable interest to a large number of clients of these companies . . .

The writer finishes with a rather direct and unambiguous comment on these companies, the details of which I will spare this House.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall have examined the allegations made by the honourable member's constituent. I think all members are conscious of the history of the companies to which he refers. Some months ago the South Australian Government asked the Commonwealth Government to legislate for the control of accident insurance companies, and the Commonwealth Government announced that it intended to do so. Last week, at a conference in Hobart I inquired of the Commonwealth Attorney-General about progress in this regard, and he told me that the Commonwealth Government still intended to introduce a Bill but that he could not say when it would be introduced, because it was not within his Ministerial responsibility. Since my return from Hobart, I have suggested to the Treasurer of South Australia that he communicate with his Commonwealth counterpart, who I understand is handling the matter in Canberra, to inquire whether the legislation might not be given the priority it deserved. In the meantime I think nothing can be done, except once again

to urge all members of the public, when considering taking out insurance, to be sure that the company with which they insure is a reputable and well established company that can meet its obligations. If people insist on insuring with newly formed companies that claim to be able to insure at rates that no established company can insure at, they are inviting disaster. The warning I give to members of the public is to satisfy themselves that they are insuring at the normal premium rates with reputable and established companies.

NORTH-EAST ROAD INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of October 21 about the provision of adequate lighting at the intersection of Golden Grove Road and North-East Road, Modbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Improved street lighting has been incorporated in the design for the reconstruction of North-East Road, including the junction with Golden Grove Road. The city of Tea Tree Gully has been informed of this, and the annual operating costs of the street lighting will be shared by the council equally with the Highways Department. The additional lighting will be installed as soon as possible. However, there is a backlog of street lighting work. The actual date of commencement cannot be predicted at this time, as it depends on the availability of materials and the resources of the Electricity Trust.

VISTRAM

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier have investigated the upholstery fabric which I believe is known as vistram? In correspondence which I have and which I can make available to the Premier, one of my constituents states that some time ago he purchased a chair that was upholstered with this fabric, only to find that the material, with which the chair was covered, deteriorated rapidly indeed. He has had difficulty in obtaining redress in this matter because the retailer from whom he originally purchased the chair is no longer in business and the wholesaler has taken umbrage because this gentleman has sought redress through his local member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have an investigation made.

RIDGEHAVEN SHOPPING CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of October 21 whether the Highways Department intends to build a wall on the edge of the parking lot at the shopping centre situated at

the corner of North-East Road and Golden Grove Road, Ridgehaven?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has no knowledge of a low tubular railing alleged to exist prior to roadwork and located around the car park of the shopping centre at the corner of Golden Grove Road and North-East Road. The owner of the shopping centre was required by the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully, under the terms of his building permit, to provide a concrete barrier bordering the car park to prevent accidents of the type described. He apparently saw fit to delay this installation for the several years the shopping centre has been open, possibly pending completion of roadworks. The owner has now commenced work on the required car park barrier. The Highways Department is assisting by the simultaneous provision of retaining walls where the level of the completed new roadways has been lowered adjacent to the car park.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Education say what is the present position regarding teacher recruiting? I would not seek to hold the Minister down to actual numbers, although if anyone could give me them it would be he. I have been told that, irrespective of what strides we are making in necessary education reforms, recruitment depends on the necessary supply of teachers being maintained.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it is fair enough comment to say that our current position in staffing within the schools at this time of the year is better than it has ever been, and this situation has largely come about as a consequence of two changes: the first relates to new provisions on resignation and retirement that provide an indefinite inducement to a teacher who intends to resign or retire to go on to the end of the academic year; and the second is a consequence of overseas recruitment that has been undertaken this year by the department's officers. The overseas recruiting campaign this year has resulted in the arrival in South Australia of over 200 qualified teachers. Normally at this time of the year the department is in difficulties in finding additional staff members to replace those who have resigned for one reason or another during the year and, normally, it is not until new exit students from teachers colleges are available that the deficiency can be rectified. However, that position does not apply this year, and I understand that, in terms of the time-tabling arrangements that applied at the beginning of

the year, no staff vacancies exist within the department or the schools. That does not imply that there is no teacher shortage: it simply means that on our initial time-tabling arrangements at the beginning of the year, on which we staff schools, we are at least as well off in terms of staffing schools at this time of the year. However, that position has not always applied.

Regarding the future, I believe that we shall see a gradual improvement in the number of exit students from teachers colleges and in the number of qualified teachers offering for re-employment. This year there has been a significant increase in the number of people re-employed by the Education Department, particularly of women employees who resigned to have a family and who are now coming back to the teaching profession. This trend is likely to continue in the immediate future. We shall be able to recruit additional teachers overseas, particularly from North America at least for another year or two, so the immediate prospect of obtaining the teachers we need is fairly bright. As always in matters relating to education, there is a difficulty in providing the necessary money to pay the salaries of all teachers we would like to appoint. Because of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to the national survey, the financial position for the years ahead is not clear. I hope that, if common sense will not change the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, perhaps political reasons will. Indeed, it is even conceivable that the Commonwealth Government may alter its policies on education before the Commonwealth election next year.

HOLDEN HILL SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of October 26 concerning the Samcon addition to the Holden Hill Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Samcon building being erected at the Holden Hill Primary School contains a two-teacher open unit, a self-contained classroom and an art-craft room. The estimated cost including site works is \$53,200. Work started on this addition on September 27, 1971. The builder has completed the erection of the steel structure and the external covering has been placed in position. All floor panels have been laid and the interior wall panels have been fixed. At present, work on the building is up to schedule and there appears to be no reason why it should not be completed at the scheduled time (February 18, 1972).

We hope that the building will be completed before the beginning of the 1972 school year, but this will not be possible if we do not get additional financial assistance. Indeed, had we had sufficient finance we could have started the work earlier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realize that members opposite are very sensitive about this matter but I should like to repeat my previous appeal to them, that in the interests of education in South Australia they help the South Australian Government in its endeavour to obtain additional support for education from the Commonwealth Government.

PORT RIVER CRUISE

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider using m.v. *Troubridge*, when it is not in use on the Kangaroo Island run, for showboat trips similar to such trips on Sydney Harbour? I know that a Port River cruise could not compete with the all-round charm of a Sydney Harbour cruise, but a relaxing trip on the river could be refreshing and it would be an innovation as a means of public entertainment on summer evenings.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. It is certainly one the Government has not considered. It is always worth while investigating possible sources of revenue and I shall be pleased to investigate the suggestion.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF TRANSPORT

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

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately upgrade the conditions pertaining to the engagement of a Director-General of Transport to effect his early appointment and urgently set up a council of transport to assist him in formulating detailed plans to enable the public to have a clear understanding of future transport development.

I move this motion because at present the public does not have a clear understanding of future transport development in South Australia. Although at first glance, from reading newspaper releases and listening to and watching other news media over the last few months, I should have thought that the Minister had given a tremendous amount of information to the South Australian public, on recently going through this material I have found that no sensible story can be ascertained from that study. At first, one would imagine that the

Minister was rather shy and that this was the reason why he had been backward in informing the House and the public of his and his Government's intentions. Knowing the Minister and having seen him operate in this House, I must put aside the thought that he is shy; if there is one thing one can say about the Minister it is that he is an extrovert. He always loudly proclaims his views as he tries to force them on others. Therefore, one cannot say in his defence that he has been shy and that that is the reason for his refusing to let South Australians know what he is planning.

The next and more plausible explanation of the Minister's attitude is that he has been hiding his real intentions, whatever they may be, in his public statements of the Government's intentions. When one studies the huge volume of material available, one cannot get a sensible statement from him. Therefore, obviously the Minister is either hiding his good intentions beneath a meaningless barrage of publicity or else he simply does not know what to do. No doubt it would be better for South Australia if the Minister was simply hiding his Government's intentions. It is much worse if the Government and the Minister have no idea of what should be done about transport development. I have given this preamble as some guideline why I have now adopted, and my Party has adopted, the attitude that we must have a Director-General of Transport appointed.

When we were in office, public announcements were made about what transport proposals would be implemented. The Minister of the day had full knowledge of what was intended and informed the public about this. In those days there was no doubt about the Government's intention in relation to public transport. The situation, however, has changed. Today we have a Minister who wilfully or in ignorance cannot guide the State's public transport development. Therefore, there is an urgent need for co-ordination at the highest expert level. The only way we can obtain this is to take public transport out of the political arena and put it in the hands of someone who will do the job for the sake of carrying it out properly and well. Therefore, we have decided to agree with the Government that we should appoint a Director-General of Public Transport; this is our first move to take the politics out of transport in this State.

Having stated the urgent need to outline future transport proposals, I now wish

to ask a number of questions. First, when will a Director-General of Transport be appointed? This matter has been discussed for some time in the House. Earlier the Government dealt with a proposal to appoint a supreme co-ordinator of transport in this State, certain information being given to the House about how the appointment would be made. Subsequent to that, we have seen in the press large headlines. One headline states "United Kingdom Expert gets South Australian Railway Job", although I thought that the job was to cover a much wider area than that and that he was to be the co-ordinator of transport in the State. The article states:

A British railways electrical research expert has been appointed South Australia's new Director-General of Transport. He is Dr. L. L. Alston, director of electrical research for the British Railways Board since 1965. His starting salary is believed to be \$17,000 a year. The Roads and Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, said Dr. Alston's qualifications and experience were ideally suited to the post.

That announcement was made on August 17 this year. However, by September 24 a different heading appeared in the newspaper concerning this appointment as follows: "Transport Chief Has Another Job Offer". That article states:

Dr. L. L. Alston, of London, would not take up his appointment as Director-General of Transport in South Australia because he had been offered another job, the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday. In the Assembly, Mr. Virgo denied that Dr. Alston's withdrawal was because of disagreement with the Government's transport policies. The post carries a salary of at least \$17,000.

Further supporting statements were made that Dr. Alston would no longer occupy the position. The situation is that at present we are no closer to knowing what will be done about this appointment than we were when the Minister first announced that an appointment would be made. We are still completely at a loss, although months have passed since August. Apparently the Government is having no success in finding the man it wants.

My second question is as follows: How will the department, which I take it this man will direct, spend the huge sum allocated to it? I remind members that earlier this session the Treasurer provided in the Loan Estimates \$500,000 for transport research, saying that the Government intended to finance a programme of research and development relating to public passenger transport. A first contribution of \$500,000 in 1971-72 was provided, and it was said that a more detailed announcement would

be made later in the session as planning progressed and that, if necessary, enabling legislation would be submitted. As I understand it, that sum was the first instalment of an eventual \$5,000,000 vote for transport research. The House knows little of how that money will be spent; we cannot judge what value will be obtained from this expenditure. The Minister leaves that subject as much in the air as he leaves many other matters for which he is responsible.

My third question is this: How will the Director-General co-ordinate South Australia's transport development? With what authority will he be clothed? How will he deal with the directors of the transport organizations existing in this State at present? How will he stand in relation to the Commissioner of Highways, the Railways Commissioner, and the General Manager of the Tramways Trust, as at present constituted? Will his position be inferior or superior? How are we to judge?

If we consider the monetary remuneration that this gentleman will receive, we can only assume that his position is to be inferior to those of heads of departments that he is to co-ordinate. In the Public Service, one must measure the standing of a man to some degree by his salary range. If the salary of this officer is to be about \$17,000, as stated in one report, or \$18,000, in terms of the Premier's statement in *Hansard*, his position is to be inferior to those of officers who are receiving more. Therefore, will the Government import a person to do a top job and give him a second-place position?

How is this man to be able to co-ordinate? How will he be supported in his job? What helpers will he have? I refer now to a recent survey of the situation in London, reported in *Economic and Scientific Affairs*. It is a survey of current affairs for this year, headed "Transport in London", which states:

On January 26, the Greater London Council submitted its transport plans for London to the inquiry at present proceeding into the Greater London Development Plan (see 16.1.70 p.78). As the transport authority for the London area, as provided by the Transport (London) Act 1969, the GLC is now able to put forward comprehensive plans for all aspects of London's transport system, and itself to take a major part in putting plans into effect. The Act requires the council to publish plans, regarded as short-term programmes of action for periods of around 10 years, within the context of the Greater London Development Plan as a whole. Comprehensive machinery has now been set up under the Act to consider existing transport facilities and projects of improvement; to guide preparation of plans and to review their implementation; and to act as a forum for

discussion between the various authorities concerned. It includes in *particular the Greater London Transport Group*, consisting of representatives of the Department of the Environment, British Railways Board, London Transport Executive, and the GLC. The general aim of current planning is to develop the roads and public transport to form a balanced and complete system, while maintaining standards of environment. To this end restraint of use of private cars, mainly through parking restrictions, would continue to be necessary.

I quote the report further, to show the important detail that this authority considers. The report continues:

In addition to the modernization of bus fleets and of operating methods now in progress, bus operation is being assisted by such devices of traffic management as reserved lanes for buses both with and against the prevailing traffic flow.

With what will this Director-General be supported? Is he to come here, be set up in an office, have clerical assistance, and be the handmaiden of the Minister? Is he to make the sort of statement to the public that the Minister has been making? Is he to further confuse this State, or is he to co-ordinate transport and reassure the public? We do not know these things, hence the moving of this motion, which is directed to the establishment of a council of transport. We must be sure that this man is not a political pawn and a puppet of Labour Governments in office. We must be sure that his job is safe from political interference.

I suggest that the Government should announce the appointment of a council of transport to help the Director-General carry out his duties and formulate new plans. I suggest that the membership of the council of transport should comprise the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust (as at present constituted), the Director of Planning, a representative of local government, and a representative of the airlines. I mention the airlines because the need for an integrated transport system is increasing and a freeway does not end at an airport, as a means of getting people through the airport. Air transport will require various methods in future.

I suggest that the council should also have on it a representative nominated by the environment committee, to ensure that preservation of the environment is regarded as importantly as it ought to be and as importantly as it is held in the public mind today. Obviously, private motoring, in the form of representation from the Royal Automobile

Association, and the Australian Road Federation should be involved on the council. The South Australian region of the federation should be part of the approach to a council of transport, subject to the directions and references by the Director-General of Transport. Unless the Government is willing to involve the community, as well as Government departments, in this way, it will fail in the future, as it has failed in the past 17 months in relation to transport planning. Point No. 5 is simply—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What happened to No. 4? You haven't given the fourth point yet.

Mr. HALL: Obviously, the Minister has been diverted by his colleagues.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No. You got to the third, but you didn't give the fourth. You're stumped.

Mr. HALL: If the Minister reads *Hansard*, he will find that point No. 3 is how he will co-ordinate, and with what authority, and that point 4 is about who will co-ordinate that authority.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You didn't say that.

Mr. HALL: Point No. 5 is this: how much of the M.A.T.S. plan will be current?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: How much of the M.A.T.S. plan is proceeding? How important does it feature in present transport proposals for Adelaide? These questions need to be examined in relation to this motion. The Minister has said consistently—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's an admission.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and the details are interesting. He has consistently supported public transport, amongst many other things that he has done, as I will review. A newspaper report of November 2—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That was yesterday.

Mr. HALL: Yes. I am pleased that the Minister remembers what day it is, because he has been making so many statements that I am sure he must have difficulty in knowing which day or which year it is. The report states:

Adelaide's need for rapid transport: The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) forecast last night that an electric railway where practicable and exclusive bus lanes would provide the rapid transit system for metropolitan Adelaide.

On July 21 this year, the Minister said there was a plan for an air train. The report is as follows:

A French-based company hopes soon to have a pollution-free air cushion passenger vehicle

making trial runs between Adelaide and Marino. The vehicle, the French-designed Aerotrain, is one of a number of quick-transit public transport systems under consideration by the South Australian Government. The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) discussed the project yesterday with the managing director of Aerotrain (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. (Mr. I. Hendy).

On August 5 last the Minister said that dial-a-bus could be here this year. The press report states:

A dial-a-bus transport system could be operating in Adelaide before the end of the year. In the Assembly yesterday, the Minister of Roads and Transport said, "I would like to think that well before Christmas we will see dial-a-bus in operation in South Australia."

Well, there is less than one-sixth of the year to go. In many statements that the Minister has made on various matters he has placed great emphasis on public transport, yet what is he doing? He has been spending money on roads. His statements are not at all in accord with his actions. The Minister has been busily continuing to implement parts of the M.A.T.S. plan, at the same time denigrating that plan. On October 13, 1970, the following reply was given to a question asked in another place:

In the Highways Department's road programme for 1969-70 an amount of \$12,583,981 was spent on declared urban arterial roads, which are part of the roads and routes shown in the M.A.T.S. Report.

That relates to expenditure in connection with M.A.T.S. I remind the Minister of what he said yesterday in this House in reply to a question about how much money this Government has spent on the M.A.T.S. plan. The Minister said:

Between June 1, 1970, and September 30, 1971, an amount of \$4,102,000 has been spent in the acquisition of property for transportation routes shown in the M.A.T.S. plan. This amount includes a sum of \$177,510 spent by the former Government out of general revenue, which has since been reimbursed by this Government from the Highways Fund.

Despite the Minister's emphasis on rapid public transport, he continues to spend money on road development. This harks back to the answers he gave on *This Day Tonight* in July last year when he tried to make out that he would not be spending money in such a way. On that occasion, the Minister said:

The position with the Commonwealth Government money is that this is to be spent on main roads, arterial roads, and included in this definition is freeways and expressways. There is no prerequisite that it must be spent by the acquisition of land or the building of the Noarlunga Freeway or the Modbury Freeway, or any other freeway or expressway one cares to mention.

The only conclusion one cares to draw is that the Government is doing this of its own free will. The Minister has publicly said that there is no compulsion on his Government to purchase land in accordance with the M.A.T.S. routes, yet yesterday he said that \$4,500,000 had been spent in this way. The Minister continues to misrepresent the M.A.T.S. plan, while at the same time proceeding with it.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that he is speaking with two voices?

Mr. HALL: He certainly is in this matter, as in other matters. The Minister calls for one form of transport but proceeds to establish another type deliberately of his own free choice. Sixthly, I refer to the Breuning report. Referring to the need for outer suburban transportation, the report states:

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

The report later states that there should be a commissioner of transportation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Now you agree with him at last.

Mr. HALL: I give these as examples of the futility of bringing a man to South Australia for three weeks and giving him the Government's policy to study before he undertakes his supposedly free examination of the M.A.T.S. plan and its import. I cite the futility of the Government's giving him an outline of its policy, to which he must adhere, and of then expecting him to submit a sensible report.

Obviously, Dr. Breuning closely followed Government policy. Although I am agreeing with the Government that a Director-General of Transport should be appointed, let us not forget that the Minister has adopted and promoted in this House a policy of providing no buses where there is no profit, and I remind the Minister of what I have quoted Dr. Breuning as saying in his report at page 11. The Minister cannot have it both ways.

We have a further situation regarding the Breuning report and a deliberate falsehood of the Minister. Members will recall the censure motion moved on this side, as well as the Minister's retraction. The Minister said, "I will own up when I am found out." That was his general attitude to the position then. There is no doubt that the censure motion accentuated the Minister's falsehood and that Dr. Breuning had been provided with

a copy of the Australian Labor Party's policy speech. The Minister told us that Dr. Breuning had been provided with a copy of the policy speech delivered before the most recent State election by the Premier (Don Dunstan) in order to make him aware of the Government's attitude. Therefore, the significance of the Breuning report can be largely discounted. Since then, we have had a continual barrage of Government announcements through the Minister, and members of the public are left in a state of utter confusion about where the Minister stands: they are no more enlightened on that matter than they are on shopping hours. Whatever attitude is promoted by the Government, there is no way of ascertaining what the Government thinks about this important matter of our transport development. This is highlighted for the public in the *Advertiser* of July 31, in which an excellent article sets out the best assessment I have seen in this State of our transport problems. In the Saturday magazine section, and headed "M.A.T.S.: Did Dr. Breuning really kill it", the article states:

Anyone who believes that the M.A.T.S. plan is dead is thinking on a wrong track. Freeways are still scored deeply into the future pattern of Adelaide and freeways are still strong in the concepts of the men who are actually planning, designing and building our transport facilities.

The Government is committed to at least some freeways. In his policy speech, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said: "Freeways from north to south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg, will be necessary, but we do not believe that a massive concentration of elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private cars."

Of course, it is this misrepresentation of concentrated elevated freeways that the Government is deliberately promoting in this State in order to discredit the M.A.T.S. plan. The article enumerates several points that have been made in this House, and concludes with the words "So who says the M.A.T.S. plan and freeways are dead?" The Minister has assured us that the M.A.T.S. plan no longer exists, but he has admitted that parts of it are to be completed, so the public can be excused if it is cynical about the Minister's attitude. However, there are wider issues than the M.A.T.S. plan to be considered in my motion.

What about the railways? The Minister has stepped in with his special capacity to confuse, and in the last week or so he has raised the matter of the future of the railways; he has raised fears in those employed in the

railways and those living in the country that, perhaps in addition to threatening the employment of those employed in the railways, he may also mean that transport controls will be imposed in country areas. He is raising these fears with his indefinite statements, but he then leaves the matter in that state: he does not enlighten us and does not tell us what is to happen. The *Advertiser* of October 27 contains the following report:

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that the South Australian Railways deficit had risen to alarming proportions. Co-operation between management and staff was essential in searching for a remedy, he said. Mr. Virgo was opening the annual conference of the Australasian Transport Officers Federation, attended by public transport delegates from all States except Queensland. He said the South Australian Railways loss over a number of years had been \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 Over the past three years, due primarily to cost increases, that deficit had increased first to \$12,700,000, then to \$16,100,000 and this year was likely to be more than \$20,000,000.

He is reported to have made one or two subsequent statements. Someone has said that rail discrimination would threaten jobs, but the Minister has assured the unions that it would be no threat and that he would not economize in the railways by employing fewer people. What does he mean? Previously, the Minister has strongly criticized the Opposition for terminating several rail services. It could not possibly happen that the Minister would reverse his decision and his attitude to rail services, and reduce them. He cannot do that, because he has maintained that the rail services should be replaced and that the road-bus services be removed. I think he said in his last reference that the situation had gone too far to be reversed, but from his declared attitude, can the Minister mean that he will do what he criticized us severely for doing? If he is not to replace services and not to reduce employment, what does he mean to do?

If this were a minor matter, perhaps we could afford this capricious attitude of the Minister in using the railways as a plaything and applying the yardstick of Labor policy to our economic lament. However, this is not a minor matter. The Minister referred to the deficit on railways and said that he was concerned. I assure the Minister that he has cause for concern, particularly in the remaining 18 months that he has left to him in office. If the Minister applies to the present projected deficit of \$20,000,000 the percentage changes that have occurred in the deficit for the last 10 years, he will obtain an interesting result. I

urge the Minister to do this sum: starting with a deficit of \$20,000,000 in 1971-72, apply the percentage changes in the last 10 years, and the deficit will be \$40,800,000 in 1981, and the aggregate of loss to this State for those 10 years will be \$254,000,000.

Yet, it is with this sort of enterprise that the Minister plays at present. This is a staggering loss that this State cannot afford. This loss would occur without supplying any of the new needs to be considered in the development of metropolitan Adelaide. I suppose the Minister may say that he will take some action to retrieve the situation and do something that will, in his opinion, offset this loss. As from yesterday, he is already involved in a large-scale new project as a result of the Government's purchase of the Kangaroo Island ferry. In considering the losses that will accumulate during the next few months that he is in office, the Minister cannot claim that he will reduce them by adopting the attitude that he has adopted on the issues to which I have referred. He will be confronted with an ever-increasing deficit that will amount to overwhelming proportions, unless he adopts a different attitude in his administration.

People are realizing now that Australia with a relatively small population is, strangely enough, the most urbanized population on earth, but in all of this wide continent most people live in six different situations. Taking the country cities as well as the capital cities into account, the figures I have been given show that 88 per cent of Australians live in cities and that South Australia has the greatest percentage concentration in its capital city than has any other Australian State. We therefore have in this city a most peculiar problem and one of immense proportions. It is interesting to speculate that London's population is spread (and these figures were given to me only this morning) over an area of 723 square miles. If we take the area of greater Adelaide from Sellick Beach to Gawler (although that is a little ambitious at present, but it is not too ambitious where public transport is concerned), there is to the north the northern extremity of Elizabeth, stretching north of Smithfield and only a short distance from Gawler, and we all know the emphasis being placed on the development to the south.

If we take the area of greater Adelaide, it totals 711 square miles. So there is a most peculiar factor here: it has the greatest city concentration of any State's population. Greater Adelaide's population, which is spread over an enormous area on world standards, is

unchecked. In many ways this is desirable in respect of the living conditions of those who want to live on their own block in their own house. This provides an enormous transport problem, however, from Sellick Beach to Gawler, over an area about the same as that of Greater London. This means that we must have guidelines for those involved in the physical development of Adelaide, whether in respect of a private citizen who wants to live in peace away from traffic arteries, in respect of an individual who wants to be involved in business next to traffic arteries, or in respect of a business that wishes to spend millions of dollars on a large project. Those people must know. Yet some people to the west of Adelaide, near the Hindmarsh Interchange, have said, "I know what will happen to the Hindmarsh Interchange: we will have it." What do I tell people who come to ask for my advice?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Play politics, just the same as you usually do.

Mr. HALL: I will ignore the Minister's facetious remark. The Minister should know that those people who ask for advice cannot obtain a responsible reply to their queries. So development languishes and planning cannot proceed, because the Minister and the Government will not announce a decision or apply themselves to obtain a decision to announce. We cannot have this problem that is peculiar to Adelaide, whereby this enormous expenditure is handled in this fly-by-night way of off-the-cuff announcements or the Minister's statements about an aerotrain or dial-a-bus transport. He has rejected the underground railway, although he will refurbish the Adelaide railway station. The Minister is involved in detail after detail, hardly any of which sees the light of day. In the meantime, under an apparent cloak of secrecy, he goes on believing in M.A.T.S. There is only one answer, and that is for the matter to be taken out of the hands of day-to-day politics. One could not say that the Director-General would be free from political direction: he will be responsible to the Minister. But he should not be involved in the day-to-day policy-making in which the Minister is involved. This is what is destroying the confidence of members of the public on transport: the confusing detail, the lack of knowledge, and the flow of harmful information which is of no use and which is only disturbing people.

One knows that whatever the result is in Adelaide it will have to be a combined effort on the part of many authorities on transport.

One knows, in studying the relatively thin population in the outer areas of Adelaide, that we cannot have enough public cross transport to eliminate the need for the private motor vehicle. It cannot be done within the future planning of this State as we are dealing with it around Adelaide. Yet we know that we must have a greatly upgraded system of public transport into the inner areas from the outer areas. This was part of the M.A.T.S. plan, with over \$100,000,000 involved in upgrading the railways in one section of the plan. Whatever the result may be, it must be free from day-to-day politics. We must have a coordinator who can work as an expert and with the co-operation of the other directors and managers involved in transport plans on individual lines of thought, be they highways, buses or aspects of rail transport. This man must be cloaked with authority and not given an inferior position.

It may well be that the real reason for Dr. Alston's not accepting the position was that, when he thought about it, he might well have found that he would not have the authority to carry out the duties that would be asked of him. It is up to the Government to clear up this most confusing matter regarding the biggest project that has ever faced the State. It is up to the Government to reassure people in country areas that there will be no transport control, as intended by the earlier Labor Government between 1965 and 1968. It is up to this Government to reassure businesses in this State that they can develop and invest in certain areas without fear of acquisition within five or 10 years. It is up to the Government to reassure the general public that transport is in competent hands and that one of its largest investments will be a wise one. I submit that the best way to achieve all this is to support the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN seconded the motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): Is no-one prepared to support the Leader? Surely the member who seconded the motion, if anyone did second it, is prepared to speak. I am amazed that not even one member opposite has the courage to try to defend the tripe the Leader has put up. Let us get a few facts straight. The Leader has made great play several times during his speech that the purpose of the motion is to take politics out of transport. But what happened during his speech? We got the filthiest mess of politics ever heard from the Leader. How hypocritical can he get! I expected the Leader (and I had been waiting anxiously for about three-quarters of an hour) to tell us why we

should support a motion that states that the Government should immediately upgrade the conditions appertaining to the engagement of a Director-General. He has not told us one of the conditions appertaining to it. Why has he not done so? Why is the Government being asked to upgrade conditions which have not been outlined and which have not been criticized? However, the Leader asks the Government to upgrade them. Please let us be reasonable, sensible men. Surely, if these conditions are such that they need upgrading, we could have been told where the upgrading should take place. What are the conditions? Are we not offering the man sufficient annual leave? If that is so, we did not hear about it.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Deputy Leader tells me not to be silly. If the Pom from England would shut up, he might learn, too. This motion states that the Government should immediately upgrade the conditions pertaining to this engagement. Not one of these conditions was mentioned in the 45-minute diatribe that we heard from the Leader. All he did was make his usual misquotation of salary, and he played on this, because he had not even taken the trouble, I suggest (and I am being kind to him now), to read the advertisement. I would be unkind and unfair if I were to suggest that he deliberately misconstrued the conditions for political purposes. I would rather be kind and say he had not taken the trouble to read it, because the advertisement clearly stated that the Director-General of Transport would have a salary of not less than \$A17,000 and that it would be subject to negotiations according to qualifications and experience. However, the Leader deliberately misled this House when he asked how the Director-General could exercise control over the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, and the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, all of whom were paid more than the Director-General would receive. He has not taken the trouble to ask one question on it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He doesn't look too happy.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And neither he should. It is political skulduggery to stir a little more on the last day of private members' business, as he has tried to do on this issue for the last 18 months.

Dr. Tonkin: It is our last opportunity to get anything done.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Bragg has done his share of stirring, too, with

the same lack of success as the Leader has had. I do not believe that the conditions of employment for the Director-General need any revision. I believe that the terms of office which we offered when the job was advertised are adequate for the position. I believe this was shown when we received 65 applications from all over the world.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased the honourable member did not make it 66, because his application would have gone straight into the wastepaper basket. Many of the applicants were adequately suited for this position. I believe that the selection that the State Government made was admirable, and I think it is nothing short of vilification for people like the Leader and others to offer the gutter-type criticism that they have made.

Mr. Venning: Break it down.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will not break it down: it is what has occurred here this afternoon. Criticisms have been levelled, even though members know why this man did not take the job he had accepted. Is the Leader saying that the State Government should increase the salary offered for this position to the \$65,000 it would have to offer? Is that the upgrading he is seeking? If it is, I wish he was honest enough to come out and say that. There is a report, which I imagine that other members have seen, that this is what he has been offered. This man is 44 years of age, married, a chartered engineer, a B.Sc., Ph.D. and F.I.E.E. After a post-graduate apprenticeship with the English Electric Company, he held teaching and research appointments at the Royal College of Science and Technology, Glasgow, from 1950 to 1955. For the following five years, he was employed by A. Reyrolle and Company, where he initiated the work and built up the facilities of one of the research and development sections. The section developed successfully in collaboration with the company's well established teams. Between 1960 and 1965 he was employed by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority on technological work for the fusion reactor programme, initially at Harwell and from 1962 at Culham, where he led the pulse technology group. His responsibilities included contracts placed with industry and collaboration with other organizations in England and abroad. Since 1965, he has been the Director of Electrical Research with the British Railways Board.

Mr. Millhouse: What has this got to do with the matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is the man that the Leader has sought to vilify.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! That is absolutely untrue.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the member for Mitcham agreeing with the view I hold that the Leader has been talking nonsense.

Mr. Mathwin: I think you must have called him a Pom.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not need to do better than that. I suggest to the member for Mitcham that he read *Hansard*, from which he will find out. This is the man who was selected to come to South Australia as Director-General of Transport.

Mr. Mathwin: A Pom.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He is not a Pom. I have no hard feelings towards most English people; I have a very high regard for them. There are exceptions and bad apples in every barrel, however.

Mr. Mathwin: I notice that when I look opposite.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe the calibre of this person justifies the decision of this Government (we people who are so confusing to the Leader of the Opposition) to appoint a Director-General and the selection that it made. I had the pleasure of interviewing this man when I was in England. I wish not to boast but merely to say that as a result of that interview the decision was made. Perhaps in all the confusion that he talks about the Leader might be gracious enough to admit that, incompetent as he thinks I am, at least I was able to select a fairly competent person. It certainly does the Leader no credit to suggest that this man has decided not to come to Australia because he might not like me; that was a fairly filthy sort of thing for the Leader to say.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think the Leader said it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then I suggest that the honourable member read *Hansard*. The Leader also said that the reason why this man did not come was that he believed he would not have the authority that he had thought he would have, as he would have to work under the Minister. That statement is typical of the type of debate that the Leader has introduced. I do not accept for a moment that there is any need for the House to require the Government to have a further look at the conditions pertaining to the engagement of a Director-General of Transport: the type of

person who applied when the job was advertised shows conclusively to any fair-minded person that the conditions are adequate to meet the situation.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to outline them, since you have talked so much around them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I think that I have outlined them sufficiently, I do not want to bore the House by repeating them. The honourable member should have been listening. If he wanted to speak, he should have done so when he seconded the motion. What is the basis of the motion? The Leader said that he was trying to take politics out of the matter. However, honourable members know that he has raised this matter to get political mileage for himself, but he does not realize that there is no mileage in it for him. When the Leader announced his policy before the last election he said that the public transport proposals in the M.A.T.S. plan would be vigorously pursued; that the railway from Whyalla to Port Augusta would commence shortly; with regard to roads and bridges that, in the next 12 months, his Party expected to start work on major bridges; and that it would continue to hammer the Commonwealth Government for aid to complete the sealing of the Eyre Highway, over which there would be increasing traffic. He also said that arterial roadwork proposals for the metropolitan area would be vigorously pursued, and that new roads, including freeways, needed to avoid traffic congestion, would be built. What happened to his policy? Only 42 per cent of the people supported it, whereas 54 per cent supported Don Dunstan's programme, which was that we would withdraw the M.A.T.S. plan and not proceed with the freeways envisaged.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you are doing just that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are giving effect to the voice of the people. I know that that principle is foreign to members opposite, who do not know what it is to go to the people in a democratic system.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has never been to the people in his life on a democratic basis. If he did go to the people on that basis he would get done like a dinner, and he knows it. The people of the State have endorsed the policy of the Government, so we have their authority. The Leader must have his press officers working frantically cutting out every press statement that I make, as he is fairly well equipped with those statements. He also has tape recordings

of all my statements made on radio and television. I concede that that is his job: he is in this political game and, if he can make a political mile, it is his job to do so. However, I do not like people who are hypocritical and who say that they will take politics out of the matter and then plough in politics as hard as they can. The L.C.L. said that it would adopt the M.A.T.S. plan in its entirety; there were no "ifs" or "buts". However, what happened after the elections? The Leader referred to a television interview on channel 2, but he did not realize that I had a copy of the transcript of that interview, too. He knows that the former Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. C. M. Hill) and I tried to get a few things sorted out on that programme with Geoff Michels.

Mr. Millhouse: Poor old Geoff has trouble with you and the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He had no trouble with me, but he had much trouble with the honourable member's former colleague. If the honourable member keeps quiet long enough, I will tell him about this interview. The transcript states:

Mr. Hill: Well, let me say that M.A.T.S. includes \$107,000,000 to be spent on public transport.

There are no "ifs" or "buts". It continues:

M.A.T.S. includes the finest rapid rail transport system.

At this point I rudely interjected, as follows:

By the cutting out of half the stations in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hill: No.

Mr. Virgo: That's not right.

Mr. Hill: The cutting out of the stations was not approved by the former Government. That is one of the exemptions that is not approved.

The Opposition said that it agreed to the whole M.A.T.S. plan, but apparently, if anyone disagreed to any aspect, that was one of the things it would not approve. The transcript continues:

Mr. Virgo: The cutting out of the Glenelg tramline was approved.

Mr. Hill: No it wasn't.

Mr. Virgo: Yes, it was; my word it was.

Mr. Hill: No, it was not. We were going to have a further look to see whether we could run the Glenelg tram in the underground.

The plan was approved: then the L.C.L. was going to cut it out and then, when people started to make noises, it said that it would have another look at it. I suggest that there is a fair amount of double talking in this matter. I will now deal with the series of questions that the Leader laboriously went through. I

am disappointed he is not in the House to hear the replies. He may have the loudspeaker in his room switched on but, in any case, the member for Mitcham can convey the replies to him. He asked when the Director-General would be appointed. He read from a newspaper article that claimed that Dr. Ashton (and the name of the person concerned is Dr. Alston) was appointed South Australian Railways chief.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you're having trouble with your notes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I always have trouble with the member for Mitcham, as I do with the Leader, but I have written down what the Leader said. What rather intrigued me was why the Leader would quote from newspaper reports and not from *Hansard*. Obviously he did not want facts. He would rather read a newspaper reporter's version of what was said than use the actual words said. Why would he do this? Did he want a different slant? Was that his political reason for raising these matters? Why did he not want it verbatim, as had been given to this House? Why did he not want to read the statement in *Hansard*, as follows:

Following receipt of a cable of acceptance a few weeks ago, followed by a letter of confirmation, I publicly announced that Dr. L. L. Alston had been appointed to the position of Director-General of Transport in South Australia. However, Dr. Alston has now requested that he be released from his earlier acceptance and consequent appointment because of new developments that were not apparent when he accepted the position. In seeking release, he has said that he had been looking forward very much to the challenge that the position of Director-General constituted, but since notifying us of his acceptance, he has been offered another position which is still under negotiation and which he (Dr. Alston) considers to be more in line with his professional development. In expressing regret for any inconvenience caused, he has stressed that his two decisions, first to accept the position of Director-General and now not to take up appointment, were both taken only after very serious and deep thought and discussions with his wife and family.

Why did the Leader not read that, instead of reading the newspaper report? Is he frightened of the truth?

Mr. Millhouse: There really isn't very much in that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There could be no more in the newspaper report of that statement than there was in the statement itself, so the Deputy Leader's claim is as hollow as is the Leader's action. The Leader then said that the Government was doing

nothing to appoint anyone else. That was a major statement to make.

Mr. Jennings: How does he know that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is a question that I should like to ask him. How does he know what the Government is doing? Neither he nor the Deputy Leader has been interested enough to ask what it is doing.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, I will ask you now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is improper for the honourable member to interject.

Mr. Clark: And it would be improper for you to reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. The Leader's next question was how the department would spend the huge sum of money, \$500,000, allocated this year, in research. It is remarkable how the Leader sees some things in the press (and I am also fairly sure statements have been made in the House) but misses other press statements. He did refer to dial-a-bus. I think he may have referred to the fact (at least I should like to think he had read about it) that the Government has engaged P. G. Pak Poy and Associates to undertake phase I of a feasibility study on dial-a-bus. If the Leader does not know, at least two other members on the Opposition side of this House and one Opposition member in the Legislative Council know that. That was the Leader's first point.

Of course, a sum of money that is devoted to research and planning and development cannot be expended until the department responsible for that expenditure is established, and we are trying to put the horse before the cart. We do not intend to appoint a department of planning and development that will be under the supervision and control of the Director-General until that officer is available and can have a say in the selection of personnel. Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. Jennings: It's common sense.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought it was common sense. However, apparently the Leader wants us, because \$500,000 has been allocated for planning and research, to go ahead and spend it. Is he asking us to spend it irrespective of whether we get value for it? Will he be satisfied as long as we spend it? I do not think the Leader is being very realistic.

I now turn to his third question, which was how the Director-General would co-ordinate transport. Perhaps the Leader went on a little further and clarified that by asking what authority the Director-General would have in relation to the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, and the General

Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust and by asking where the authority would lie. I would have expected the Leader (or, if he had not personally done it, some of his colleagues or staff should have drawn his attention to it) to know that last week I introduced a Bill to amend the Municipal Tramways Trust Act to place the trust under the Minister's control. When explaining that Bill, I drew attention to the fact that we would be doing likewise regarding the South Australian Railways. It is not necessary to do it in relation to the Highways Department, because the relevant Act gives the Minister complete jurisdiction over that department.

The authority of the Director-General will be exercised in the co-ordination of transport through all these various adjuncts of transport, through the authority of the Minister, which is the right and proper way for it to function. I have dealt with the inferior monetary position that the Leader has claimed would apply, and I hope that what I have said has sunk in. The Leader forgot point No. 4, but we got it eventually, and it referred to how the Director-General would be supported, what staff he would have, and so on. What amazes me is that the Leader seems to be able to get so many reports on what somebody said or did but always seems to lose, or never to refer to, the reports that could enlighten him. I must now refer the Leader to a press release of January 29, 1971, as follows:

Mr. Virgo said that the acceptance by the Government of the Breuning report means that a Director-General of Transport will be appointed to ensure that all forms of public transport are properly co-ordinated and upgraded. A new and expert organization, to be known as the Transport Planning and Development Branch, will be set up in the Roads and Transport Department and the branch will have the task of fostering, developing and testing new transport technologies.

Does that now provide the Leader with the answer about how this man will be supported and with what staff? It is there. He will be supported by the staff of the Planning and Development Branch, of which he will be the head. That was stated in January and the matter was debated in this House, but the Leader and all other members on the other side were more concerned with ridiculing Dr. Breuning than with the matter before the House. That is the tragedy of it and the principal reason why the Leader does not know.

I was interested and delighted to hear his reference to another newspaper report that he had got hold of, about the Greater London

Council, which was conducting an inquiry into major forms of transport. I was interested in two aspects. If one refers to *Hansard* reports of the earlier debate in February this year, one sees that the Leader spent much time ridiculing the newer form of transport, the personalized rapid transit. He called them comedy capsules. He is entitled to do that, but I wish that our public transport system would pay as much as do some of the capsules that operate in Disneyland, to which he referred. If we obtained the profit that the Disneyland capers, as I think he called them, make, we would have done a tremendous thing for South Australia. Whilst the Leader has seen fit to ridicule the personalized rapid transit system, using the term "comedy capsules", he also referred to the Greater London Council, but forgot to tell the House that that council had had a plan prepared for the adoption of a personalized rapid transit system in the city of London. Why did not the Leader tell us that? Would it have taken too much away from his case and made him look ridiculous? There can be no other reason.

The Leader said that the Director-General should not be a political pawn but that he should be capable of serving this Government and the next. This Government will appoint the Director-General, who, on the Leader's own admission, will be serving a Labor Government for at least another 10½ years, because a little over 12 months ago the Leader said publicly that the Labor Party was entrenched for the next 12 years. The fifth question asked by the Leader was how much of the plan was being proceeded with, and he referred to press cuttings of an address that I delivered at the University of Adelaide on Monday evening. I wonder why he did that and why he did not speak to one of his three colleagues who were there and ascertain what I said. I wonder why the Leader has not accurately checked on what was said. I do not think it is any good for the Leader to go on in this innocuous way. So that the records are completely straight, I draw his attention to a press release of the statement I made on January 29 which formed the basis of the motion moved in this House in February and which was adopted by the House. The press release is as follows:

Apart from the appointment of a Director-General of Transport and the establishment of the Planning and Development Branch, Adelaide will not be committed irretrievably to the freeways as set out in the M.A.T.S. plan. The current programme for building and widening arterial roads to cater particularly for

increasing commercial traffic will be speeded up.

Surely that is quite clear. I will now deal with another part of the Leader's speech. The Leader, not understanding the Government's policy, is claiming that members of the public are confused; in fact, it is the Leader who is confused and, the more he talks, the more he is confusing the few members of the public who listen to him. I will read only a part of the report in question; obviously the Leader has a large filing system upstairs relating to everything I have said, and I am sure he has the full details. The report states:

The freeways would not solve our transport problems; they would only make people more reliant on the private motor car. The Government will not implement the decisions made by the previous Government to construct the freeways and expressways proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan which are within Adelaide's built-up areas and where substantial demolition of private property is involved.

I do not know how many times that has to be said. Although I have said it on numerous occasions, I repeat today, I hope for the last time, that that is the Government's policy. If people think that their problems will be solved by engaging in the type of exercise in which the former Government wanted to engage, that is, building these monstrosities through suburbs such as Mitcham, Fullarton, Rose Park, and Norwood, I seriously suggest that they do a little more thinking about it. I am amazed that the Leader, who had several overseas trips during his term of office, and that the Deputy Leader also, who visited the United States (I think just before his term of office), are so blind to the mistakes which the Americans have made and which they openly acknowledge they have made. I suggest that they confer with the member for Davenport who, as I did, only recently had the opportunity of not only seeing these monstrosities but also listening to what the Americans had to say on the subject, asking themselves, "Can we dig ourselves out of the mess of 20 years of concrete pouring?" This is the type of question the Americans are trying to answer at present.

The next point with which I wish to deal relates to one of the few allegations that the Leader has made which have any basis whatsoever; that is, that I have been talking of the need for public transport but, from the Government's point of view, I have been spending money in the road sector. The Leader asked why I was doing this, but I think that was the silliest thing to ask, because

no-one knows better than the Leader does. It is because of the rotten financial structure that exists between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. The Leader knows that the State has a little less than \$1,000,000 a week available to be used on the building of roads, and he also knows that it cannot be used for anything else. In addition, he knows that, if I want to obtain \$10,000,000 to upgrade the public transport sector, I have to convince Cabinet that that money will serve the State better if it is spent on public transport than if it is spent on education, hospitals, social welfare, water supply, sewerage, or in any other area.

It is a difficult assignment to argue on that basis and, in fact, one should not have to do so. This is not a new situation and, even if the Liberals of South Australia do not acknowledge that it is wrong, the Liberal Ministers of every other State, including the former Western Australian Minister, have acknowledged that this system must be changed and that public transport must receive continuing financial assistance, with an in-built growth factor, the same as applies to road transport. The question of finance is the key not only to this problem but to most, if not all, problems. The simple but nevertheless real explanation I have given in this regard is well known and should not even have been questioned by the Leader, because he knows the reason for it. He would be the first on his feet if I suggested taking \$10,000,000 from the Highways Fund and spending it on rail rapid transit: he could be heard from here up to his farm. The Leader knows that that is illegal and cannot be done, but he has tried to take a snide political point. It was a member of his political Party who, prior to the last Senate election, said, "If we are elected as a Government we will provide the State with finance for public transport systems." So, the Liberal Party acknowledges the need for such systems. However, we do not have the money and we do not have that man, either. The Liberal Party decided to unload him; he was the Prime Minister, but he is now a back-bencher. I am referring to John Grey Gorton. Other members of the Liberal Party in the Commonwealth sphere have acknowledged the need to provide proper public transport, and to provide the finance for it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want more money for transport, education, health and everything else under the sun, yet you want income tax reduced.

Mr. Clark: And so we do!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that the Leader referred to the termination of rail services by his Government, because that leaves me no alternative but to say something I think would be better left unsaid. His Government decided to curtail the Angaston, Kapunda and Wallaroo-Moonta rail services. However, the Railways Commissioner submitted a document to the Liberal Government showing that, if he were permitted to continue to provide a co-ordinated service to Wallaroo, Moonta and Kadina (rail to Bowmans and road to Wallaroo and Moonta), he would reduce his losses, compared to those likely with the complete curtailment of services, by \$27,000 a year. However, the Minister of the day directed that the service be handed over to private enterprise. That is what the Minister and the Government of the day thought of railway finances, so it is hypocritical that Opposition members should raise these issues.

The Leader referred to press cuttings of my statements about the railway deficit, but I am not sure whether he was trying to create the impression that I should not have made these statements or that I should not have concerned myself with the deficit. He suggested that it appeared that I had just woken up to the fact that there was a deficit. If it gives him any satisfaction to think that, that is all right with me. However, I remind him that in 1961-62, when there was a Liberal Government, there was a deficit of \$8,220,000, but did the Government care about it? In 1963-64, the deficit was \$6,350,000; and, in 1964-65, the deficit was \$7,127,000. Where was the Liberal Government then? The member for Mitcham was a member of it.

Mr. Millhouse: No fear I wasn't. I was a member of the Party, but not a member of the Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope I am not asked to draw a fine line by using the word "Government" to mean a member of Cabinet.

Mr. Millhouse: That's what it means.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It might mean that to the Deputy Leader, but I regard all of my friends on this side as members of the Dunstan State Government, and they are all proud of it. However, some of the back-bench members of former Liberal Governments may be only too happy to dissociate themselves from those Governments. What did the Governments of those days do? Why were they not concerned? Why did they not make a noise about it? If one compares present-day values with past values, the expected \$20,000,000 deficit is not much different in real money value from the

\$8,000,000 deficit in 1961. I think I have a responsibility in this regard, and I intend to discharge that responsibility. If it increases the wrath of the Leader, I do not apologize to him: he must lump it if he cannot like it.

The Leader said, "We cannot do away with the private motor car." I suggest that that stupid statement and the one in the press this morning attributed to the former Minister show that that is the way some people are apparently talking to the public. Are we trying to cut out the private motor car? Can the Leader or any member of his Party show where we are doing that in any way? What would happen to the economy of the State if the motor car industry suddenly folded because of the action of the State Government? That is the most ludicrous thing even to suggest, yet the former Liberal Minister is reported in this morning's *Advertiser* as saying that that is what we are doing, and the Leader has repeated it in the House this afternoon. What utter rubbish! I expect that all Opposition members will have to vote in favour of the motion, because they will get the cane if they do not. However, few will vote for it with enthusiasm.

I said at the beginning of my speech that the Leader had not advanced any reason for upgrading the conditions appertaining to the engagement of the Director-General. I have told the House and I have stated publicly many times that we are trying to fill this post with all speed, and I have again detailed to the House the decision of this Parliament that we should establish a transport development branch. I cannot understand what this council of transport would have to do. The Leader said that the council could comprise the Commissioner of Highways, the Railways Commissioner, the General Manager of the M.T.T. and representatives of town planning, local government, airlines, the Committee on Environment, the R.A.A. and the A.R.T.F. Where will all these people lead us? The suggestion here is that they will formulate detailed plans and assist the Director-General. Is it proposed by the Leader that we set up so many committees that the Director-General has to spend his time attending committee meetings, or do we want him to head his transport development branch? Do we want him to co-ordinate transport under the supervision and jurisdiction of the Government? I think we have to get our priorities straight on this and I believe there is a simple way to do it. Accordingly I move to amend the motion as follows:

By striking out all words after "That" in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof:

this House commend the Government's action in creating the position of Director-General of Transport and its declared intention to make an early appointment to that office, and support the Government's decision to establish a transport and development branch under his control.

I am at a complete loss to understand how members opposite can do other than support that amendment if they agree that the position of Director-General of Transport should be established. It has taken members opposite 12 months to agree to that, and for that I thank them. They ask for it to be done expeditiously and this amendment confirms the intention of the Government to make an early appointment. Members opposite are also asking for this rather strange-sounding council of transport when they are apparently oblivious to the fact that as soon as the Director-General is appointed this branch will be established. They should not have been oblivious, because this matter has been the subject of debate and decision in this House, but I know a lot happens and it is difficult to remember everything. If the Opposition supports the view put forward by the Leader, that the purpose of his motion is to take politics out of transport, they have a wonderful opportunity of proving that they are genuine by supporting the amendment I have moved. The amended motion will then be a unanimous expression of opinion of this House and there could be no better way of taking politics out of transport.

Mr. PAYNE: I second the amendment *pro forma*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the motion and I unhesitatingly oppose the amendment which the Minister gave suddenly to the House at the end of his hour-long speech. This amendment merely whitewashes the Government. It does nothing and it leaves out altogether one of the important parts of the motion moved by the Leader, which is for the establishment of, as he calls it, a council of transport to help the Director-General of Transport. I was glad that the Minister got up to speak after the Leader, although I did not enjoy the invective and the jeering which he gave members on this side in an attempt to get one of us up before he spoke. I deliberately did not rise to speak on the motion because I wanted to see whether he had anything to say in reply to the points raised by the Leader and particularly in reply to questions asked by the Leader. I was disappointed in the Minister's speech because he

did not give us information except in the last part of the speech, but it was information irrelevant to the motion.

The first part of the speech was merely invective and abuse, particularly of the Leader, without anything constructive. If any member wanted any proof of the need for a Director-General of Transport to co-ordinate transport in this State, it was apparent in the Minister's speech this afternoon. At present, there is no-one but the Minister responsible for the co-ordination of the various bodies responsible for transportation.

Dr. Eastick: Do you say he is a responsible Minister?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I used the word in its technical sense—responsible to this House. There is no-one else, and the Minister obviously is never prepared to give any information or a straight reply to any question. He makes the most contradictory statements, as has been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today and as we saw ourselves during the Minister's speech. That is the greatest confirmation we could have for the requirement for a speedy appointment of a Director-General of Transport.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He cannot even co-ordinate his thoughts, let alone a transport system.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I do not intend to go through all the things the Minister said, because that would be as tedious as it was to listen to him in the first place. The Leader deliberately couched his speech in the form of a number of questions that could be answered easily by anyone who genuinely wanted to give information to the House. The first question was as follows: "When will a Director-General of Transport be appointed?" I wrote it down, as the Minister said he wrote it down. Not one word was said in reply to that straight-out question. All the Minister could do was to pretend that the Leader had blackguarded Dr. Alston. However, the Leader did not criticize Dr. Alston at all; Dr. Alston was offered a better job and he took it; no-one could blame him for that. We know it is embarrassing for the Government and unfortunate for the State that the person appointed is not now coming and that there is, therefore, to be a considerable delay in the appointment of a Director-General of Transport. The Leader did not criticize Dr. Alston, yet that was all the Minister could say in reply to the first question. We now have no better idea as to when that appointment will be made than we had 65

minutes ago when the Minister started his speech.

It appears that the Minister of Education intends to speak to this debate. I ask the Minister again, as he is supporting his colleague, when we can expect the appointment of a Director-General of Transport. That is what we want to know and it was the first question asked. The next point raised is simple and has been raised by me and other members from time to time. How can we expect a man, who is expected to take a position advertised as from \$17,000, to co-ordinate the activities of Government officers and heads of the Railways Department, Municipal Tramways Trust and so on who are being paid more? In society today, status and salary are closely tied together. As Parliament decides it, we know that the salary of the Railways Commissioner is over \$20,000.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you sure?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think so; I think it is \$20,600.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You said you knew it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has spent his whole speech giggling in this way. I have been with him in this place for 3½ years during which I have come to know when he is uncomfortable. He mutters to himself on such occasions, as he muttered during the Leader's speech, and he tries to put off his opponents by making silly and irrelevant interjections.

Mr. Langley: You'd be a past master at that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad to know that I have had some effect on the honourable member. If the Government intends to pay the Director-General more than it pays the Railways Commissioner, the General Manager of the Tramways Trust, and the Highways Commissioner, why does it advertise the position of Director-General as from \$17,000? That was the point that the Leader was making, and it is the point of the motion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you complaining about salaries and conditions?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is most obvious and, had the Minister not been intent on avoiding the point, he would have seen it. He is not a fool, whatever else he is. I know that we do not have the detailed conditions being offered for the job; I am sorry about that, but we must accept it. All we know is the salary, and that is all we knew at the time of Dr. Alston's appointment. On August 19, after his appointment had been announced,

after referring to the appointment of Mr. Currie the Minister said:

We are attempting to make sure that we never again have such a fiasco involving a man such as Dr. Alston; hence the delay in his appointment. Dr. Alston has been offered the position, which he has accepted. When he says that details are subject to confirmation, he is referring to the contract which is currently being drawn up and which will be subject to negotiation between the worthy doctor and the State Government.

One would have expected that at least the Government had some idea of the conditions that could be published before it made an appointment. I do not argue with the Minister that it is better to have a man appointed before the department is set up, but surely when a man is offered a job he can be given an idea of the conditions before he is asked to accept them. Yet, on the Minister's own admission, that was not done in this case. Those are two of the obvious points omitted by the Minister in his long reply, although they were two of the most significant points made by the Leader. I wondered whether the Minister would say anything at all about the council of transport. Obviously, when he read the motion he miscalculated the line the Leader would take, preparing his notes in the expectation of the Leader's taking a somewhat different line. That is why he was at some disadvantage, as we all noticed.

Dr. Eastick: Was he on the wrong bus?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether he gets on a bus at all these days. Until the last five minutes of his speech, he did not say anything about the council of transport that we suggest should be appointed as an advisory and co-ordinating body to help the Director-General. We believe there is merit in this suggestion. Certainly the Minister was not able to say anything to the contrary except to say that it would be yet another committee, brushing it off in that way.

We believe that we are now changing to a system under which various sectors of transport, which have previously been controlled by independent or semi-independent boards, will now be under governmental control, so it is appropriate that we should have a co-ordinating advisory board in which several interests can participate. After all, the previous Labor Government did the same thing when it appointed a Minister of Social Welfare, to whom the Director of the new department was responsible, and then set up an advisory council. That is an analagous situation. The Minister did not have much to say about this proposal in the motion, or no doubt he would

have dealt with it earlier than he did. I hope we will receive replies to these questions. Since we have left office, in appears that, in spite of contradictory statements by the Minister and his deliberate refusal to give information, things have gone on very much as before. Although there is a denial that freeways will be built, land is being purchased for them. I notice that the Minister spoke about freeways going through Mitcham and Fullarton. He did not refer to the Noarlunga Freeway which is to go through his own district and which he and the Minister of Education opposed so bitterly when they were in Opposition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did you support the Hills Freeway?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: When things are different they are not the same. You moved in Cabinet to get it knocked out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We did not go on with it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At this stage!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have complained earlier about the Minister's interjections, which he makes in an effort to put off those who are taking part in debates. If the Minister of Education speaks, I hope he will say where he stands with regard to the Noarlunga Freeway and whether he takes the same position now as that which he took when in Opposition. Perhaps he will let us know whether or not the Noarlunga Freeway is to be built and what route it is to take. I believe the Government is continuing along the same lines as we followed when we were in office. The same plans are going into effect, but they are being denied and this is causing confusion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us why you were buying the land for the Hills Freeway the day you went out of office, when you say it was rejected by your Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the Minister knows, the answer to that is the question of hardship. I am afraid that I relied on the Minister's making more points in his speech than he did make. That was why I did not speak before him: so that I could reply to the points. I think that the only points he has made have been replied to. Having asked several questions, I shall be pleased if the next speaker, who I hope is the Minister of Education, will answer them and say when we are to have an appointment. I also ask why the salary is to be so low and what the Government really thinks of our proposal for a council of transport to assist the Director-General.

I come back to the main point that we consider it urgent that we have in South Australia a skilled professional officer to co-ordinate transportation in the metropolitan area. We do not consider it satisfactory to have merely a Minister who is an amateur, and a most unsatisfactory one, in this position. We support the Government in the appointment of the Director-General but we think he should be appointed immediately and that he should be linked with the council of transport.

I shall now deal with the amendment, which the Minister poked in at the last moment. As I have said, I oppose the amendment because it does not mean anything. It takes away the whole motion and it is simply a commendation of the Government's decision to appoint a Director-General.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't agree with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we do, and we support the rest of the motion, but, as the Minister well knows, we cannot support the amendment, because it cuts out several significant parts of the original motion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It cuts out the council of transport.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is playing dumb now. We are not willing to see that go. We consider the council to be an important element in the future planning and co-ordination of transport in Adelaide. I am pleased that the Leader has moved this motion this afternoon. I had hoped that it would clear the air. It has made clear our position in this matter and I only wish that I could say the same for the Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The only aspect of the debate this afternoon, from the speeches by the Leader and the Deputy Leader, that has made clear their position has been their evident desire to continue their campaign of deliberate misrepresentation of statements by the Minister of Roads and Transport and to continue their personal attacks on him. I shall deal first with the charge made against the Minister by both the Leader and the Deputy Leader that the Minister and the Government, having announced that the M.A.T.S. plan and freeways would not go ahead, have acted in a contradictory way if land is still being purchased.

The Leader and the Deputy Leader are delightfully displaying disingenuity by saying that land is being purchased for freeways. That is nothing more or less than complete and deliberate misrepresentation of state-

ments that the Minister has made several times. The position on this matter is that the Government has decided that certain routes are necessary as transportation corridors. The use of those transportation corridors will have to be determined precisely in future. At this stage it is clear that we need to keep our options open. It is also clear at this stage that these routes are not necessarily freeways.

Therefore, land being purchased along these routes is land for a transportation corridor. It may conceivably be a freeway, but it is more likely to be some other form of rapid transit corridor. The Government has argued that it is necessary to take this action to keep its options open. I think that position is clear. The Government has not said that it is purchasing land for freeways. That is the statement by the Leader and the Deputy Leader and it is their misinterpretation of the Minister's statements.

It is simply an attempt by the Leader and the Deputy Leader to further embellish their relationship to aunt sally. The technique of the Leader and the Deputy Leader is to set up some kind of aunt sally by misrepresenting statements (in this case, statements by the Minister of Roads and Transport) and then to knock it down, saying that there is a contradiction. The Leader and his Deputy would never have got an aunt sally in the first place but for misinterpretation.

In fact, by implication, we have the lie given to what the Opposition has tried to do on this matter by none other than the member for Davenport. I think it would help those members who were not present to refer to page 1900 of *Hansard*, which contains a report of a question asked of the Minister of Roads and Transport by that honourable member. She made clear that she had serious doubts about the suitability of a freeway system. In explaining the question, she said:

Recently, in the United States of America I travelled about 15,000 miles by road, so I had a good chance to study its transport situation. I only hope that we shall be spared some of the nightmare developments in road systems that I have seen there. At the proper time I could speak at great length on this subject.

The whole burden of the honourable member's question was that her visit to the United States had convinced her of the unsuitability of complicated freeway systems and of the need to develop various forms of rapid transit and to explore the possibilities of new forms

of transport. At this stage of our knowledge, we cannot determine exactly what the future transport situation will hold, but we know that we must have our options open and make relevant choices, hence the need for transportation corridors and the need to continue to purchase land for them.

On Dr. Breuning's advice, the appropriate transportation corridors at this stage seem to be identical with certain of the M.A.T.S. routes. Therefore, acquisition along those corridors is proceeding. There is nothing contradictory in this. It is simply a wise policy that will enable future Governments to have and to exercise a clear choice as to our future transportation system. It is clear from what members who have travelled overseas have said, as well as from the advice of oversea experts and others, that methods of transport and views on those methods are changing rapidly. It would be the greatest folly on our part to proceed with what is clearly recognized overseas to be an inadequate freeway system: that is, the M.A.T.S. plan. That plan has been discarded, but the need for some form of transportation corridor has not been ignored. There is nothing contradictory about all this; it is perfectly clear and straightforward. The only thing that has caused confusion all along has been the deliberate attempt by members of the Opposition, especially by the Leader and the Deputy Leader, to misinterpret in order to try to make some political capital out of the situation, and for no other purpose whatsoever.

Mr. Gunn: You're putting up a smoke-screen.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader and the Deputy Leader have been putting up a smokescreen, which is entirely of their own creation. I have not put up any smokescreen; what I have said is fully consistent with statements made by the Minister and other Government members. What has been misinterpreted by the Leader and the Deputy Leader, as well as by other Opposition members, is the statement that land within the built-up metropolitan area is still being purchased for freeways, but that is simply not true. For some reason, members opposite think there is political mileage to be gained from trying to spread that statement around.

Dr. Eastick: Read yesterday's *Hansard*!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The reply to the question asked yesterday referred to the South-Eastern Freeway which, in the main, is not through a built-up area, and land is being purchased there for that purpose. That

is a freeway where further work is proceeding in open countryside and, as the member for Light well knows, the reply given yesterday refers to land being purchased directly for transportation corridors.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I suggest that the member for Flinders, the member for Glenelg, and others read some of the literature on what are alternative transportation possibilities in the future and on the fact that, in order to develop these possibilities, one has to have land reserved for them. Surely members opposite have, somewhere amongst them, the necessary intelligence quotient to work out that, if land is being purchased for a future transportation corridor (it may be a modified system of public transport akin to a railway or something of that nature), that is not a freeway in the sense of a right of way reserved exclusively for the use of private forms of transport including the motor car. There is a clear distinction between a freeway, as we know it, reserved for the motor car and something that will be similar to the South-Eastern Freeway.

Mr. Evans: Does public transport use a freeway?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Public transport can use a freeway. The traditional freeway can be used only by public transport in the form of a bus; that is all. If we are talking about a transportation corridor in terms of possible future developments, it may not be a corridor along which private motor cars travel at all; so it is not a freeway in that sense. If members opposite would simply accept that possibility and realize that the Government, in the interests of the future of South Australia, is keeping open its options, we would be much better off, and members opposite could save us the distasteful experience of having to listen to their personal attacks on the Minister of Roads and Transport and their continued use of invective against him. This would be of great benefit to everyone and it would enhance the standard of debate in this House.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think he might reciprocate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think no-one's temper has been more sorely tried than has that of the Minister of Roads and Transport, who has continually been subjected to deliberate misinterpretation in this House. I think the Minister has been more than reasonable in the calm and considered way that he has put up with all this. After 12 months, the Opposition now agrees that a Director-General

of Transport should be appointed, and that appointment is being negotiated at present. The Deputy Leader now wants to know when the appointment will be made, but that is like asking the Deputy Leader, who will be at the conference this evening, to tell us when that conference will finish. I suspect that the Leader and Deputy Leader are aware that, on matters of this sort, the Government accepts the advice of the Public Service Board and that, in negotiating for the appointment of a Director-General of Transport, where presumably the possible salary could cover a wide range (depending on the qualifications of the respective appointee), the advertisement should be in a form that creates ambit, giving the Government the maximum room in which to negotiate.

Initially, of course, the Leader and other Opposition members wanted to suggest that Dr. Alston had refused to come to South Australia because, it was alleged, he had heard something dreadful about South Australia. Shortly after that allegation had been made without any foundation whatsoever, a report appeared in the *Sunday Mail* that Dr. Alston had accepted a job with the World Bank, according to the *Sunday Mail*, at a salary of \$62,000. The Leader and his Deputy are not suggesting that we should pay that much. It is unfortunate that we have lost the services of Dr. Alston to the World Bank and that the bank can offer that kind of salary, particularly to someone we wanted to get here. It is clear that the salary for the work involved in the service of the bank would be far beyond our range. There has been no suggestion, however, as the Leader and his Deputy know, that Dr. Alston was offered a salary of \$17,000. The advertisement said "from \$17,000" and, surely, it should be recognized, first, that in any negotiation an ambit should be created to allow room in which to manoeuvre and, secondly, that the Government in this matter acts on the advice of the Public Service Board.

Dr. Eastick: Couldn't the Government—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I assume that the member for Light knows more about this matter than does the board! Thirdly, there has been no suggestion that Dr. Alston was offered a salary of \$17,000: all that was done in the advertisement was to set out the absolute minimum salary that might be contemplated in negotiations between the Government and the prospective appointee.

I think that Opposition members would be aware of the dramatic differences in salary that might be warranted and qualifications

that might be held by a variety of possible candidates for the position. This would be even more reason for creating an ambit for the negotiations that might take place between the Government and the prospective appointee.

Now I come to the ridiculous suggestion of the member for Mitcham—"him who is Deputy Leader". He says it is impossible to have a situation where someone in the Public Service is appointed at a salary and has to give instructions to someone on a higher salary. I point out that Ministers of the Crown are on salaries much lower than those of top civil servants, and we will be considering legislation to enable the Government of the day to give certain directions to the Municipal Tramways Trust and to the Railways Commissioner. Every member of the Government except the Premier earns a salary significantly lower than that of the Railways Commissioner.

Mr. Hall: The Premier is paid it, but he's not earning it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader may care to make that sort of statement from his own experience in Cabinet, but I prefer not to be involved in the question of who is earning what. Surely, what is critical in this matter is who has the authority to make the decisions. The matter of salary is a relatively less important matter, although people who regard status as the most significant factor might regard the relative salary as being of prime importance. I think the critical factor in this matter is whether there will be the necessary structure of authority to enable co-ordinated decisions taken by the Director-General to be implemented. If the Director-General can convince the Government of the day as to the appropriate policy to be adopted in the transportation area, will that decision be given effect to? That is the answer we want, and it will apply so far as this Government's policies are concerned.

The Deputy Leader carried on at some length saying, first, that he recognized that it would be inappropriate to staff the transport branch of the department before appointing the Director-General, obviously recognizing that it would not be suitable to tie the Director-General's hands before he was appointed. The Director-General, whoever he may be, should have some say in the staffing and development of the branch of the Government he is to head. Nevertheless, the Leader and his Deputy, while effectively admitting that point, do not mind saddling the

Director-General with some cumbersome council of transport which, presumably, would have some authority over him. They do not mind doing that before he is appointed, but they are not willing to wait for the new Director-General's views on whether or not a council of transport would be appropriate. If it is good enough to say that the final development of the transport branch should await the appointment of the Director-General, surely the same applies in regard to the council of transport. That applies independently of any query we might raise about the council of transport or of compounding the complicated administrative arrangements that already apply in the transportation field.

Surely, if we are to get a co-ordinated and effective policy in the whole field of transport, we must have an administrative structure which has some basic sense to it and which permits co-ordination. I think that the council of transport, as formulated by the Leader in the motion and as explained by him, would not help co-ordinated development in public transport or in any other area of transport. Rather would it be a means of ensuring that all those involved in transport who were pulling in different ways could maintain the maximum degree of tug in the direction they wanted to go. It would be a technique of delaying co-ordinated policy decisions in this area by making them more difficult to carry out.

Quite apart from that question, I would not, even if I could, accept the general worthwhileness of the motion of a council of transport and I would not want to establish such a council until we had had suitable advice from the new Director-General. I think that Opposition members, having listened to some extent to the member for Davenport, are in the process of withdrawing from the previous stance taken by them over freeways, and they are partially changing their point of view. It has been a long, slow and agonizing process for Opposition members and I sympathize with them in their difficulties in this matter. They have come part of the way and, if they would open their minds and clear out the cobwebs that have been left there for so long—

Mr. Millhouse: How did you come around on the Noarlunga Freeway?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My position has not changed. I was against the 1962 freeway route. Prior to the election the Government announced that it would not proceed with the freeway, and that decision has been implemented since the election. The Government's

policy at election time was that it thought that certain freeways would be necessary. If there has been any change in policy since the election, it has been the change in emphasis from the statement in the Premier's policy speech that certain freeways, including the north-south freeway, would be necessary to the direct statement that these routes are to be thought of as transportation corridors, and the likelihood that they will be freeways for the private motor car is now very small indeed.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that the case now?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has been the case all along. It was made clear in our election policy speech that at the time we thought certain freeways (the Port Freeway, the Modbury Freeway and the north-south freeway) would be necessary. If there has been any change in the Government's position, it has been a strengthening of its view that these roads, whatever they may become in relation to transportation, will not be freeways for private motor cars. Any freeways built will, like the South-Eastern Freeway, be in open areas: they will not go through the built-up areas of Adelaide. As I do not want to be unfair, I will relate my next comment to the Leader and Deputy Leader, who are the two members opposite who deliberately misinterpret things. The others are moderate gentlemen who carry on and do their best to be loyal to their Leader and Deputy Leader. However, I hope they will say privately, "You have gone on long enough with this business of misinterpreting what the Government is saying on the matter. We are all getting a bit sick of it. You have accepted the idea of a Director-General. Why not listen to the member for Davenport and accept not only the amendment that the Minister has moved to this motion but the whole principle of the Government in respect of transport?"

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEAT BELTS)

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result of their discussion forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

The purpose of this motion is to allow the House to adjourn prior to 6 o'clock this evening until 2 o'clock tomorrow so that the only members whose time will be involved as a consequence of the conference will be the managers for the House of Assembly. Other members who are not involved in the conference will be able to avoid the wearisome business of waiting around for hours and hours for the conference to conclude. It will enable members to get on with many of their commitments and business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not oppose the motion. I am one of those who waited here until 3.30 last Thursday morning for a conference to conclude and for a report to be made to the House. It is a burdensome and time-wasting process. However, this is the first time that we have adopted this new procedure, and one matter has been raised with me which is of some importance and which I think you ought to consider, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps give a direction on before we vote on this motion. The point is that, at some time during this evening or tomorrow morning, the conference will be concluded (successfully or otherwise, depending on one's point of view), but we will then have to wait until 2 o'clock tomorrow before we can receive the report. I do not know whether the report is to be made at 2 o'clock, when it will cut into Question Time, or whether it is to be regarded as Government business and will be made at 4 o'clock. We have not considered that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The motion says that the report is to be made forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That, I presume, means 2 o'clock, and it will cut down Question Time. I do not necessarily argue about that, but this will be the result of the suspension of Standing Orders now proposed. What is going to happen between the time when the conference ends and 2 o'clock with regard to any information getting out about it?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You might not be finished by 2 o'clock.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Alexandra has his point of view on this and I have mine. If this were a Select Committee, nothing could be said about it until the report was made. I do not know whether this applies to a conference of managers. There will be many people, particularly amongst the news media, who will want to know what has happened. Do they

have to wait until 2 o'clock tomorrow? Does anyone who divulges information about the result of the conference commit any offence under Standing Orders? I think this is a serious aspect of the matter not because it is a matter in which I am interested but because this is a new departure in procedure, and I do not know whether it has been as thoroughly thought through by honourable members as is warranted. I look for your guidance, Sir, on the matter so that we will know where we stand on this. Members of the press will be waiting for the report and I think members are entitled to know about this before a vote is taken.

The SPEAKER: I consider that the motion moved by the honourable Minister of Education is clear. The sole responsibility of managers is to report the results of the conference to the House, and, in my opinion, the revelation of the result of the conference to anyone before reporting it to the House would be disorderly. I consider it is the responsibility of the managers to report to the House in the same way as they report now, except that the House will adjourn until 2 p.m. I will now count the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order: the Deputy Speaker has already counted the House.

The SPEAKER: I understand from the Deputy Speaker that he had not finished counting the House and, as Standing Orders require it, I must count the House. There is no point of order. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 2529.)

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

I oppose the Bill, which seeks to provide that there shall be an inquest in the case of every death resulting from a road accident or from every death which a coroner has reasonable cause to suspect results from a road accident. This matter having been canvassed in the House last session and this session by way of question, I have already indicated my attitude towards it. It may be worth referring to exactly what has taken place with regard to inquests resulting from road accidents. The information I have is that for a considerable time within the area

of jurisdiction of the City Coroner the following practice has obtained: where a person has been charged with an offence in which the question whether the accused caused that death is an issue, inquests have not generally been held. This is because of the provision of section 20a of the Coroners Act, which provides, in effect, that the Coroner shall not proceed with the inquest until the charge has been disposed of. In those cases, once that has happened, the facts have been fully ventilated, so that any further proceedings at the inquest are redundant.

Secondly, where all the known relevant evidence of the circumstances of the fatal accident have been given in evidence in a court of summary jurisdiction, generally speaking no inquest is held, again for the same reason. Thirdly, where no person other than the deceased and no other vehicle has been involved in the causation of the accident and no person other than the deceased has been injured, again generally there is no inquest unless there are some special reasons. Fourthly, where the deceased is a young child and it is shown from police reports that death was not due to the fault of anyone, and the parents of the child do not desire an inquest, in such cases there is generally no inquest. In other cases, it is the practice of the City Coroner to hold an inquest.

During the year ended June 30, 1971, in the area of jurisdiction of the City Coroner there were 137 deaths, and 75 inquests were either held or were pending in respect of those deaths. Possibly the proportion of inquests to deaths in country areas is considered lower than the proportion in the area dealt with by the City Coroner. I have not been able to check the figures referred to by the member for Flinders in his second reading explanation, but I suspect that the figure of 73 probably represents the inquests actually held and the inquests which might be held, or are still to be held, in respect of deaths occurring during that period, because obviously the inquests generally will follow some substantial time after the time of death. I simply refer to those figures to indicate just what is taking place within the jurisdiction of the City Coroner.

I have already made many points on this topic. I think that the idea that the automatic holding of inquests in relation to deaths resulting from road accidents will confer some public benefit or in some way serve to reduce the road toll is entirely misconceived. I make it clear, as I have done in the past, that I am always in favour of the holding of inquests, but

I recognize that there are cases (and perhaps a number of cases) in which no purpose is served by the holding of an inquest. I think that it may well be that in country areas too few inquests are held, but I do not think the remedy is to pass a law that requires an inquest in every case.

Mr. Venning: How do you get around the problem?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will come to that. Let us analyse the situation. In many cases a road death results in a charge of some kind, and all witnesses give evidence in the court on the case against the motorist, so the facts are fully ventilated. Nothing further can be added by the holding of an inquest. A police report is always made in respect of a road death, so there are reports to the coroner of statements taken from witnesses, observations of police officers, results of the post-mortem examination when an autopsy is held, and all the information available on the death of the victim. That goes on the files and is made available to those who have a legitimate interest in the information it contains. It is all there. There are cases where nothing further can be added by the holding of an inquest in which oral evidence is taken.

Sometimes, as I have said, the facts have been fully ventilated at the hearing of a charge in court, and this was the policy behind section 20a of the Coroners Act. I do not remember when it was enacted, but it was put there a few years ago precisely because of the duplication that was occurring. Prior to the passing of that amendment, the practice was that, when a death occurred in circumstances in which the coroner considered that an inquest should be held, an inquest would be held and the coroner would decide whether there was a *prima facie* case against some person in respect of the death on which that person ought to be committed for trial on some charge, and the coroner would actually commit for trial.

The defendant would then go before a magistrate at the preliminary hearing, and ultimately there would be a trial before a jury in many cases. Frequently there was duplication and doubt about which should go first, the coroner's inquest or the preliminary hearing. Sometimes the preliminary hearing did not take place. I think that, very wisely, the procedure was adopted that, where the police were preferring a charge, the case ought to be proceeded with in the ordinary way. The facts can be ventilated before the magistrate or in the criminal court and, generally

speaking, everything that is to be known about the matter will then be known. The coroner can still decide whether an inquest should take place, but generally speaking he will not hold an inquest.

To compel the coroner to hold an inquest, with the taking of oral evidence, in those circumstances would be absolutely absurd. It would achieve nothing and would be a gross waste of public money and a great inconvenience to the people concerned. There are other cases in which no good purpose is served by holding an inquest. All the facts are obtained by the police and often there are just no witnesses who can give oral evidence about the matter. Generally, the driver involved will be advised by his insurance company to exercise his privilege against self-incrimination and not to give evidence, and very often he is the only person who can say anything about the events that have occurred. He will generally exercise his rights and say, "I decline to answer questions, on the ground that they might incriminate me." An inquest in those circumstances becomes an absolutely fruitless exercise, a waste of everyone's time, an unnecessary cost to the State, and an inconvenience to many people.

There are other cases in which the holding of an inquest has positively undesirable consequences. One has been referred to me by the City Coroner in the practice that I read out, namely, in the case where the deceased is a young child, the parents do not want an inquest, and no light would be thrown on the matter by an inquest.

I remember another case in which both parents of a young child, a girl aged about 10, 11 or 12, were killed and the only witness who could have given any evidence, the only eye-witness left, was this child. The end result of an inquest would have been for this young girl to go along and give evidence about this accident that had resulted in the death of her parents. Already the accident had had a traumatic effect on her, and a tragic and disruptive effect on her life. She would not have contributed anything which was not already known and which she had not already told the police, and an inquest would have been a harassing exercise and would have contributed nothing to the sum total of knowledge of the events of that accident. In many cases there are positive reasons why an inquest should not be held, and in other cases it is simply the negative reason that no purpose would be served by it, and the holding

of an inquest, generally speaking, will not contribute anything.

Considerable emphasis was placed by the member for Flinders on the public aspect of the inquest. He suggested that, because an inquest was public, in some way it would contribute to the education of the public, and that, if an inquest had to be held into every death, because of the public character of the inquest, it would contribute to the education of the public and to reducing the road toll. The honourable member did not explain how this would occur and I have not heard anyone else explain it.

Inquests are probably held weekly in metropolitan Adelaide: I think the coroner's court held 75 inquests last year. How many of those inquests received any publicity from anyone? How many of them have honourable members seen reported in the press? They are reported in the very rare instances where there are sensational circumstances, and almost always when there are sensational circumstances that would interest the press some charge is laid.

Mr. Venning: Is this the point?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Is there any other point? No-one has explained what other point there may be.

Mr. Venning: The people involved.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The people involved can obtain all the facts anyway. They can get access to the reports to the coroner and, if the coroner refuses to hold an inquest, the Attorney-General has power to direct him to hold one if the people involved who have a legitimate interest (the relatives or people who have a possible civil claim arising out of the accident) apply to the Attorney-General. Since I have been Attorney-General, I have always directed the holding of an inquest in these circumstances.

Mr. Venning: What about the Clare case?

The Hon. L. I. KING: No relative ever asked me to hold an inquest in the Clare case, and I said in this House that, if I were asked, I would direct that an inquest be held. I think the honourable member asked me a question, and I invited him to tell the relatives that, if they wanted an inquest into these deaths, I would direct that one be held, and I would have done that. The only people who sought an inquest into the Clare incident were two doctors who had nothing to do with the matter.

I will not direct the coroner to hold an inquest, at the request of two strangers on the matter, when the people concerned do not seek

it. If those concerned had sought it, their application would have been acceded to. No-one, whether the member for Rocky River or any other member of this House, can point to a single case in which, since I have been in office, an application has been made to me by somebody having a legitimate interest in the matter (either a relative, next of kin, or person having a possible claim arising out of the accident) to direct an inquest and I have refused to direct one.

It is my practice to do so. About a month ago I directed an inquest into an accident case where an unfortunate drowning had occurred. Everyone concerned thought that it was an unfortunate accident, that no light would be thrown on the matter by holding an inquest, and that the inquest could lead to unpleasantness. The coroner decided not to hold one.

The mother applied to me, saying that she was suspicious about the possibility of foul play. Frankly, I could not see the slightest ground for her suspicion, but the fact that she held that suspicion was enough ground for me to direct that an inquest be held, and it was held. I strongly favour holding inquests, but I do not believe that it is for this Parliament to write into the law a requirement that in every case an inquest must be held, regardless of whether it is the reasonable or sensible thing to do, and I have already explained my reasons for that.

I was asked earlier to say what was the remedy for the relatively low proportion of inquests to deaths from road vehicular accidents in country areas. It is a problem that I recognize, and I think it is important that it should become known that the avenue is available of applying to the Attorney-General to direct an inquest. That is a matter, I suppose, of publicity, and it is a matter on which members, especially those representing country districts, can assist. In addition, although it is not easy to do (but I believe that progress is being made), I am trying to ensure that in each case in which an inquest is refused the papers come to Adelaide for perusal by some member of the staff of the City Coroner or the Attorney-General's Department, so that we can see whether there are cases in which obviously an inquest should have been directed. Perhaps in that way, by degrees, country coroners can be educated to the importance of holding inquests in cases where civil claims may be in question or where the relatives, for one reason or another, may want an inquest to be held.

This is not easy to organize, because the reports to the coroner in the country are filed in the police station; they do not come automatically to the city, and it will require some organization to get them to the city in order to enable supervision to be exercised in the matter by the City Coroner or by the Attorney-General's Department. I have been working on that for some months, and I think a considerable improvement may be expected in future. However, I want to stress clearly once again that, in my view, inquests ought to be held in every case where the next of kin consider it desirable, either to satisfy their own minds as to how the death occurred, or perhaps even to have made public some facts which they feel may exonerate a deceased relative from any suspicion perhaps in relation to liquor or some other matter.

I believe that in such a case there always ought to be an inquest and, where the coroner declines to direct an inquest, I will direct that inquest. There may, of course, be the exceptional case where I may be satisfied that the harm done from holding an inquest may be greater than any good that may come of it, but I have not experienced such a case yet where there has been a legitimate request, and I think that such a case must be extremely rare. However, I believe that for this Parliament to say that in every case there must be an inquest would be to thrust on many people inquests which absolutely no-one wants and which serve absolutely no purpose at all, and I would strongly oppose that suggestion. For that reason, I oppose the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (HOURS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 2541.)

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): Someone has said that the decline of western civilization dates from the invention of the saxophone. That statement purports to be a statement about the decline of western civilization; in fact, it is a statement about that person's estimate of a certain musical instrument. I suggest that we are in somewhat the same situation regarding this debate and the Leader's reasons for initiating it this session. The Bill purports to refer to shopping hours but I consider that, as the debate has progressed so far, we can learn far more about the Opposition and its reasons and motives for introducing the measure at this time. As I

move around the place, people ask me such questions as, "Why has Hall blown it?" and "Why has he introduced the measure at this time, when it can be of no political advantage to him to do so?" My estimate of the situation is that the Bill has been introduced at this time because of the Opposition's fear that the Government will soon be moving on this issue; and in that situation, of course, it would have the ground cut politically from under its feet. Therefore, the Opposition misrepresents the situation in an attempt to gain a splash in printer's ink now, before it is too late.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you care to clarify the Government's position in regard to this matter in the light of things that have been said by the Minister? We have been trying without success to get some clarification.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I remind the member for Mitcham of what the Minister has said in this debate and again this afternoon: namely, that we are continuing to negotiate with the people involved in industry.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, you don't know?

Mr. HOPGOOD: The member for Mitcham asked me to pass an opinion—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HOPGOOD: —yet when I am part way into it he makes some sort of judgment on a statement that I have not as yet completed.

Mr. Millhouse: Please go on.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I thank the member for Mitcham. With his tolerance, I point out that, as I see the present situation, the Government is negotiating in order to determine how best we can satisfy all those people who are involved in this situation. As I see it, three sets of people are involved. First, there are the members of the general public, and they have varying degrees of enthusiasm for this issue.

The Hon. L. J. King: Including the residents of Mitcham.

Mr. HOPGOOD: It is interesting to note that, when we examine the referendum result in Mitcham last December, we find that 41.89 per cent of the people in Mitcham voted in favour of the question, and 49.75 per cent opposed it, and those figures included the wife of the honourable member. I make perfectly clear that that was probably a deliberate vote on the part of the people of Mitcham, because there was an informal percentage of only 8.36 per cent, and that

is somewhat below the mean for the various districts.

Mr. Gunn: What was it in Mawson?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Members opposite are asking me to read out certain figures for certain districts, and I am happy to do this, because the thing that has always beaten me is exactly what validity State electoral boundaries have to shopping districts. State electoral boundaries are ephemeral things: if we look at the metropolitan boundaries, we see that they are different from those that existed two or three years ago. It is clear to anyone who studies the trend of population at present that already it would be possible to justify a further redistribution of State electoral boundaries. As boundaries change all the time, I cannot see why we should be tying shopping districts to the State electoral districts.

Mr. Millhouse: You never made that point last year when the Bill for the referendum was passed.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I am sure I did; I am sure that this was one of the big objections to the vote in electoral districts as being, in effect, some sort of local option poll. If we are going to regard State districts as having some sort of validity with regard to shopping districts, why stop there? Why not go down to the polling booth level to see how people vote there, because polling booths have a greater degree of stability than have State electoral boundaries? If we do this exercise, we see some most peculiar results emerging.

In the District of Coles, for example, there was obviously a majority of people who voted "No": 6,136 voted "Yes" and 7,515 voted "No". But at the Athelstone polling booth, 597 voted in favour and 505 voted against. Would members opposite suggest that we draw a line somewhere between Athelstone and Hectorville, Newton or Paradise and say that there shall be one set of rules on one side of the line and another set on the other side? The member for Torrens would have real problems in this respect, because the return for the Torrens District shows some interesting results. We find, for example, that Torrens as a whole voted "No" (5,866 in favour, 6,430 against).

When we get down to the polling booth level, we find that Lower North Adelaide voted "No" (291 in favour, 333 against), whereas North Adelaide voted "Yes" (988 in favour, 896 against). Walkerville voted in favour (985 in favour, 732 against), whereas nearby Sefton Park and Prospect South were both

"No" polling booths. Is it seriously suggested that we put a ring around part of North Adelaide and Walkerville? We could even include Vale Park, because if we look at the figures for that polling booth we find that 661 voted in favour and 610 voted against, even though Vale Park is in a State electoral district that voted decidedly against the proposition (5,953 in favour, 6,900 against).

The Fisher and Heysen Districts show a most confusing pattern: one town voted one way, whereas another town voted the other way. The fact that Fisher or Heysen finally came down one side or the other is purely a statistical accident, something which came out in the wash and which was in no way related to the way the people in the Hills villages voted at their polling booths. The Leader has assumed a variety of positions on this question. Back in November when we were discussing this matter he thought we should leave things as they were and that the fringe should continue to have Friday evening trading, whereas the inner city area should not be allowed to have late trading. This, of course, would have gone nowhere at all to remove what has been called the festering sore that existed in the retail industry in relation to lack of uniformity. Later, he said he was in favour of an open slather, as I think he called it. Indeed, I think he said in the debate that he was in favour of no controls on trading hours. Yet in this Bill, by legislative fiat he would have us bring in uniform Friday evening shopping throughout the whole of the State. So the Leader, inasmuch as he speaks for the whole of the Opposition, has changed his position from time to time on this matter.

Late shopping is being debated in various parts of Australia and is bringing a considerable amount of unrest and criticism because it is an issue on which one can never really win or on which all segments of the population can never be satisfied. When Sir Henry Bolte announced his intention to do something along similar lines to what is contained in the Bill, he immediately brought down a hornet's nest on his head because he had omitted to do the very thing that the Leader has omitted to do: namely, to consult with the relevant people in the industry. It is one thing to hold up an ideal and say, "This is what we believe should be done," but it is another thing to do the hard yakka on how to legislate sensibly to bring in this reform that is regarded as desirable. I have said several times (and I carried it out at the

referendum) that, although I would not make use of Friday evening shopping (because any shopping centre at its busiest is a good place to keep away from), nevertheless I see the advantages of it, and I do not object to it.

Mr. Mathwin: I'm sure I've seen you in the Lazy Lamb.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Never in the Lazy Lamb. However, it is one thing to state my viewpoint, but it is another thing to work out how it can be done in such a way as to balance the various interests existing in the community on this issue. I pose four questions to the Leader and I believe, although I should be giving the Leader the benefit of the doubt, that he would have to reply honestly in the negative to each of them. Yet they are questions crucial to the determination of whether or not such legislation could ever be given effect to.

First, has the Leader discussed this Bill with the employers and employees in the retail industry, or has he simply "done a Bolte" and invited all sorts of industrial unrest from the employees in the industry? What is the Leader's position on a 40-hour week for shop assistants? Does he believe that shop assistants should have to work longer hours than other employees in the community? Does he believe that this is a benefit that can be obtained for shop assistants only by a long series of negotiations through the arbitration system (negotiations that have gone on for a long time now without bearing any fruit), or is he in favour of assisting them by means of legislation to obtain a reform which is enjoyed by practically every section of the work force in this country and which has been enjoyed by these people for many years? Has the Leader consulted with the people who will be directly affected by the Bill?

The second question is this: Has the Leader considered the effect of the Bill on the retail price structure? What does the Leader know about the effects on overheads in the fringe areas as a result of the discontinuance of late evening trading? I do not know. I have heard that the larger retail establishments on the northern side of the city are now making greater profits than previously because, although their gross takings have been reduced slightly as a result of the shorter trading hours, their overheads have been reduced significantly on wages, on air-conditioning that has not had to be turned on for the extra hours, and on lighting, etc. I do not know, but I have heard it said that this is the case.

Unfortunately, this cost advantage, which is the result of the shorter trading hours, has not been passed on to the general public in the form of lower prices. It is difficult to induce the retailer to pass on such a cost advantage to the general public in terms of lower retail prices but, if the retailer were faced suddenly with higher costs, within five minutes those higher costs would be passed on to the general public. So, in posing the problem, I ask whether the Leader has considered the effect of the Bill on retail prices. I remind honourable members that the Bill, purely by legislative fiat, seeks to bring in late Friday evening trading throughout the State. My third question for the Leader is directly related to places such as Port Lincoln.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members for Eyre and Unley must discontinue interjecting across the Chamber. I saw both of them clearly on this occasion.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Leader consulted with those people who live in those country towns which have at some time in the past elected to adopt metropolitan trading hours, because, by an across-the-board amendment to the Code, he now seeks to reverse that previous decision introduced? Earlier I referred to local option, pointing out the absurdity of trying to introduce local option at the metropolitan level or to interpret the referendum result in terms of a series of local option polls. In the country this is possible because no-one will bother to travel from, say, Naracoorte to Mount Gambier, towns which are not so far from each other, simply because one town may have longer trading hours. Therefore, the principle of local option has operated in the country for some time. By the Bill, the Leader seeks in effect to sweep away that system. I ask him whether he has consulted people in these areas to find out whether this machinery, which has worked well in the past, should be abolished.

Fourthly, I ask the Leader whether he has considered the means whereby this policy of his could be explained to a metropolitan popu-

lation which overwhelmingly voted against it only 13 months ago. I pose this question to the Leader because these are the very questions which the Government has been looking at closely for some time and which it is continuing to examine closely. The point is that we will not be stampeded into premature action by any Bill which the Leader happens to introduce. In referring to the referendum vote last year, the Leader said that the opponents of 9 p.m. Friday shopping combined to produce a fear in the minds of the public that Saturday morning shopping was threatened. The Government had made it clear all along the line that Saturday morning shopping was not threatened. The Minister of Labour and Industry made clear at the time of the referendum that it was not threatened, and that position still applies.

If we turn to the results of the referendum, one of the biggest factors in the decision that was brought down was in fact the intervention of the Leader. If one looks at the old metropolitan area, one sees that the stronger the Labor area the stronger the "No" vote, and the stronger the Liberal area the weaker the "No" vote. I say that because there was no actual "Yes" district in the metropolitan area.

That is some indication that a significant proportion of electors in the metropolitan area in fact cast their vote purely as a reaction against the position the Leader adopted at that time. In summing up, I simply make the point that the Government is continuing to look at the situation and, unlike the Leader, it is consulting with all the people directly involved in the situation. However, we refuse to be stampeded into premature action, and for this reason I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 4, at 2 p.m.