

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 6, 1974

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

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

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

GOVERNMENT HOUSE FURNITURE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (February 21).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only items of furniture from Government House that have been sold over the past two years were purchased on September 21, 1972, by Brigadier W. Wearne, then Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor. The furniture, which had been located at Peppertree Cottage, was as follows: one sofa, \$10; one single-bed mattress, \$5; two small bookcases, \$5; two cane chairs, \$4; and two sets of curtains, \$6: a total of \$30.

WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (February 27).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One additional classroom has been placed on the Waikerie Primary School site. No decision on the need for a second classroom can be made until enrolment statistics for all primary schools are collated and accommodation requirements listed in priority order. The consultant architects have submitted for consideration new plans for the conversion of the infants section of the school to open-space teaching. These plans propose a comprehensive modification that is estimated to cost \$70 000. Approval for the work to proceed was forwarded by the Education Department to the Public Buildings Department on March 5, 1974, but no date can be given at present as to when the work will be undertaken.

MONARTO

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (February 28).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Expenditure on land acquisitions to February 28 has been \$1 167 447, and all other expenditure to the same date has been \$241 177, making a total of \$1 408 624.

DEPARTMENT TRANSFERS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier give details of his decision to transfer to Monarto not only the Agriculture Department (which transfer the Government has announced) but also the Lands Department and the Environment and Conservation Department? A document now circulating throughout these Government departments contains the text of a minute, purportedly from the Premier, outlining details of the Cabinet decision on the future of these departments. The document states, in part, that if Monarto is to be an early success it will be necessary to relocate the three departments named. It also states that the whole of these departments will be moved except those sections that

are essential to provide a service in Adelaide. It goes on to say that the move will not be made before 1977. The Premier has already indicated, in reply to a question in this House yesterday, that the position of officers of the Agriculture Department who are not willing to move will be precisely the same as applies to all Public Service personnel. From that we can conclude that, if the officer does not want to move where the department sends him, he can always find another job. This appears to be a situation that will face not only one department but at least three. Therefore, I ask whether the Premier will give the House any further information he may have, and whether he will give an assurance that the Government will safeguard the future of all officers of these departments, particularly if for personal reasons they do not wish to move to Monarto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some time ago the Government announced that three departments were moving to Monarto, namely, the Agriculture Department, the Lands Department, and the Environment and Conservation Department. The minute merely confirms that earlier announcement by the Government. Some time ago the Government established a relocation committee under the chairmanship of Mrs. Stevens (a Commissioner of the Public Service Board), who is currently working with the departments concerned on the transfer to Monarto of the major part of these departments. It is necessary, of course, to examine each of the functions of the departments to make certain that the necessary service to the public is maintained. Regarding the moving of officers, the relocation committee has on it a representative of the Public Service Association, so there is constant discussion on the committee regarding the terms and conditions under which people will move to Monarto.

Dr. Eastick: Does the committee have the Callaghan report?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has the Callaghan report available to it. Regarding the conditions of the move of public servants to Monarto, they will not be treated less favourably than are Commonwealth public servants who move from elsewhere in Australia to Canberra, but, of course, the same conditions must apply. It is not possible for us to say that we will move part of a department in which someone is employed but that somehow or other we will maintain him in Adelaide when employment in Adelaide for him does not exist. That would be impossible for us and, if the Leader had any experience in administration, I am sure that he would know that full well.

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr. COUMBE: In view of reported comments on the current price of gas from the South Australian fields and of the reported statement of the Minister of Development and Mines that he would welcome and support the extension of exploration work in this State, can the Minister say what practical action has been taken by the South Australian Government, especially the Mines Department, to assist and promote further exploration work for oil and gas within South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I, as Minister, have issued a statement setting out clearly the conditions under which we invite and encourage an interest in mining exploration in this State. This has provoked considerable comment and questioning within the mining industry. The Mines Department has had a considerable number of inquiries in relation to this matter, and I understand that the mining

industry has welcomed the definite decision. It is along these lines that we welcome exploration within this State, and we also are not opposed to overseas capital being involved in the exploration phase, provided that at the exploitation phase there is majority Australian equity within the situation. We understand that the equity situation in relation to companies on the Stock Exchange fluctuates from day to day, so we have said to mining companies, "Get your package together, given the broad outline that we have set down, and then we will have a look at it on its own merits. We will also do what we can in putting your case before the Australian Government if, in fact, this case needs to be heard at that level." As I say, the mining industry has considerably welcomed this definite policy statement, and I believe that it will go a long way towards assisting an upturn in exploration in this State.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether it is intended to use part of Belair Recreation Park as a solid waste dump site and whether the denuded areas on and near the public golf course are to be replanted? On the existing golf course, which at present is either bare or covered in dry grass, there is about 1 000 tons of building rubble, which has been lying there for some months. I have waited patiently for some action to be taken in this regard but there has been no action. Last year the department concerned moved into the area and removed many trees, claiming that it was upgrading the present golf course. However, all that really happened was that a bulldozer moved in and knocked down trees so that there could not be a public outcry against the destruction. Ever since, the site has remained the same; some tree slumps are left, but no real action is taking place to carry out work that was said originally to cost \$90 000. The area is merely a dump site for rubble from demolished buildings. Can the Minister say what is intended and when the work in question will be carried out?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I would certainly agree with the honourable member that the matter remains static. Certain works are continuing, and I assure the honourable member of two things: first, that the areas surrounding the golf course which will not be required for the fairway will be planted with trees; and, secondly, that the material in question has been placed there for the purpose of constructing the course. As soon as possible, I will bring down a report for the honourable member setting out exactly what work has been done and outlining what must still be done to complete work in the area.

POLICE FILES

Mr. HALL: Is the Premier aware that in police files there is a report which was placed in the hands of the police in the latter part of last year and which confirms the statements I made in the House about the management of the Federated Storemen and Packers Union of Australia? Will he inform the Commissioner of Police that such a report is in the files of the Police Department? Last week, Superintendent Tobin was reported as saying that a complaint had to be made before the police could act. He continued:

We don't want to pin it down to individuals: the complaint needn't come from Mr. Hall. If the facts presented indicate a crime has been committed, naturally we would investigate the complaints thoroughly.

As such complaints and reports have been in the hands of the police for some months, I ask the Premier whether

he is aware that the police have this report and whether he will inform the police of what they have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of the contents of the police file on this matter; this has certainly not been reported to me. With regard to informing the Commissioner of Police about what might be in his files, I should have thought that the honourable member was as competent as I to do that.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that any reason not to do it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What could the honourable member suggest would be the purpose of my informing the Commissioner that the member for Goyder had said in this House that he believed there was something in the police files? The member for Goyder is in the same position as is any other member of the public. If he has material to put before the police concerning a crime, he can go directly to them: he does not need my intervention.

Mr. Millhouse: So you won't do anything?

Mr. Hall: You're dodging the question.

Mr. Millhouse: And you all know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is intervening, and honourable members will abide by what he says.

PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say how many warnings have been given following receipt of complaints concerning the display of pornographic literature in newsagencies and delicatessens? In reply to a question I asked recently, the Premier set out the following procedure fully: on receipt of a complaint, the complaint is noted, a warning is given, and prosecution will follow if the warning is unheeded. I am still receiving a steady trickle (not a stream) of complaints to my office about the display of material of an explicit sexual and pornographic kind. My advice to people who are complaining has been that they should follow the advice given—

The SPEAKER: Order! In explaining his question, the honourable member may not give advice to anyone. He may give information, but he may not offer advice.

Dr. TONKIN: With great respect, I am simply stating a fact. I have advised people that—

The SPEAKER: Order! In explaining a question, the honourable member may not advise people, although he may explain his reasons for asking a question.

Dr. TONKIN: —they should contact the Vice Squad. I am interested to know how many complaints have been received and warnings given this year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I can recollect, three cases have been referred to me this year, and I gave directions in consequence. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

LEGAL AID

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say what view the Government takes regarding the establishment of the so-called Australian Legal Aid Office and what co-operation, if any, exists between the State and Commonwealth Governments regarding its establishment? I understand that the Commonwealth Government, acting through the Commonwealth Attorney-General (Senator Murphy), is setting up, without legislative backing but by administrative act, an Australian Legal Aid Office in each State and that it is proceeding to recruit staff, and so on, with a view to offering legal advice and other services to members of the public. There is (and I will not go into this aspect because I would be commenting) much controversy concerning the method of establishment and the

aims of the Australian Legal Aid Office, which obviously cuts across certain legal assistance schemes (and certainly that provided in this State by the Law Society) that are already operating. I therefore ask the Attorney this question to ascertain what is the South Australian Government's view on the whole idea.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The decision to establish an Australian Legal Aid Office was taken by the Commonwealth Government, and so far I have received no request from the Commonwealth Attorney-General for co-operation in relation to that plan. The honourable member would be aware, of course, that the Commonwealth Attorney-General established a committee to survey the provision of legal aid that is currently made available, and at that time he approached me to ascertain whether I could suggest a member of the South Australian profession who had been concerned with legal aid matters and who would be of value to the committee. Subsequent to that conversation, Mr. E. P. Mulligan was appointed to the committee, which has, of course, reported to the Australian Attorney-General. The Law Society has consulted with Senator Murphy regarding the co-ordination of existing legal assistance schemes with the work of the Australian Legal Aid Office. At the meeting of Attorneys-General held in New Zealand, Senator Murphy agreed to the establishment of an officers committee consisting of Commonwealth and State representatives for the purpose of considering how the funds the Commonwealth Government would make available for legal aid in the next financial year should be channelled. I understand that this committee will examine the matter and that the Commonwealth Government intends to proceed with the establishment of the Australian Legal Aid Office. However, the co-operation of State Governments in this regard has not been sought.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it is a good idea?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I favour the idea and, if the South Australian Government's co-operation was sought, I should be happy to give it. I see a great possibility for the establishment of a co-ordinated scheme of legal aid consisting, in part, of the work of the Australian Legal Aid Office and, in part, of the sort of legal assistance that has been provided in this State for some years by the Law Society, together with the new forms of legal assistance that the Law Society and law students are seeking to provide by way of neighbourhood legal offices and consultative facilities of that kind. What is needed is an overall plan for (the provision of legal aid to ensure that the various facilities do not duplicate one another's activities. I see the establishment of the committee, of which Mr. Mulligan is a member and to which I have already referred, as being a way in which this can be achieved.

OFFSHORE BOUNDARIES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier say what is the current position regarding the negotiations between the Premier and the Commonwealth Government on South Australian offshore boundaries? Following a series of questions in this House last session, the Premier explained that he was at that time negotiating with the Commonwealth on this matter and that he expected the negotiations to continue. It will be appreciated that members of the fishing industry are concerned about defining the South Australian offshore boundaries and are anxious to know whether any progress has been made in relation to the establishment of the State's boundaries. I ask the question today because of serious accusations which have been made recently by a section of the fishing community against senior officers of the South Australian Fisheries Department. These accusations follow interpre-

tations of the department's policy regarding offshore waters. If the matter could be cleared up it would be appreciated by the section of the community most affected.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no way of establishing the position of offshore boundaries as between the States and the Commonwealth except by a decision of the courts. On this score a petition to get a definitive decision on the matter was presented to the Queen by the Governments of Tasmania and Queensland for reference to the Privy Council. However, the Queen has decided not to refer the matter to the Privy Council. In consequence, until certain High Court decisions have been taken (because there is no way the High Court can give one single advisory opinion in this matter) it will be impossible to determine the matter. Discussions have been taking place between the Commonwealth and the State Governments regarding the administration of the offshore boundaries in what is inevitably a somewhat indeterminate period as far as the current position of the law is concerned. Neither Commonwealth nor State can know for certain exactly what type of administration is valid in an offshore area. At this stage of the proceedings I cannot make an announcement as to the conclusions reached between the Commonwealth Government and ourselves.

Mr. Millhouse: Can't you bring a bit of pressure to bear?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham will have pressure put on him if he is going to continually interject when he has not got the call.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a relevant point.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to license builders of swimming pools so that consumers may be adequately protected? There is no legislation requiring the licensing of these builders. Furthermore, there is no legislation controlling the construction of swimming pools, and many unethical practices are being carried on in South Australia. Some builders of swimming pools have gone bankrupt, leaving many pools half completed. Certain reputable builders have already joined the Swimming Pools Association of South Australia Incorporated, which has established a code of ethics, and the members subscribe to a fidelity bond to guarantee the completion of swimming pools if members go bankrupt. A common contract for the construction of a pool requires the customer to pay 37½ per cent of the total price after the completion of the excavations and a further 60 per cent upon the completion of the concrete shell. I spoke to a builder only yesterday on this matter and, although 97½ per cent of the total cost may have been paid, the pool may have been only half completed. I have received many complaints and, on contacting the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, I have found that 15 official complaints were made about similar matters last year. Furthermore, apparently another two complaints have been made this year, and many unofficial complaints have been made by telephone. Legislation is needed to protect people having a swimming pool built by a builder who has gone bankrupt. At present, there is a specific case in this State of a company that builds swimming pools for sale, and many people are left in doubt about whether the pools will ever be completed, although in some cases up to 97½ per cent of the cost has been paid. I therefore urge the Attorney-General to license builders of swimming pools as soon as possible in order to protect the consumers.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I understand that a swimming pool is defined in the provisions of the Building Act as a building and that the provisions of the Builders Licensing Act would therefore require a person constructing a swimming pool to be licensed as a builder.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: As from January 1.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, when the Building Act came into operation. I will have that position checked to find out whether the law in that respect is being complied with, but I acknowledge the force of the matters the honourable member has raised. Of course, what he has said reinforces the argument that the Premier and other people have put when they have pointed out the need to license builders and people operating in the building area generally. I do not know whether, as the honourable member has alleged, the provisions of the Act in this regard are being flouted, but I will have inquiries made to find out whether that is so.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been an improvement in the level of the underground water basin as a result of the regulations invoked about the middle of last year regarding draw-off and the putting down of irrigation bores? The past season has been one of higher than average rainfall and it is fair to say that there has been an obvious regard for preservation of flood irrigation and the fullest observance of a policy of using a minimum quantity of water. There seems to be an apparent appreciation of the need to conserve this all-important commodity, and I should be pleased if the Minister could tell the House of any beneficial effects since the regulations were invoked.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot say whether there has been an improvement since the regulations were invoked: I think the honourable member would appreciate that time must elapse before that could be done. In fact, we would check the effect of it over a whole year rather than take only one season and, as the honourable members know, a period of less than six months has passed since the restrictions were invoked. I have not yet called for a report from the committee that administers this part of the Act. Of course, the Act, which was previously the responsibility of the Minister of Development and Mines, is now my responsibility. I will inquire whether any purpose would be served in doing at this stage what the honourable member has requested, but I do not think there would be. However, I assure the honourable member that the effects of the restrictions will be closely examined and monitored, because it may be necessary to go further than we have already gone hitherto, although I should hope that would not be the case. One reason for imposing the restrictions was the alarm expressed by people responsible for advising the Government on this matter about the need to check a serious depletion of the underground water resource. Otherwise, there could be serious problems similar to those we have been experiencing in the Adelaide Plains area. I shall be pleased to have the matter checked and I will let the honourable member know the result.

PARTY LEADERSHIP

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Leader of the Opposition say whether his role as Leader of the Liberal and Country League has changed in any way since the appointment of Mr. John Vial as Executive Director of the L.C.L.?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must rule the question out of order. It is not a matter concerning the activities of this House.

GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to review the proposed extension and upgrading of facilities at the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln with a view to further increasing the killing capacity, particularly in respect of cattle? On the completion of upgrading, the ultimate capacity of the works will be about 260 head of cattle a week. As the cattle population on Eyre Peninsula is now about 1 000 000, the capacity of the extended works still will be far from adequate. In fact, the difference between the turn-over and the killing capacity of the works will still be greater than it has ever been previously.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what protection is provided for fruit and vegetable growers who market their produce through agents at the East End Wholesale Market, to ensure that the return to growers for fair average quality produce is within the quotation range published for that market? Further, will the Minister ask his colleague who provides the quotation range? Many growers have told me that their returns have often been far below the range quoted in the press and on the Australian Broadcasting Commission country radio programmes as being the fair average quality price range for produce on that day.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will confer with my colleague and let the honourable member know the outcome of that conference.

ALICE SPRINGS RAILWAY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether his negotiations with his Commonwealth Government colleague Mr. Jones were successful in concluding an agreement to build the Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway line? During Question Time last Thursday, the Minister told the member for Stuart that he considered that he would reach final agreement with Mr. Jones. For that reason, and because of the discussions the two Ministers have had, I ask the Minister what stage the negotiations have reached.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have already told the member for Stuart in reply to his question (and I am pleased now to tell the member for Eyre the same thing) that last Friday the Australian Minister for Transport and I had a fruitful discussion about the proposed Alice Springs to Tarcoola railway, as well as about many other matters. Mr. Jones is reporting to the Prime Minister on the matter of the railway and in due course an announcement will be made.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say whether rate concessions for pensioners apply to those pensioners who are in senior citizens' homes, such as Senior Citizens Homes Incorporated at Nuriootpa? If the concessions do not apply, will the Government consider granting them? Some time ago I contacted Treasury officers who seemed to me to be uncertain whether the concessions applied, and I therefore wrote to the Treasurer, as follows:

I am writing on behalf of the committee of Senior Citizens Homes Incorporated at Nuriootpa with regard to a concession on water rates and council rates for pensioners. The units are rated separately and pensioner units are readily identifiable. The inmates of the home units pay a capital sum to the homes which allows them to live in a unit for the rest of their lives. They are charged maintenance charges by the committee to offset rates, taxes, etc.

The committee is worried that it has to increase its maintenance charges, but if these pensioners were granted the concession it could reduce their maintenance charges and they would benefit. However, I have been unable to determine whether the concessions apply to this type of home. If they do not, I should hope that the Government would consider granting them to the pensioners concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter is administered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and it depends entirely on the form of ownership of the cottages referred to and on who is occupying them.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I thought I made that clear.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think, the honourable member has made clear in his explanation what are the circumstances of this case, which I will have examined, and I will let him know. However, in the case of cottages, certain forms of ownership apply and, where a pensioner actually occupies the cottage, a remission is granted.

OIL SPILLAGE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Marine say whether within the last 48 hours there has been an oil spillage into the sea off Port Stanvac? Has such a spillage been reported to any Minister and, if it has, what action has been taken to remedy the situation? If the Minister has no knowledge of such an incident, will he obtain a report for the House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A report was made by the pilot of a DC9 aircraft yesterday. Although I am not certain of the time the report was made, the tug *Tancred* went out to the area, which is about nine miles (14 km) offshore, and examined what was supposed to be the oil spillage. I point out that at this time of the year the sea takes on all sorts of colour and people may think oil has been spilled when in fact it has not been. However, it has been established that the water in the area referred to by the pilot in his report is discoloured as a result of the presence of plankton bloom, and a similar case arose. I think, about two years ago when oil spillages were reported to be extensive along the whole South-Eastern coast, whereas in fact that was not the case. Plankton bloom, which looks like bitumen, is a natural phenomenon. Indeed, no tanker has left South Australia or has been in the area concerned for some time. As I say, it is definitely not an oil spillage: it is discolouration resulting from the presence of plankton bloom, which is part of what might be called the marine ecology. The matter has been checked out, and I can report to the honourable member that there was no oil spillage in the area.

DRUGS

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Attorney-General intend to increase penalties for the illegal use of drugs, especially in relation to drug pushers? Under the Dangerous Drugs Act, provision is made for a maximum penalty of \$4 000 or 10 years imprisonment or both. As some members of the general public are most concerned at the increase in drug abuse within the community, and, as I am sure the Attorney-General would agree that a drug pusher is one of the lowest forms of animal, \$4 000 seems a small sum to fine a person that makes much money from selling what is virtually a piece of blotting paper.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As the honourable member points out, the Act provides for a maximum period of imprisonment of 10 years, and obviously in all serious cases the penalty will be imprisonment and not a fine. A fine is provided for the case where the court judges that a fine is the appropriate penalty, but in serious cases there would be no question that the penalty imposed

by the court would be imprisonment, the maximum term being 10 years. I should have thought that that gave ample scope for a judge to impose in a serious case a long term of imprisonment, and I really do not think that extending the maximum period of imprisonment beyond 10 years or increasing the maximum fine beyond \$4 000 would do anything to reduce the incidence of this serious crime. I agree with the honourable member that it is a most serious crime, but I do not think that the solution to the problem is increasing maximum penalties. In fact, in my experience it is rare for judges to impose penalties anywhere approaching the maximum permitted under the appropriate Act, so that it does not seem to me that anything would be achieved by increasing the maximum penalty.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General say how many charges have been brought under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, since that Act was proclaimed, in respect of the supply of drugs by persons who are not dependent on drugs, and is there evidence to suggest that the activities of drug pedlars in the community is increasing? It has been a fairly well established progression that the criminal aspects of drug dependency tend to increase with time and that, as criminal activities become more highly developed, there will be a greater availability of drugs in the community. This matter concerns the community, particularly after the statements that were made I think earlier this year by Dr. Gabrynowicz. This may tend to throw light on the activities of drug pedlars in the community.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

CRASH REPAIR RATES

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry received from the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce a request for an increase in motor vehicle crash repair charges, and does the Minister believe that a crisis exists at present within this industry? Before Parliament adjourned for the Christmas period, I referred this matter to the Minister, and at that stage a report had been released by Thomas, Sara, Macklin and Company regarding motor vehicle crash repairs. I have no doubt that the Minister has seen this report, and he would be aware that the hourly rate for a crash repairer is much less than that of a mechanic. He would also be aware that the cost of maintenance of a garage, tools and equipment is on a par with that of an ordinary motor garage. However, it seems unfair that the repairer or the proprietor of premises where repairs are carried out must accept from the trade a vastly different hourly rate from that of a motor mechanic on repairs. In addition, as many people are working in backyards as crash repairers. I should have thought that, in line with consumer protection thinking, the Government would be interested in licensing or registering such premises to ensure the maintenance of standards of both the equipment and the operating skills of those who work in such premises. I should be pleased to know whether the Minister has been asked for any increase or whether he has been approached at all in this regard.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have been approached by members of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. Several matters have been raised with me and are presently being considered. Whether the registration of premises would solve the problem is a matter that is being examined. The honourable member raised several topics, and I agree with what he has said. We are now considering

most of the matters he has raised, and I hope to have a report soon.

CALLINGTON AREA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in providing a reticulated water supply for Callington and Hartley? The quality of the water in the Bremer River having deteriorated rapidly in the last year or two, many of the settlers are in difficulties with regard to their water supply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot give the information offhand, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him know the position.

LAMB

Mr. VENNTNG: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain the situation regarding the importing of lamb from New Zealand? I think that it is common knowledge that there is a lamb shortage in this State at present. However, it was rather significant that, at the abattoirs this week, sales in this category were halved and prices were down considerably. The reason for this was said to be the importing of lamb from New Zealand. Although in times of shortage the importing of lamb has merit in the short term, this practice needs to be watched carefully. It would be undesirable to have the price of spring lamb later in the year affected by the importing of lamb from another country.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member.

NOXIOUS TRADES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has any plans to reduce or restrict the existing area, north of the old Islington sewage farm, that is now declared for use by noxious trades? This specified area contains several important industries which, because of the nature of the trade, can operate only in this part of the metropolitan area. Therefore, I ask the Minister to assure me that the Government does not intend to reduce this area, which is so important to these industries.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member may be aware that in this locality the Enfield council zones the area available for noxious trades. Several aspects are involved in this matter, although my derailment is concerned primarily in relation to planning. As I am not certain what is the current situation, I will find out and let the honourable member know.

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Government will follow the lead of the Victorian Government with regard to the use of the term "Commonwealth Government"? Recently, I received a letter from the Premier of Victoria (Hon. R. J. Hamer) in which he enclosed a copy of the directive to Victorian Government departments on the use of the term "Commonwealth Government". I shall quote a couple of parts of the directive in explaining my question.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's well named—the Victorian Government!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is asking the honourable Premier a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I point out that the Premier has often, in this place, praised Mr. Hamer—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —as a progressive and enlightened Liberal: I have heard him do it. In part, this circular states:

State Cabinet at its meeting of January 7, 1974, discussed the frequent use by Ministers and departments based in Canberra of the term "Australian Government" in place of the commonly accepted standard term "Commonwealth Government".

It is to be noted that there is no authority in the Australian Constitution for the use of the term "Australian Government". This circular also states:

Cabinet therefore decided that Victorian Government departments, instrumentalities and agencies should henceforth use the term "Commonwealth Government" in preference to "Australian Government" in correspondence and communications as far as practicable.

That is the gist of the circular. In view of the admiration that the Premier has often expressed for Mr. Hamer, I ask him—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —whether the Government will follow the lead of the Victorian Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member does not abide by the directions of the Chair, I will warn him a second time, and he knows what will happen thereafter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No". On occasion it is perfectly appropriate for the Government of the Commonwealth to be referred to as the Australian Government. It would be absurd for us in South Australia to refer to the West German Federal Republic as the Bundestag Government of Germany rather than as the Government of West Germany.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What would you do about the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it would also be absurd in that case. There are appropriate occasions when the national Government should be referred to by the title of "Australian Government". On other occasions, it is necessary for a distinction to be drawn.

Mr. Gunn: Why don't you admit you're a centralist?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In some circumstances, it is necessary to retain the use of the term "Commonwealth Government" as distinct from State Governments but, as I think those occasions are limited, I certainly do not intend to follow the pettifoggery and parochial suggestions made by the honourable member.

LAND VALUATIONS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier ascertain what basis is used by the Valuation Department, in determining the unimproved value of land, for valuing improvements? Recently land has been sold at high prices, with the result that unimproved values appear to be excessively high, because the department is valuing the land having regard to what the improvements cost many years ago. However, because of inflation, the replacement value of the improvements would be considerably higher than the sum allowed by the department. I believe this matter should be investigated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from the Valuer-General.

CONSERVATION PARKS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when management plans for South Australian national and conservation parks will be available for public inspection? For some time, the Minister's department has been working on management plans for national

and conservation parks. Many people are becoming concerned that the time taken has been too great.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It has taken some time, and it will still be some time before the plans for all this State's parks are prepared because, as the honourable member would realize, it is a complex and an expert job to recognize certain aspects concerning our parks and to know what should be done for their total protection. Nevertheless, the job must be done thoroughly, and the Government has recently engaged additional staff for this purpose alone. I assure the honourable member that, once management plans have been prepared, they will be released so as to give the community an opportunity to examine the recommendations contained therein and so that any public comment can be considered before the plans are finally adopted.

UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry give me the report he promised me concerning the intimidatory tactics used to force tip-truck owner-drivers to join the Transport Workers Union? The Minister will recall the answer he gave me previously in which he promised to give me that report.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I thought I answered the honourable member's previous question satisfactorily when he asked it and when I said that this was a matter between the parties concerned and the unions. I understand that they are now all members of the union and that—

Mr. Hall: Of course they are!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —they were not forced to join the union.

Mr. Hall: What about the report you promised?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Goyder.

DAMAGES COMPENSATION

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government has considered legislation that would allow the payment of compensation to victims of crimes in respect of property damaged by absconders from State institutions, including prisons and juvenile centres? The only compensation currently available is that where damage is against one's person. There have been many instances in the past in which houses and their contents have been damaged. I refer, for instance, to jam being put into pianos, windows being broken and, as well, to the destruction of fabrics, and so on. One can also refer to the damage that has often been done to motor vehicles, which damage is not covered by insurance. Does the Government intend to enter this field, and have the meetings of Attorneys-General examined this matter on a Commonwealth basis in preference to merely unilateral action being taken by any one State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not aware of any move that has been made in Australia to provide for compensation for property damage caused by criminal action, whether by escapees from criminal institutions or by other people. I doubt whether a valid distinction can be made between damage caused by a criminal act committed by a person who is not an escapee from an institution and damage caused by a criminal act committed by an escapee. In both cases there is loss, and the cause of the loss is a criminal act. The fact that the offender has escaped from a prison or other institution is not really relevant. In some cases, damage to property by criminal action would be covered by the forms of insurance that a property owner takes out; that is the most satisfactory way for the loss to be covered. I doubt, however, that there is real justifica-

tion for removing that burden from the risk that is carried by the insurance company and shifting it on to the general body of taxpayers. Certainly. I would want to be convinced that there were sound social reasons for taking that step before doing so. I am not convinced that there is any ground for a change of this kind to be made, and I am not aware of any move that has been made anywhere in Australia to bring it about.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier ask the Auditor-General to supply the information on the financial arrangements regarding, the lease of Ayers House, about which I asked the Premier a question recently? Last week I accused the Government (at page 2207 of *Hansard*) of financial mismanagement—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has sought permission to explain his question. Order! I point out to honourable members that Standing Orders provide that, when the Speaker is standing, an honourable member who is on his feet must resume his seat. Apparently some honourable members are not willing to abide by Standing Orders. However, unless they do so from now on they will suffer the consequences. The honourable member for Bragg asked a question, and sought permission of the House to explain it briefly. He then started off by saying, "Last week I accused the Government." I therefore withdraw my permission for the honourable member to explain his question.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You said that the member for Bragg asked a question and sought permission to explain it. However, the member for Bragg did not open his mouth. The member for Davenport was the member involved.

The SPEAKER: I humbly apologize: I referred to the wrong member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Auditor-General.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. LANGLEY

Mr. DUNCAN moved:

That two months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Unley (Mr. G. R. A. Langley) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GOVERNOR)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill which, in terms of instructions passed under the Royal Sign Manual and Signet to the Governor of South Australia, must be reserved for Her Majesty's assent, provides for an increase in the salary payable to His Excellency the Governor. It also makes an appropriate adjustment to the method of calculating the expenses allowance payable to His Excellency.

I now consider the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is a rather elaborate commencement provision intended to ensure that the effective date of operation of the measure is July 1, 1974. Clause 3 amends section 73 of the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, here referred to as the principal Act, by effectively increasing the salary of the Governor from \$15 000 a year to \$20 000 a year. I

point out to honourable members that the last adjustment of His Excellency's salary was made in 1964. Clause 4 amends section 73a of the principal Act by recasting the provision that provides His Excellency with an expenses allowance that moves up or down with changes in the cost of living.

In 1966-67, the method of calculating the consumer price index, on which the variation in expenses allowance was based, was substantially changed and this has caused some difficulty in calculating the expenses allowance. The effect of this amendment is to adapt the method of calculation of the allowance to the changed base and, hopefully, to ensure that no difficulties will in future occur. Clause 5 repeals section 73c of the principal Act which made special provision for an allowance for certain salaries formerly met by the Governor. In fact, these salaries are now met from general revenue, and the amount provided by this section has been merely used to offset payments from general revenue. Accordingly, the need for this section disappears.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOATING BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the control of boating; to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1972; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the result of the Government's detailed consideration of the problems arising from the rapidly increasing interest in pleasure boating in this State. As members are aware, several years ago a Government committee was set up to formulate principles on which boating legislation could be based. This committee took evidence from interested parties, and made recommendations which form the basis of this Bill. Although the recommendations were made several years ago, they are even more essential today. As the House is aware, I intended to introduce this legislation quite some time ago, but I decided to defer its introduction pending uniformity of legislation throughout Australia. Unfortunately, it seems that uniformity will not be reached for some time, and, as the Government believes no more time should be lost, we have decided to go it alone.

This Bill basically involves the registration of motor boats, licensing of drivers, and the requirement of boats to carry life-saving equipment. There is no doubt that the weight of evidence presented to the committee to which I referred earlier was strongly in favour of the registration of motor boats. The committee stated it was evident that the lack of a craft identification system was a major factor in boating indiscretions. Drivers were more prone to take a chance, believing that, with identification difficulty, there was little likelihood of them being caught. The committee considered registration of motor boats would lead to more responsible behaviour.

The evidence submitted to the committee was also in favour of licensing drivers of motor boats capable of more than 10 knots. The majority of those who gave evidence considered that many breaches resulted from ignorance of navigation laws rather than hooliganism, and if drivers were licensed, following a test of their knowledge of elementary boating rules, there would be less trouble. The risk of losing a licence would be a deterrent to irresponsible behaviour. In extending licensing to all drivers, we have taken into account the recommendations of the Committee of State Marine Authorities established to draw up uniform requirements. Another of the recommendations of

the committee of inquiry was the compulsory carriage of basic life-saving equipment in privately owned motor and sailing boats.

The reason is simple: preservation of life. Many people have died in small boat accidents in South Australia in recent years because they did not have the necessary equipment. As honourable members realize, lives can be just as easily lost from unpowered boats, and for that reason we have decided to extend the life-saving equipment provisions to this type of craft. The equipment it will be compulsory to carry will be set out in regulations under the Boating Act.

Mr. Coumbe: Can you give details of the regulations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, but no doubt the chance will come later. There will be provision for the exemption of certain classes of boats and types of equipment, having regard to their purposes and areas of operation. It is obvious that the provisions of this Bill would be a waste of time if not properly policed. Administration of existing South Australian legislation on small boats is fragmented, and this Bill will bring control mainly under the one Act administered by the Minister of Marine. The Bill falls into four major parts. The first provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, set aside certain areas for the purpose of boating, or for other specified aquatic activities. There will be a provision for protected and unprotected waters. "Protected waters" will mean rivers, bays, estuaries, and similar waterways generally, and "unprotected waters" will mean all other waters. The second part deals with the registration of motor boats, and the third part with the licensing of drivers of motor boats.

The licence, once granted, will operate for an indefinite period without periodical renewal. However, if the Director of Marine and Harbours suspects the competence of a driver he may require him to be re-examined.

To qualify for a driver's licence a person must be 16 years of age or more. However, a special permit may be granted to a person between 12 and 16 years of age to drive a boat not capable of more than 18 kilometres an hour. A person holding such a permit may drive a boat capable of a speed in excess of 18 kilometres an hour only when accompanied by a licensed operator. The final part of the Bill contains provisions relating to improper conduct in the operation of motor boats, in water ski-ing, or in other aquatic activities. In particular, offences are created in respect of the reckless operation of motor boats and in respect of a person operating a motor boat while under the influence of alcohol or a drug. I have outlined the proposed requirements in some detail, because I understand the concern in the boating community over the possible cost that will fall on boat owners. However, the Government believes that the requirements are essential for proper behaviour and control in our waters.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 suspends the operation of the new Act until the Queen's pleasure has been signified thereon. It is hoped that this procedure will overcome any argument that might be raised against the validity of the new Act on the basis of inconsistency with the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Act of the Imperial Parliament. Clause 3 deals with the formal arrangement of the Act. Clause 4 amends section 667 of the Local Government Act by striking out paragraph (29a). This paragraph empowers a council to make by-laws regulating boating. The validity of present by-laws is preserved under a later provision of the Bill. All new regulations will, however, be made under the new Act and not under the Local Government Act.

Clause 5 inserts various definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. In particular it should be noticed that the definition of "boat" is confined to boats that are not used in the course of commercial undertakings. Clause 6 provides that the new Act is to bind the Crown. Clause 7 provides for the Governor to declare waters described in the proclamation to be waters under the control of the Minister for the purposes of the new Act. The powers conferred by the Act in relation to the regulation of aquatic activity are to be exercised within the boundaries of these waters. Clause 8 enables the Governor to set aside parks of the waters under the control of the Minister for specified activities. In addition, the Director is empowered to grant licences to clubs and other persons permitting them to have the sole use of specified waters over the periods specified in the licence.

Clause 9 empowers the Director to grant an exemption from all or any of the provisions of the new Act to the participants in any particular regatta or contest. Clause 10 deals with the registration of motor boats. It exempts from the registration requirements any motor boat that is required to be registered and to bear an identification mark under any other Act, and any motor boat that is exempted by proclamation from the registration requirements. Clause 11 deals with the procedure to be followed in the application for, and granting of, motor boat registration. Clause 12 requires the Director to keep a register of motor boats.

Clause 13 deals with the registration label and identifying mark that are to be carried by a registered motor boat. Clause 14 makes it an offence for a person to operate a motor boat upon waters under the control of the Minister unless it is registered and bears the appropriate registration label and identifying marks. The operator is, however, given appropriate defences where it is not practicable to comply exactly with the requirements of the provision. Clause 15 provides that the registration of a motor boat is not to be transferable. This provision is the result of advice from registering authorities in other States. Where a boat is sold, the owner is to be entitled to the return of a proportionate part of the registration fee.

Clause 16 deals with the licensing of motor boat operators. It provides for the manner in which an application for a licence is to be made. Clause 17 provides for the examination of applicants for motor boat licences. Clause 18 provides for the issue of licences. Once a licence has been issued it continues in operation, but the Director is empowered by this clause to require the re-examination of the holder of a licence. Clause 19 requires the Director to keep a register of licensed operators. Clause 20 empowers the Minister or a court to cancel or suspend a licence where the holder of the licence has been convicted of an offence that shows him to be unfit to hold a licence. Clause 21 enables the Director to issue special permits to persons between the ages of 12 years and 16 years, enabling them to operate motor boats that cannot exceed 18 kilometres an hour or to operate any boat whilst accompanied by a licensed person.

Clause 22 makes it an offence for a person to operate or to allow any other person to operate a motor boat while unlicensed or without a permit. Clause 23 provides that, where a boat is involved in a collision or other casualty, the operator must report the matter to the Director as soon as practicable. Where the death or injury of any person results from the accident, the matter must also be reported at a police station near the place of the accident. Clause 24 enables a member of the Police Force or any authorized person to prohibit the operation of an unseaworthy boat, or any boat while it is dangerously overloaded. A right of appeal against any such order lies to the Minister.

Clause 25 makes it an offence for any person to operate a boat, or to water ski in a reckless manner, without due care, or while so much under the influence of alcoholic liquor or a drug as to be incapable of exercising proper control. Clause 26 deals with the equipment that must be carried by a boat. Clause 27 requires a person who discovers a wrecked or abandoned boat to report the discovery to the Director. The Director may forfeit the wrecked or abandoned boat to the Crown. He may use moneys obtained from the sale thereof for the purpose of defraying the cost of salvage operations. Clause 28 is a necessary power to enable a member of the Police Force or an authorized person to ascertain the identity of the operator of a boat at a time when a contravention of the law in relation to the operation of the boat occurred. Clause 29 is a provision designed to protect the safety of passengers in a boat and other persons who may be affected by the operation of the boat. It provides that a person shall not operate a boat or water ski at a speed in excess of 8 km/h within 30 metres of any person swimming or bathing, any vessel or buoy displaying a sign indicating "diver below", or any other vessel. Certain defences are given where compliance with the provision is not practicable or would endanger any person or property. Clause 30 is a necessary power to enable a member of the Police Force or an authorized person who suspects that the operator of a boat has committed an offence to require the operator to manoeuvre the boat into a position required of him. Clause 31 enables an authorized person to arrest a person whom he suspects of having committed an offence against the new Act and to convey him to a police station for the purpose of charging him with the offence.

Clause 32 makes it an offence for a person to supply false information in any application for registration or a licence under the new Act. Clause 33 deals with the procedure for proceedings relating to offences under the new Act. Clause 34 provides that, where no specific penalty is provided for an offence against the new Act, the penalty is to be a monetary penalty not exceeding \$200. Clause 35 provides for certain evidentiary matters. Clause 36 deals with the fees to be payable under the new Act. Some uninformed allegations have been made that the Government intends to use this legislation as a revenue-raising measure. This has never in fact been this Government's intention. The registration fees are intended to be used towards defraying the cost of administering the new Act. In order to make this clear, the present clause provides that the registration fees shall not exceed a level sufficient to defray the expenditure to be incurred by the Government in the administration of the new Act.

Mr. Becker: Ha, ha!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What is so funny about that? Clause 37 empowers the Governor to make regulations necessary or expedient for the purposes of the new Act. In particular, regulations to prevent the pollution of waters may be made. Speed limits may be prescribed. Water ski-ing and other similar activities may be regulated, and a power is included enabling the Director to grant exemptions, in appropriate cases, from any provisions of this Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In the course of negotiations relating to the establishment of a petro-chemical industry at Red Cliff Point in this State it became clear that a good case could be made out for increasing the scope of operations of the authority established under the principal Act, the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act, 1967. This Bill then proposes that the authority, which will be renamed the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, the words "Natural Gas" being omitted from its title, will be authorized to construct and maintain or otherwise control pipelines for the carriage of petroleum, which will be defined widely so as to include gaseous or liquid hydrocarbons.

At the same time, the opportunity is being taken to reconstruct the authority by removing the necessity of particular interests being represented in its membership. At present, users and producers of the product transported (that is, natural gas) are represented. With the best will in the world, the economic interests of producers and users of a product may well be in conflict and, indeed, this is a natural situation. This, then, is one good reason for drawing the membership of the authority from a wider field. An even stronger reason is that, as the number of products transported by the pipelines of the authority increases, so will the possible producers and users proliferate to the extent that separate representation on the authority would just not be feasible. I seek leave to insert the remainder of my remarks, dealing with the detailed consideration of the clauses of the Bill, in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the long title to the principal Act by striking out the reference to natural gas. Clause 4 inserts in section 3 of the principal Act a definition of "petroleum" which is quite wide and to which the attention of members is particularly directed. This clause also strikes out from this definition section the definition of "producer company", which will become redundant in the light of subsequent proposed amendments. For the same reason, subsection (2) of this section is proposed to be struck out.

Clause 5 amends section 4 of the principal Act (a) by changing the name of the authority to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia and (b) by causing all offices of members of the authority to become vacant and providing for the appointment of six members to take effect on the commencement of this measure. This clause also removes the provision in this section, subsection (4), that provides for representation of various interest groups. Clause 6 inserts a new section 4a in the principal Act. This section is purely of a transitional nature and, it is suggested, is quite self-explanatory.

Clause 7 amends section 5 of the principal Act by providing a term of office for a member of a period not exceeding five years, with eligibility for reappointment, and removes the provision for staggered periods of service. This provision makes certain other consequential amendments to this section. Clause 8 makes a series of formal and consequential amendments to section 10 of the principal Act, and these amendments are self-explanatory. Clause 9 is similar in effect. Clause 10 repeals section 13 of the principal Act which, in the opinion of the Government, places an unnecessary restriction on the powers of the authority in that it may deprive the authority of its discretion in making available its facilities. Clauses 11 and 12 are again formal and consequential.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 5. Page 2294.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I suppose this Bill, which consists of six pages, is of a reasonable size, but the explanation except in relation to the various clauses covers only two paragraphs. Since the introduction of the system of incorporating explanations of Bills into *Hansard* without their being read, we have to wait until the next day to read the explanation in *Hansard*. We all know the past record of the transport industry in this State and the study trips made by the Minister and his colleagues. When the Minister came back from his last study tour, he was enthralled with the dial-a-bus system. Anyone who saw it in operation would know that it was doomed to failure. There are other sticky parts to the Government's policy on public transport and transport generally in the State, such as the recent take-over of private buses, involving a mere \$4 000 000 (and that is only a guess)! Since then we have heard of the payment of \$8 000 000 for new buses.

Mr. Gunn: Do you think the Government has taken the buses over so it can enforce its policy?

Mr. MATHWIN: Undoubtedly. The Minister has told us that all the bus drivers are now members of the union, so he has made a successful *coup d'état* and has achieved compulsory unionism. The Bee-line buses are a proud child of the Minister of Transport, and the road traffic training centre at Marion is another success as far as he is concerned. Doubtless, when the Minister was in Rome he would have seen the operation of the free bus services there. The second reading explanation of this "most important" Bill contains only two paragraphs! In the first paragraph the Minister states:

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

Members of this Parliament have not had the opportunity to study all the reports by these committees. The Minister also states that the Bill will go some way towards giving effect to the recommendations of the committee to which he refers. Opposition members are entitled to see the report.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would you read it if you got it?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would. I always read what the Minister gives me and listen to what he tells me. Yesterday morning I saw him wriggle when the Prime Minister was talking about the centralization policies of this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I was the first to applaud him.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know, but the Prime Minister is the Minister's boss. If he does not applaud the Prime Minister he does not get any money.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Neither we nor the Liberals got any money from the Commonwealth Liberal Government.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is not true. The Minister is riding roughshod over the Opposition on this matter. In the first paragraph of the explanation of the Bill, he also states:

The term "goes some way" is used quite advisedly, since the ultimate intention of having a single authority actually operating all major forms of public transport in the State is just not capable of being realized at this stage. However, it should be clear that this is the ultimate aim. The ultimate aim is to have one single body, and I would not argue with that. I agree with the Minister that we

must have one ultimate body to organize this matter, but the Bill is extremely vague and tells us so little. No-one can understand it and it is wide open, giving the Minister such powers that he could do virtually anything. It will be interesting to see how far he goes. I hope that in the Committee stage the Minister will be sympathetic to amendments that will be moved.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which ones would you suggest? Those to be moved by the member for Goyder?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will speak to the amendments to which I suggest that the Minister should be sympathetic and I hope that he will be swayed by my eloquence and that he will accept those amendments. The Bill looks like a rushed Bill and I suppose we could say that it is like a terminated pregnancy, that it really finishes before it starts. A basis for saying that is that, although the Bill comprises six pages, the Minister has given us an explanation comprising only two paragraphs. We are supposed to clutch at straws and guess what is in the Minister's mind. I was pleased to read the report on public transport in the metropolitan area that the Minister has given to all members. On page 2 the Director-General of Transport (Dr. Scrafton) states:

This report should be read in association with two complementary papers which will be submitted to you in the near future. The first deals with the establishment of a transport authority to operate or control all public passenger transport in South Australia, and the second is a preliminary review of the potential use of the transport corridors designated in the 1971 supplementary development plan. The three reports together provide a basis for public transport development in South Australia to serve the State for many years.

However, the Minister has not given us the supplementary papers, and we do not know what they contain. We often hear the cry that this Government prides itself on open government and that it has nothing to hide, yet the Minister has not given us the opportunity to study reports that his Director-General of Transport states must be studied with the report we have. The Minister has on his shoulders that he has not supplied the papers to which I have referred. That is a far cry from the open government policy of this Government and the Commonwealth Government. The latter Government's policy on open government states:

A key channel for communication between the Parliament and the people will be a number of expert commissions making regular reports and recommendation on new spending.

However, the State Government has seen fit not to give us reports, and it is disappointing that the Minister does not intend to let us look at reports by his Director-General of Transport and the committee. Are we to guess what is in them? How do we get the information? It is an impossible task, yet the Minister expects us to take for granted this wide-open Bill. In his reply, I should like the Minister to deal with the matters that I and other Opposition members have brought forward. The Bill makes no provision for a right of appeal. No reference is made to who will be the members of the authority, and I will deal with that matter soon. Will this authority control private and public school buses, of which there are many? Will taxis around the metropolitan area come under control? No reference is made to this in the Bill. Public transport must be defined. Does the Bill relate to goods or to passengers, or to both? No reference is made to these matters in the Bill, and certainly not in the short explanation given by the Minister.

What will be the position of the authority in provincial towns? Will buses that carry blind people, crippled

children, and people who work at Bedford Industries come under the jurisdiction of this authority? These questions have been brushed aside and forgotten. What will happen in the cases of charter buses and people who conduct tours? Will they be controlled? Previously, the people who operated these tours and charters refused to come under the hand of the Minister. Will they now come under the control of the authority? Will the Minister do what he did a couple of years ago? Will everyone who works for these private tour operators and all those who drive taxis have to belong to a union? Will all these individual organizations disappear, with eventually there being one body? The Minister has not seen fit to deal with these matters.

We must rely on the Commonwealth Government for finance for high-speed corridors, as we must now call them. It will be interesting to see whether the Commonwealth, in its allocation this year (the term of the previous allocation having almost concluded), places an emphasis on roads or on public transport. The motorist will be forced to accede to the wishes of the Commonwealth Government, which may decide not to spend money on arterial roads but to allocate it for public transport. The problem for motorists could thus become even greater. If fares increase as they have increased in the last few months, the public of South Australia will be held to ransom. With the increase in rail fares, parents of some young children must pay nearly \$1 extra in fares. Under the new rail increases, the weekly pass now applies for seven days of the week, although people work and travel on only five days of the week.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know it's eight times the single fare. Start talking the truth instead of gobbledegook.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister says that it is eight times the single fare. On February 21, I asked a question about this matter, and I am still awaiting the reply. My question related to the case of a person who had asked about this figure of eight times the single fare, the Minister having repeated today that that is the basis of the weekly fare.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's right.

Mr. MATHWIN: My constituent travels from Oaklands Park to Kilburn.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a different thing altogether.

Mr. MATHWIN: His current rate for a yearly ticket is \$118.70. He has been informed that from next July a yearly ticket, for travel between Oaklands Park and Kilburn, will cost him \$190.20.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where are you reading this?

Mr. MATHWIN: My question is reported at page 2141 of *Hansard*. Obviously, the cheapest way for this man to travel from Oaklands Park to Kilburn is to buy a single ticket on each day of the year. Would it not be better to have a yearly ticket working out at a rate cheaper than the daily rate? A single ticket costs 35c each way, which is \$3.50 a week, or \$171.50 a year. If he buys a weekly ticket, the cost is \$3.60, which is 10c more than the weekly cost for single tickets each day.

Mr. Millhouse: It sounds as though something is wrong.

Mr. MATHWIN: Something is drastically wrong; perhaps the computer is wrong.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I have the answer to it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I asked this question on February 21, and I have still not received a reply.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you'll sit down, you'll get it.

Mr. MATHWIN: If this person buys a weekly ticket, the cost is \$3.60. Even on this basis, the yearly cost is only \$176.40, whereas if he buys a yearly ticket it will cost \$190.

This seems to be completely ridiculous. The Minister has said that the weekly fares will not cost more than eight times the single fare, if that were so. In this person's case the yearly rate would be \$130.20, or \$2.80 a week, and not \$3.60. This was a simple question, in which I related all the facts to the Minister, yet I have waited since February 21 for a reply and have still not received it.

Mr. Gunn: He doesn't know.

Mr. MATHWIN: It will be interesting to get an answer. I can well understand the Minister's being upset by finance. However, he is not as upset about that matter as is the man who must buy a single ticket each day. The finance comes from the Commonwealth Government, and it will be interesting to see what happens when that Government takes over the Glenelg tram. Perhaps it will stipulate what colour the tram will be painted and where it will stop along the route. I have often referred to the drab colour of that Irani, so the Commonwealth Government may well change its colour. The Municipal Tramways Trust probably had a certain quantity of paint in reserve and was trying to use it all up.

Clause 6, which deals with the constitution of the authority, provides that it shall consist of seven members appointed by the Governor on the Minister's nomination, and that one of its members shall be appointed by the Governor as Chairman. Although we know that the authority is to comprise seven members, we have no other information. I read through those sentences lime and time again to see whether the Minister had hidden some sort of explanation there. However, I could not see it. I therefore hope that the Minister will say what is in his mind in this respect. He does not have to name the members, although it will be interesting to see whom he intends to appoint. Although I agree with the principle of worker participation, I disagree with its involving a pay-off to, say, a union secretary or organizer. One of the major problems of worker participation is that it can involve jobs for the boys. I would be happy if one of the employees of, say, the M.T.T. or the railways was appointed. However, I will not agree with the Minister's telling a union official, "Here is a little plum for you."

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If a person was a member of a union, would you allow him to sit on the board?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, because I have no arguments with unions. Indeed, I was a member of one myself, once.

Mr. Jennings: You've told us that many times before.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about trade unions. I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to speak to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am sorry that I was led off the track by the Minister of Transport. I would like to know who will be the members of the authority. I agree that a worker ought to be appointed, but I do not think the appointment should be dished out as a plum. Will the Minister therefore say what he intends to do in this respect? This Bill is too vague, and the second reading explanation of it is even more vague. Indeed, the Bill is so wide that it gives the Minister certain authority without our being told what is intended. If the Bill passes the second reading, it ought to be amended drastically and, if the Minister is not flexible and is unwilling to accept reasonable amendments, the whole Bill should be withdrawn. Realizing that the Bill has been introduced hurriedly, with insufficient time for a second reading explanation to be prepared, the Minister should be willing to accept amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I presume we have had from the member for Glenelg an example of responsible opposition. At least, I presume that is what he

intended his contribution to be, in common with the contributions of other Liberal and Country League members. However, I could not see much responsibility in what he said. I presume he was following the lead of his colleague the member for Hanson, who led for the L.C.L. in this debate, but the member for Goyder pointed out yesterday that a rejection of this Bill would be a rejection of planning in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and throughout the State. I am surprised that the member for Glenelg would go to those lengths and still regard his opposition as responsible opposition. That is what I think the L.C.L. is claiming to practise.

I support the second reading but with the qualification expressed by the member for Goyder yesterday: I do not believe that this Bill should have effect outside the metropolitan planning area. I guess that in due course that point will be tested. I also have another qualification: my opposition to part of the definition of "prescribed body" in clause 4, to which the Minister has added paragraph (d) as follows:

Any other person or body whether corporate or unincorporate for the time being prescribed as a prescribed body for the purposes of this Act.

That means that literally any single individual, company or other group of persons engaged in transport (although even that is not stated) could presumably be prescribed by regulation under this Bill, and they would then be a prescribed body and therefore liable to be controlled and directed, in the wording of clause 12 (1) (c), in "the activities of that prescribed body in relation to public transport within the State". Technically, if the Bill passes in its present form, anyone can be prescribed. Even the member for Florey could be prescribed, certainly in relation to his activities involving public transport and, technically, I guess that the Minister would have power to tell him whether to catch a bus or not. That is an absurd situation, and I do not suppose that even the Minister intends to go to that length. However, a literal interpretation of the Bill would allow that, and I believe that it is unnecessary for Parliament to give such sweeping powers to the Executive. The reason that the Minister supported having this power was that it would be provided by regulation.

Of course the prescription as set out means by regulation. Regulations have to be laid on the table and can be disallowed by either House. However, there is much difference between legislating by regulation and legislating directly, as we prefer to do, by Parliament. First, Parliament often does not meet for many months at a time: in fact, there was a gap of seven months between the end of the 1972 session and the beginning of the 1973 session, when a general election intervened, as it does every third year. Whilst the gap is not nearly so long between sessions of the same Parliament, it can be for many months, as Government members will know.

During that period neither House of Parliament is able to take any action regarding a regulation that could be made the day after the session ends. To that extent the protection of the machinery for disallowance of a regulation is illusory, because it can be frustrated so easily for a long time. The second point is that there is much difference between introducing a Bill that has to be agreed to by both Houses and simply saying that a regulation can be disallowed by one House or the other. One is a positive action in which the approval of both Houses is obtained (and that is the traditional and proper way, except when it is not possible to use it); the other method is putting in a regulation, which is government

by the Executive, and which may or may not be disallowed in future. I do not believe that the Minister's explanation justifies so sweeping a power.

I see no reason why the present Minister (or a subsequent Minister) would want to bring some other body, either corporate or unincorporate, or an individual, or a group under the control of this authority in a way that should not be done normally by an amendment to the Act. I believe that paragraph (d) of clause 4 should be struck out, so that we will safeguard people from prescription at the whim of the Minister, as the Bill at present provides. No doubt the Minister will oppose my point of view, but I hope that it will prevail eventually. I believe that this is an undesirably wide power, and an unnecessary power to be included in the Bill. We could get along for the present quite well by bringing under the control of this authority the M.T.T., the railways, and the Transport Control Board. I bring one other point to the attention of the Minister, because I think he may have unwittingly left a hiatus in clause 12, the clause that gives guts to the whole thing. Its marginal note is "Powers and functions". I am not sure of the meaning of "functions": normally, as I remember it in legislation we use "powers", but the Minister has chosen to use "functions", as clause 12 provides:

(1) The functions of the authority are as follows:

(a) to co-ordinate all systems of public transport within the State.

We hope that that wording will be changed to "metropolitan planning area". Clause 12 (b) provides:

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

That is the power to make recommendation to the Minister. Clause 12 (c), in which I think the hiatus occurs, provides:

until a recommendation referred in paragraph (b) of this subsection has been given effect to in relation to a prescribed body, to control and direct the activities of that prescribed body in relation to public transport within the State;

Perhaps the Minister could seek expert advice on this point, but there may be a hiatus between the making of the recommendation and the assumption of the power, and the hiatus or gap should be closed. Paragraph (c) of this clause (apart from the hiatus problem) gives the power to the authority, because the function of the authority is to control and direct the activities of that prescribed body in relation to public transport within the State. That is a very strong power, and I believe that it is necessary to have that control within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. I am reminded that about 10 to 15 years ago the Metropolitan Transport Advisory Council comprised the head of the M.T.T., the Railways Commissioner, and a former Crown Solicitor of the day. That council did nothing except block an extension of the Mitcham bus route to Torrens Park. The Act was on a three-year period of extension, and eventually we had it knocked out and obtained the extension of the bus service. I hope that this suggested authority will be more effective and progressive than was its weak predecessor.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If the legislation is not tampered with I will give you that assurance but, if it is tampered with, I cannot.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would rather have the assurance that the legislation would be tampered with (to use the Minister's words) in the way that I have suggested.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You want the authority to be ineffective?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want it to be effective in a proper area, but I do not want to give the Minister or his Government quite tyrannical powers, which paragraph (d) of clause 4 would give. At this stage I support the Bill, but I hope that it will be amended. If it is not amended in the ways that have been suggested by the Liberal Movement, I shall probably not support the third reading.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): Opposition members, as distinct from those who wear the Liberal Movement tag, who have spoken in this debate have generally chosen to lambast the Minister of Transport and attack the Government's policies on transport, in order to build a case to reject this Bill. It is reasonable for me to say that there has been little effort by the Opposition, apart from those to whom I have referred, to speak effectively to the Bill in such a way that electors of this State would be entitled to expect from members of this House who are supposed to function as responsible members of Her Majesty's Opposition. We have had this tirade *seriatim* (a word the member for Mitcham is so fond of using): one member after another on the other side has got up and dredged up—

Dr. Tonkin: It is very nice to see you on your feet.

Mr. PAYNE: I should have thought that the member who took the trouble to interject might be more careful about his contribution. His total contribution to transport in this State amounts to a couple of jeeps painted purple.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They didn't even comply with the law of the land.

Mr. PAYNE: The act we have seen put on by the members of the Opposition does them little credit. Every member of this House ought to know, and certainly we on this side know, that we have responsibilities in this Chamber which differ according to our positions. Opposition members are not required to get to their feet and waffle; they are required to act responsibly. A lack of responsibility has been displayed clearly by many of them who have spoken, including their Leader, who is their Leader for the present (one can never be sure what the future holds, in view of past events in the history of the Liberal and Country League).

One would have hoped for some responsibility from the member for Glenelg, whose contributions to the transport policy in this State relate to a request to have the Glenelg trams painted purple and for letterboxes to be placed on them. I suppose I am an idealist in these things but nevertheless I would have expected more responsibility in general from Opposition members. As members of the Government we expect Opposition members to endeavour, as is their job, to attack, probe and discuss policies put forward by the Government. We expect them to exercise responsibility, but none has been shown.

Mr. Coumbe: When are you going to start?

Mr. PAYNE: I am always ready to please. In answer to that interjection, I have started and I will continue for the statutory period that I am allowed. The curious thing about the tirades to which we have been subjected from the other side is that the Opposition, as distinct from the Liberal Movement, during a debate on an Appropriation Bill on September 19, 1973, should have shown their objections to the Minister's policies on transport generally. On that occasion the member for Mitcham moved to amend the line affecting the Minister of Transport's department, and obviously in terms of Parliamentary protocol this was a vote of no confidence in the Minister and in his administrative policies. What did we hear? Exactly the same happened then as is happening now: deadly silence. In

order to express their opinion on these matters all Opposition members had to do was what I was invited to do by the member for Bragg a few minutes ago and get on their feet. But there were no starters. They were engaged elsewhere; they were reading, researching, or doing something else.

Dr. Eastick: That was September 19, not March 6.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You change with the wind.

Mr. Coumbe: I think the circumstances were slightly different.

Mr. PAYNE: I am leading up to that. I am charging the Opposition with lack of responsibility, and I believe I made that clear in the beginning of my argument. The Opposition was not responsible on September 19, and its credibility is in question now. The matters that have been aired on this occasion, as the Leader of the Opposition so aptly pointed out on March 6, were dredged up from as far back as 1970, so most of them were already known on September 19 and, in fact, they were adverted to by the member for Mitcham when speaking to his motion. However, at that time no member of the Opposition took the point and got to his feet to support that motion of no confidence. I am saying that the Opposition is not fair dinkum and that it did not exercise responsibility then and is not exercising it now. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Becker: We all know your views.

Mr. PAYNE: I understand that the member who has just interjected is the shadow (and what an apt description) Minister of Transport.

Mr. Becker: You can't take it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The member for Hanson's total contribution to transport policy in this State has been to ride a bicycle to Parliament House one day as a stunt, and he has not been seen on that bicycle since.

Mr. Becker: We know you're thin skinned. You can't take it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order in interjecting, and I ask the honourable member for Mitchell to resume the debate. I point out to the member for Hanson that a reasonable amount of latitude has been given in this debate. I do not intend to stifle the debate, but interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think I have effectively established the status and the qualification of the member for Hanson regarding transport policies in this State. It consists of flogging a treading to the House one day! There is no doubt that members of the Opposition, apart from the members of the Liberal Movement, failed to exercise responsibility. This is not only my belief: it is the belief of many people outside this Chamber. Those electors who do not have the opportunity to come into the House had this brought to their notice by no less a person than Mr. Rex Jory in the *News* of September 26, 1973.

Mr. Gunn: Is he one of the Government's press officers?

Mr. PAYNE: No, I understand that he is a newspaper reporter. I do not know whether the member for Eyre has other information but I can go only by what I see and hear. Mr Jory writes for the *News*.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He uses the Press Gallery of this Parliament.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, I have seen him there. It is clear that Mr. Jory supports what I have been putting to the House today. In that report he states:

But L.C.L. members at least had the opportunity to record their dissatisfaction with the Government's transport proposals, even if it meant giving Mr. Millhouse some doubtful political and tactical advantage.

That is the essence of my argument. I am certain that I have shown clearly the lack of responsibility of L.C.L. members in this area. If the only reason why they did not speak up was that they were dissatisfied with the policies, they were not carrying out their function as an Opposition.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The shadow Minister has interjected again, even though he spoke for one hour and 10 minutes and I have only 30 minutes for my speech. I do not know whether the shadow Minister was responsible for part of the policy speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition on February 20, 1973, or whether or not he favoured it: indeed, I do not know whether he had left the Liberal Movement then.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No, he was still in the L.M. then.

Mr. PAYNE: The only one who could answer that would be the member for Goyder but I assume that the shadow Minister may have been associated with the L.M. at that time. The Leader, in delivering the policy speech, stated:

We insist that Adelaide must be given a fully integrated transportation system.

I do not think we disagree with that, but when we try to implement that kind of policy it is a different story. As the member for Rocky River is wont to say, when things are different they are not the same. It is curious that, when the Minister has introduced a Bill to establish a transport authority and to provide an integrated transport system. L.C.L. members do not like that and they do not want to hear about it. They try to think of ways to reject the Bill. We have not had one concrete proposal from that Parly.

I exempt the two L.M. members. I have no real common ground with them, but at least they tried to speak responsibly. They have made suggestions that at least bear listening to, which is more than I could say for the tripe to which members from the other end of the Opposition benches subjected us. What they said was not related to the matter before us.

The member for Eyre said that I had not read the Bill and that he did not have sufficient information in the Minister's second reading explanation. I suggest that he own up like I did last year and go and get some spectacles. If he does that and puts them on, he may see some things that he would otherwise miss. The Minister states in his explanation:

The present Bill is then no more than the first step in providing for the people of this State a co-ordinated system of public transport.

There we have it in a nutshell.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Eyre often interjects when I am speaking. He wants to get better representation in this House by living in my district, and now he wants to put in his two cents worth. He knows he is well represented, but I do not need any help from him and I ask him to allow me to continue my speech.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. During the course of this debate you have ruled several times that members have not been confining their

remarks to the matter under discussion, and the member for Mitchell is talking about personal representation. I ask you where this Bill deals with the representation of individual members.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was about to rise, and I uphold the point of order. I ask the honourable member for Mitchell to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope I am permitted to comment that the member who took the point of order said yesterday, when speaking in the debate on this Bill, that he had got something in *Hansard* anyway. I remind him of that, irrespective of a subsequent point of order. The contention (if we can give it that much credibility) from the other side has been that the Government's policies should be criticized because nothing has been done in the transport area. Of course, this is untrue and unjust.

Mr. Jennings: It's also a lie.

Mr. PAYNE: Well, each person may put his own connotation on it. I prefer to use the term "untrue and unjust", because under the Minister and this Government our policies, as announced to the electors at election time, have been followed clearly and carefully as far as we have been able to carry them out, bearing in mind that we must suffer from having legislation subject to the decisions of another place. Since 1970 the Government of this State has faithfully followed the programme it stated. The electors have endorsed our policy in 1970 and in 1973, so apparently those policies were satisfactory to the people. Since 1973, the Government has gone on with the programme it announced then.

Mr. Mathwin: What clause are you dealing with?

Mr. PAYNE: I am speaking to the same clauses as the member for Glenelg was speaking to when he referred to compulsory unionism and other issues.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the member for Mitchell is referring to the policy on transport announced at election time?

Mr. PAYNE: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. There was never any doubt in the mind of Opposition members that I was referring to that; otherwise, they would not have interjected. They do not want to be reminded of their past action in this field. This Government has continued its policy of upgrading metropolitan railways, and we have incurred record expenditures. In addition to planning, we are making progress on electrification at the Marino end of the railway line, which is to be extended to Christie Downs. The Minister has worked extremely hard in obtaining funds from the Commonwealth Government for public transport. Work has been done in upgrading the Glenelg tram service.

Dr. Tonkin: What do you think of clause 3?

Mr. PAYNE: In deference to an earlier ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will keep strictly to what I have to say and will not be diverted by interjections. The Highways Department has upgraded urban arterial roads. The vast improvement in providing traffic signals is continuing. Transfer tickets have been introduced. I do not think any member would suggest that the introduction of clearways has not helped traffic movement. I have referred to some of the work the Government has done, through the Minister, in accordance with its policy. For members opposite to suggest that there is something about this work that can be criticized is clearly just not on.

Reference has been made to clause 12. I believe that, in his explanation, the Minister clearly explained this provision, subclause (1) (a) of which gives the authority power "to co-ordinate all systems of public transport within the State". Although there may be a slight difference,

essentially that is in accordance with what L.C.L. members spoke about before the State election in March last year. Certainly, no objections have been made to this type of work that has been carried out during the year, and members opposite had an opportunity to state their objections on September 19 last. Subclause (1) (b) empowers the authority "to recommend to the Minister the manner and means by which the powers and functions of any prescribed body, in relation to public transport within the State, may be assumed and exercised directly or indirectly by the authority". How in the devil can public transport be integrated unless some organization has this power? No member opposite has suggested that integration can take place in the existing circumstances. What are members opposite referring to when they speak about what is hidden in the Bill? Clearly, the Bill sets out to establish an authority to do the very thing that needs to be done about our metropolitan transport. The research necessary for the Minister to be able to carry out this integration cannot be undertaken unless we have the authority that is provided for in the Bill.

The Minister has been extremely responsible in introducing this Bill at the earliest opportunity. After all, some Opposition members have said that in certain areas he has not moved quickly enough. Yet, when he attempts to move quickly and introduces this Bill that will allow him to undertake the necessary work, members opposite do not like that either. There is no logic in the stand they are taking. If members opposite have any doubts, it is because they have not read the Bill. By clause 18, the authority is required to report to the Minister, who "shall cause a copy of every report ... to be laid before each

House of Parliament". The authority must report on its activities. If members have any worries about the activities of the authority, that provision should satisfy them. One member opposite (the shadow Minister) used shocking language by talking about six lackeys when referring to the responsible people who will be working for the State in this connection.

I have no doubt that this Bill is necessary in the interests of improving transport in this State. I remind members opposite that, as the Minister has said in his explanation, this is not the be all and end all; it is the first step in achieving integration (a term used last year by the Leader of the Opposition) and co-ordination in transport. No-one would dispute that transport systems must be upgraded. Everyone knows that work needs to be done in urban areas, the Commonwealth Government having made funds available for that purpose. The Minister has done his best to obtain a reasonable proportion of those funds for this State. He is now trying to set up an authority that will be able to make recommendations on how the public transport facilities of this State can be used to the best advantage of people who have to use them. I believe I have clearly demonstrated the type of attitude adopted by L.C.L. members. We have had to listen to a tirade from them that has done them little credit; in this case the L.C.L. has failed to act responsibly as an Opposition. I support the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the second reading of the Bill, only because amendments have already been foreshadowed. The Bill as originally presented is totally unacceptable, since its provisions are too wide and all-embracing. The member for Mitchell went to some lengths to explain an incident that occurred on September 19 last year. I want to dissociate myself from that incident. *Hansard* clearly shows that I did not vote on that occasion. In fact, I was not in the House, and I can speak for the

member for Eyre in this connection, too, because he was keeping a close watch on me that day.

With regard to this Bill, the operative word is "control", a word the Minister used early in his explanation. Although "control" and "manage" may have similar meanings, I believe that what we need in this case is not control but rather effective management and co-ordination of the existing facilities. Although the Minister said that at present overall control is not possible, it should be made clear that this is the ultimate aim. In the far-reaching provisions of this Bill, the Minister has asked the Opposition and the people of South Australia to give him a blank cheque and an open hand to control all means of transport. He has asked for permission to override previous undertakings and virtually to dictate to the people his ideas and to impose on the State his views about how public transport should operate. Although I believe the real purpose of the Bill is to co-ordinate existing transport facilities in the metropolitan area, in outlying areas transport organizations would be subject to control from a metropolitan-based organization. "Public transport" is another of the operative terms, but what does it mean? Does it mean the transport of people, goods or perishables from one place to another, or does the Minister intend to embrace shipping lines and all means of road transport or, indeed, the proposed hovercraft? Most people believe that the term "public transport" means the transport of people. However, no definition has been given, and it is so all-embracing as to be unacceptable.

I do not believe the Government has a mandate to ask for an open book on this matter. I raise these issues on behalf of my constituents who rely on public transport and who could be embraced by the terms of the Bill. Persons living on the West Coast, say, 300 miles to 500 miles (480 km to 800 km) from the metropolitan area, could by this Bill be brought under the control of a transport system designed for the majority living in the metropolitan area. This Bill could give the Government power to strangle the outlying areas of the State effectively. Indeed, it is typical of the Government's tactics: that is, trying to introduce a Bill with wide-sweeping statements and then backing off, but only as far as necessary, to get the Bill passed. There is room for an organization to provide co-ordination between the public and the various authorities. However, I do not believe that such wide-sweeping powers should be made available to a single authority that could dictate terms to the South Australian public. On the understanding that some amendments have already been foreshadowed, I support the second reading.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It is unfortunate when a Government member waits until the last minute to make a contribution to the debate on a Bill of this kind.

Dr. Tonkin: A contribution?

Dr. EASTICK: I may be generous in suggesting that it was. Government members have been given the opportunity during this debate to consider many points that have been raised by the Opposition. However, when the member for Mitchell got to his feet he wanted merely to dredge up a series of events from the past and quote them out of context. He sought to implore members of this House to be responsible and suggested that Opposition members, with one or two exceptions, were not responsible. Yet he would have us believe that on a certain occasion to which he referred he would have been delighted to have Opposition members support a personal attack not on an administration or management but on an individual's

own character! When debating the measures that come before this House, I do so knowing that, if an attack is made on someone, it is not made on an individual's character in the way the member for Mitchell would have had Opposition members support the member for Mitcham earlier. By all means, let us be responsible, but let us not try to twist the facts to suit some political ploy. Earlier this afternoon members had the opportunity of realizing that an important part of one's contribution to debate is the knowledge that the point one is making has not been made previously. There are only two ways to determine this: either by being present in the Chamber and listening to debate or reading *Hansard* to ensure that the point that one is making at the expense of someone else has not been made previously.

This Bill has been rushed into the House ahead of the schedule originally planned for it, simply because the Government has failed to bring to the attention of members certain important measures which it claimed it had ready three weeks ago but which, because flaws have been found in them, have not been introduced. The Minister has introduced this Bill before the full ramifications of its probable effects have been considered and before Opposition members have had an opportunity to read the various reports regarding the measure. Indeed, my colleagues have not seen the report referred to by the Minister and his colleague; nor have they had an opportunity to understand all the claims and counter-claims that have been made by a group of important people who have investigated this measure.

Because of this the Opposition cannot judge fairly and clearly whether what it is being asked to support is based on the facts supplied to the Minister. The Opposition hopes that this report has been made available to the Minister only and not to his colleagues at the expense of Opposition members. The report which the Opposition wants to see and which is a vital part of this issue is only one of many reports that have been made on this State's transport system. I wonder what is the common denominator that runs through all those reports. What is the common thread therein that is being denied Opposition scrutiny? I postulate that the thread clearly brought out in all those reports is that, because there has been political intrusion into the affairs of the transport authority, no successful transport schemes can be undertaken.

Mr. Coumbe: You're right on the ball.

Dr. EASTICK: That is the whole crux of the matter, and it does not, I suggest, relate only to the present Administration. Indeed, it has long been clear in reports submitted that there has been too much political interference in the affairs of the transport industry. I do not know when the Opposition will be given an opportunity to determine whether that common denominator to which I referred is a reality. I suggest to the Minister that, if he is fair dinkum (I use the words of the member for Mitchell), he will not deny members a chance to look at the documents and assess the situation on the basis of the facts contained in those reports: A common thread through the arguments of Opposition members has been the need for those reports to be made available, but we have been denied this. I have made public statements in recent weeks, and I have no doubt the Minister will find them on his files, because I believe a file is kept of my statements on television programmes and elsewhere. I hope that it is. The Minister of Environment and Conservation indicated to me two days ago (and I am happy with the situation) that he has a dossier of statements of mine about the litter problem and container legislation. That is not the point here, but I believe the Minister of

Transport would find from the statements recorded (and I accept having made them) that Opposition members recognize the need for a single transport authority—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You are only the second one who has said that.

Dr. EASTICK: —for the purpose of planning and co-ordinating the total requirements of this State. That has been clearly stated publicly several times. The member for Mitchell referred to statements I had made on February 20, 1973. I acknowledge having made them and of having made similar statements over a long period. These statements are not different from and are not outside the general realm of what I now say, that we recognize the need for a single transport authority. It is a progression of events, and if the member for Mitchell, the Minister, or anyone else would have us stand still and not research the full requirements of the State and alter our attitudes according to the weight of evidence available to us from time to time, they are clearly out of step with the whole situation. We acknowledge the principle of this Bill, and we have given Government members plenty of chances to make points on these issues, but we do not believe that its provisions are in the best interests of the community.

One's immediate reaction is to say (and we give this chance to the Minister and his colleagues), "Withdraw the Bill, do it properly, and re-introduce it having regard to the various aspects that should be included in such a Bill." The intangibles should be taken away and some effort should be made to remove the doubts of everyone in the community, particularly those of Opposition members, about the real intent of this legislation. The member for Mitchell said that this was the first step. We accept that situation, but what is the second step, the third step, and the fourth step? If the Minister knows where he is going in this matter, and if he is willing to make available the reports that are a necessary part of this whole issue, Opposition members may know something of his thinking and the actions that will follow. However, that knowledge has been denied us. I make no bones of the fact that I will support the Bill into the Committee stage so that we can urgently consider my suggested amendments.

With the inclusion of those amendments we could proceed to a second and then a third step subsequently without the fears of those (and certainly of Opposition members) who recognize the manner in which the Minister and his colleagues are progressing in this matter. We would be able to know that the second and third steps would be to the advantage of the people of South Australia and not, as has been said so many times, a move against their best interests. As do my colleagues, I recognize the importance of considering this matter on behalf of all the State, and in the interests of everyone and not of some sectional interest. We cannot accept a situation in which we have a sectional view that it is expedient to consider now, and subsequently consider other issues. We believe that there is an urgent need to introduce a suitable single transport authority that will recognize the need for the planning and co-ordination of the whole transport industry in South Australia. We work towards that end, and I believe that we could get some way towards it if Government members accept the amendments that I will move. A meaningful attack must be made on this problem, but I suggest that to accept the Bill as drafted would not be a meaningful step towards the necessary planning and co-ordination of transportation in this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The Leader started his speech by complaining that the member

for Mitchell had waited until almost the dying stages of the debate before speaking in it. I am delighted that the member for Mitchell spoke when he did, because I can only assume from the facts presented that he, at least, was responsible for changing the mind of the Leader from opposition to the Bill to support for it.

Mr. Coumbe: Thai's rubbish!

Mr. Becker: You would be the greatest twister I have ever heard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader finally said (and members can check *Hansard*) that he intended to support the Bill.

Dr. Eastick: To the Committee stage.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson, who was given the rather strange position of opening but concluded his remarks by saying, "I oppose the Bill."

Mr. Millhouse: That's right. That's the last thing he said.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Eyre concluded his remarks by saying, "I oppose the Bill." The member for Bragg concluded his remarks by saying, "I oppose the Bill." The member for Heysen commenced his remarks by saying, "I oppose the Bill."

Mr. McAnaney: I do.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I could go through the lot, and every Opposition member, almost without exception, opposed the Bill. However, the member for Glenelg was one notable exception, because he admitted that a single transport authority was necessary. His was one of the few Liberal and Country League contributions in which that admission was made until the Leader made his statement a few minutes ago that a single transport authority was necessary. Until then, we had heard all the gobbledegook in the world from people who obviously had never read the Bill and who knew nothing about public transport.

Mr. Millhouse: It was only after the member for Goyder spoke that they changed their minds.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It could well be that the member for Goyder changed their minds for them. I do not know.

Mr. Millhouse: All those you mentioned had spoken before the member for Goyder spoke.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is clear that they have changed their minds, and I congratulate them. I am not complaining that they have done so. On the contrary, I am delighted that at long last the Opposition has changed its mind and will now support a single transport authority.

Mr. Becker: We do not support the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is only one way we will get a single transport authority in South Australia, and for the benefit of the member for Hanson I will spell it out in single-syllable words. The only way it can be introduced in South Australia is by passing legislation in this and the other House. I should have thought the member for Hanson would know at least that much about Parliamentary procedure. The Leader did his level best to worm out of the fact that the L.C.L. really voted in support of Government policy on transport when the member for Mitcham moved a vote of no confidence in that policy. Opposition members said, "We did not vote for the Government, but we do not like personal attacks." I have sat in this seat for the past two afternoons, listening to all the abuse in the world and to personal attacks on the Minister. Now, how stupid can you get?

I give the member for Torrens full marks in that he, at least, had sufficient brains to keep out of this stupid debate. He knew that what the Government was putting up was a correct proposition, and he would not associate himself with the stupid remarks that came from other

members opposite. I congratulate him. I was surprised in one way (although it is not unusual) to hear the member for Flinders say that he agreed that we needed a single transport authority, and that that authority should be subject to Ministerial control, provided it operated only in the metropolitan area and not in the country. A typical Country Party attitude! The only place it exists is the country area of Australia. We are attempting to provide something here for the whole State—for city dwellers, urban dwellers, country dwellers, for the rich and poor alike. We do not want discrimination—

Mr. Becker: The member for Flinders did not say that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson has been sleeping for half the afternoon and would not know what anyone said. I hope he can act a little more responsibly for the remainder of this debate. I turn now to matters raised by the member for Glenelg and the member for Flinders, who both gave vent to their spleen against members of trade unions. Frankly, I cannot understand the attitude of people such as these two members, who are willing to stand in their places and to be so openly critical of others simply for being members of the trade union movement.

Mr. Mathwin: You read *Hansard* and see.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To say, as did the member for Glenelg, that a trade union secretary must not be a member of this authority is absolute rubbish and complete discrimination. To say, as did the member for Eyre, that this was a move toward compulsory unionism is utter hogwash, and the honourable member knows it. He merely took the opportunity to vent his spleen on the trade union movement and on the principles of trade unionism; we have heard him on this before. We know his attitude, and this is simply an echo of what he has said so often on previous occasions.

We have seen a great change in the attitude over recent months of L.C.L. members, and we have seen a great change in their contributions, even in this debate, because so many of them said the Bill had been rushed in without proper consideration and that it should be withdrawn. However, before resuming their seats they complained that the matter had been to one committee, that we had sent it to another and to another, and we were simply moving it from one committee to another instead of giving effect to it. Surely members opposite should make up their minds.

Mr. Nankivell: What about informing the public?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have heard much about informing the public.

Mr. Nankivell: This is supposed to be open government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wonder how many members opposite have read the report forwarded to them some time ago, compiled by the Director-General of Transport, setting out the transport policy of the Government; yet members opposite are complaining that they do not know the policy of the Government. Cannot they read? Must we have it printed in Braille? I give the member for Glenelg full credit in that he was the only member who quoted from that report. I think he is the only one who has taken the trouble to read it. I strongly recommend that all members should carefully and thoroughly read the report, entitled *Public Transport in Metropolitan Adelaide*, produced by the Director-General of Transport in September last and outlining the policy of the Government. I am pleased that the member for Flinders has now decided to get the report out of his bag and look at it, and I hope other members will follow suit. The member for Hanson

was the first Opposition speaker and the member for Glenelg was, I think, the second to last or third to last. It might be interesting if I were to read to the House a brief letter, which happened to fall on my desk this morning, from a person who lives in Jetty Road, Glenelg. That is the boundary between the districts of those two members. I do not know on which side of the street this person lives so I do not know whether he is in the district of the member for Hanson or that of the member for Glenelg. He writes:

Many thanks indeed for your letter of February 15 regarding the extension of the present diesel service to the new Hallett Cove subdivision. We are indeed grateful to you for having acted on our suggestion, and are delighted to learn that this extended service will be in operation as from July 1. I feel that with the present influx of families to this area the new service will be fully utilized. Very many thanks from all of us, and once again may I say how impressed we are with the manner in which you are handling the transport needs and problems of our State. Long may you reign!

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, so that the authenticity of document can be vouched for, would you please have it tabled, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is reading from a letter. As he is merely quoting from it, it is not necessary to table it. I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I knew members opposite would not like that. Numerous allegations have been made by them. I think the member for Hanson said we did not have a transport policy at all. Another member said we were doing absolutely nothing in the transport area. From those comments, if they were honest, which I doubt, it is obvious that there is a serious lack of knowledge on the part of the Opposition. Have members really read this report to know exactly what we are doing? Let me deal now with some of our achievements over the last few years since we have been in office. First, there has been an extension of the urban railway system. I defy any member to tell me the date on which the last extension of suburban rail services was made in the metropolitan area; but we are doing it now. We are extending the railway line from Stanvac to Christies Beach to provide public transport for urban passengers.

Dr. Eastick: Who signed the first docket?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what the Leader means by that. Is he referring to the last railway extension made? If so, I think he is referring to 1915. Which docket is the Leader referring to?

Dr. Eastick: Who made the first announcement?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I heard all sorts of announcement made by former Liberal Governments, and they were all we ever got—announcements.

Mr. Venning: That's not true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I invite the honourable member to tell me when a Liberal Government last put in a suburban railway line for passenger service.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the lines you chopped off?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No lines have been chopped off by the present Government.

Dr. Eastick: Even against the weight of all the evidence.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know about the weight of evidence: certainly not the Leader's evidence. We are electrifying the urban system to make it better, but what do we get from the Opposition? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. Venning: Run the Bee-line to Gladstone.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is typical of the stupid remarks made by the member for Rocky River and so many

Opposition members; they are irresponsible. Then there was the Glenelg tram that the Opposition wanted to stop running. I give the member for Glenelg and the member for Hanson full marks, because they did not vote on that. They, were not asked to, but, if they had been, they would have voted under dictation from the boss. We are repainting and upgrading the Glenelg trams, and the member for Glenelg knows it. He has come into this House with a lot of gobbledegook about colours, claiming that the traders at Glenelg wanted those colours. Although they have been invited to come and express their views, they have not been here.

Mr. Mathwin: They approached you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have also dealt with express buses, which on a previous occasion the Leader claimed we had announced we would institute but had done nothing about; but he and his members do not know what is happening. Do they not know that express buses commenced on the Grange route on January 29? Apparently, the Leader has not awakened to that yet, yet members opposite have the gall to come here and try to decry what we are attempting to do in the public transport area.

Dr. Eastick: What sort of roads have you got?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the Leader should keep quiet, because that interjection is almost as stupid as the one made by the member for Rocky River about running the Bee-line service up to Gladstone. In addition to these improvements, we have introduced transfer tickets. This was a bone of contention with the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: I thought you would get to me eventually.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer to what the honourable member said, because he is not attempting to compare like with like. He wants to take the cheap rate (the excursion rate, I will call it) of 35c. which is the rate for a transfer ticket, the ticket that is there to encourage people to use two forms of transport without having to pay the surcharge for the first section on each bus, train or tram. He cannot use the price of that ticket and compare it with the price of the annual ticket that he is referring to. Furthermore, although at this stage no steps have been taken in that respect, if I had my way the annual tickets, the half-yearly tickets and the quarterly tickets would be abandoned, anyhow. But what we have done—

Mr. Mathwin: And it should not be \$60.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What the member for Glenelg is saying is, "Reduce the fare on these trains and at the same time cut out the losses that the railways are incurring." It is the old philosophy of "spend more but tax less." That is an absolutely barren policy and it will not work, as the honourable member knows. I shall refer now to some other things that we have done that have been of tremendous benefit. We have introduced periodical tickets on M.T.T. services, but I have not heard one word of commendation from the member for Glenelg on that, although he asked many questions about it previously.

Mr. Mathwin: I forced your hand and forced you to do it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think we should have done it years ago. Indeed, an L.C.L. Government should have done it long before then, but it did not do so.

Mr. Mathwin: My pressure on you got it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If that gives any consolation to the member for Glenelg, I am pleased: his interjection is like an earlier interjection by the Leader. The tertiary student concessions have been of tremendous benefit to those students, but we do not hear anything from members opposite on these things. I refer also to clearways. Let

me correct one point that the member for Mitchell made when he said that our Government had introduced clearways. The former Government did provide a clearway on Anzac Highway and I give the former Government and the former Minister (Mr. Hill) full marks for acting responsibly in that respect. We have subsequently extended the clearways but, of course, the problem that has occurred as a result of this is that it has severely restricted our ideas of introducing exclusive bus lanes. We are at present dealing with that problem.

When we look into the future, we see an extremely exciting picture. Planning for the underground railway is now proceeding well, as is the planning in regard to the Modbury corridor. I could refer to many other activities, but I will confine myself to the circular bus route. But for the problem we encountered a few weeks ago in relation to buses, we would have been further advanced now with the proposal for a circular bus route. We admit that there has been a temporary setback, but I say definitely that the introduction of the circular bus route will do much to advance the public transport system still further. We do not hear members opposite say that what we have done with the bus services is good, but if they do not absorb what I say they may read about it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Mathwin: That's what your press secretary is for, isn't it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The press secretary has dealt with these matters and the people who use the buses appreciate the extended services. The point I am trying to make for the member for Glenelg is that, instead of coming here with gobbledegook and criticism that has no foundation, he should be honest for a change and give credit where it is due.

Mr Venning: You have a deficit!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will not reply to that, because if I did I would get far too personal with the honourable member. The Ingle Farm bus service has been extended to the K Mart and Ingle Farm East, and I am sure the constituents of my good friend the member for Florey appreciate that. However, I have not heard one member opposite say in this debate that he congratulates the M.T.T., its officers, or its employees on the fact that last year there was an upturn in the number of passengers carried. In fact, I have heard members being unfairly critical of M.T.T. officers during the debate.

Mr. Nankivell: Yes, but the trust has also lost business because I, like many other people, have been left standing at a stop and the bus has driven past.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That sort of comment does absolutely nothing.

Mr. Nankivell: It is an honest comment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member will go outside, make that sort of comment, and try to give the M.T.T. a bad name. In my opinion, the operators of the M.T.T. buses are efficient, co-operative and courteous.

Mr. Nankivell: Generally speaking.

Mr. Jennings: You're a non-paying customer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We heard the grudging comment about the Bee-line bus, and I ignore what the member for Rocky River has said about that matter. I think that most people now agree that it is a good service but, if members opposite do not agree, let them be out of step with the rest of the world, as the L.C.L. has been for so long. The West Beach, Grange and Panorama bus services have been extended and we have extended services to Flinders University and to Brighton railway station.

Mr. Mathwin: They can't make a left-hand turn in Brighton Road.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know why the member for Glenelg persists, because his interjections do him no credit. His remarks are stupid and it is little wonder that he is becoming known for them. I summarize by saying that the House is faced at present with a simple choice. We will have either a continuation of the operation of three separate entities, each determining its own policies and attitudes, or a properly integrated and co-ordinated service, with one authority determining the overall policy. The choice is easy, and those people who believe in public transport and in having an integrated transport policy and who believe that we must try to get the motor car off the road in the urban areas must support this legislation. On the other hand, I advise those who want the fragmentation that has operated for about 50 years to vote against the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

To strike out the definition of "prescribed body".

"Prescribed body" is referred to specifically in clause 12. I believe that, in the best interests of co-ordinating and planning the State's transport, "prescribed body" (and the connotations that may be placed on it), and the problems that could arise if the authority, under clause 12, exercised its powers and functions, would be disastrous for the State. During the second reading debate most speakers said that, generally speaking, they accepted the principle contained in the Bill. The real issue has been the way the Bill has been introduced, the effect it seeks to have, the intangibles that were not referred to by the Minister in winding up the debate, and the real need for the legislation to operate in a certain area.

This amendment and others that I will move ensure that the first step the Minister must take will be effected without doubts remaining in the minds of Opposition members of what the second, third and fourth steps may be. If the Minister really meant what he said, namely, that he seeks a single well-planned and well co-ordinated transport authority, it could be achieved by his supporting this and subsequent amendments. Initially, I would have moved a more comprehensive amendment. However, in view of the amendment the member for Mitcham has on file, I have moved my first amendment, and I seek the Committee's support for it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): During the second reading debate many members, including, I think, the Leader, claimed that the Bill was too vague. I recall one honourable member saying that the Bill was too wide open and too all-embracing. Yet, we are now in the almost unbelievable situation of the Leader, by his amendment, seeking to make the legislation even more wide open and even more vague than it was in the first place, although I certainly do not admit that it was wide open and vague. If the amendment were carried, we would simply establish an authority to sit down and think about something. Although it would be able to plan and co-ordinate all systems of public transport, it would have no systems to co-ordinate, because the removal from the Bill of the reference to the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways, and so on, as "prescribed bodies", would mean they could go on in their own way. If members opposite wanted to destroy the Bill, they should, have voted against the second reading, and not waited to take the action they are taking now. I certainly do not accept the amendment.

Mr. HALL: Although I listened intently, I could, not hear any reason for the amendment. I understood the Leader, when he spoke in the second reading debate, to say that his Party believed in the total co-ordination of transport in this State. Therefore, I surmise that his amendment is towards this end. As I do not support the total co-ordination of South Australia's transport, I will not support an amendment that would lead to that end.

I have been a member of this Parliament during times when the Opposition has fought to free road transport from licensing and restriction, and I will not support any alteration to the law that will bring back restrictions in country areas in the name of co-ordination. If the Leader wants to amend the Bill, let him do so in line with whatever is the policy of the L.C.L. This is the time for the L.C.L. to act in accordance with its policy, if it has one.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has successfully managed to draw a veil over the true implications of the Bill, and this veil has obscured the judgment of the member for Goyder. The amendment is the first of several amendments that will affect clause 12 of the Bill. Only in this clause is the term "prescribed body" used. If this amendment is not accepted, we will be signing an open cheque for the total take-over of the M.T.T., the South Australian Railways, the Transport Control Board, and any other body.

Mr. HALL: Total co-ordination.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has had an opportunity to speak. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: The whole point is that the member for Goyder has completely missed the point, which is that, if this series of amendments is passed and if any transport body is subsequently to be taken over by the Government, every such proposal will have to come before this place and be voted on here. If we let the Bill go through without the amendments, the Minister, through the proposed transport body, will be able to take over anything connected with transport at any time without any reference to this place. He knows that very well, and I suspect that the member for Goyder also knows it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I intend to ask that progress be reported in the hope that sanity will return to some members tomorrow.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SPEED)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be postponed until Wednesday, March 20, 1974.

Motion carried.

BILL OF RIGHTS

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be postponed until Wednesday, April 24, 1974.

The Select Committee has met on a number of occasions and considered a considerable amount of evidence. Towards the end of last year we were faced with the situation that the Australian Government had introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament the Human Rights Bill, which dealt

with the same subject matter only in a somewhat different way. The matter was discussed by the committee members, and at its last meeting on November 24, 1973, it was resolved that the committee adjourn and that the Chairman be authorized to fix the time and date of the next meeting, the thinking of the members being that that date could be fixed when the fate of the Human Rights Bill was known.

Mr. Millhouse: That was not the idea at all.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Human Rights Bill is still undisposed of by the Commonwealth Parliament, and it seems certain that it will not be disposed of during the currency of the present session of Parliament. That is why I am moving for an extension of time for bringing up the report.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Attorney-General has misled the House in what he has said. One cannot oppose this motion, as the committee's report is not ready and, therefore, it cannot be brought up today. We must therefore put it off. However, the reason the Attorney gave today is not the reason he gave in the committee on November 21, when he said, in effect, "We have much evidence before us and much reading to be done. It is no good our trying to meet before Christmas. We will meet again in the new year when we have had a chance to digest all the evidence that has been given and the references that have gone with it." He did not say one word about waiting to see whether the Human Rights Bill passed through the Federal Parliament. Yet that is the reason that he has had the gall to give to the House today. I said at the time that I thought we ought to meet earlier, and, even though I finally moved the motion that the Chairman be authorized to fix the time and date for the next meeting, it did not occur to me that the Attorney-General would not fix a date or time for a meeting before this House met or that he would deliberately delay, as I believe he has now done, the date on which we should report.

The real fact is that the Government does not want to proceed with this Bill but it does not want to say so. It is utterly specious, as well as being untrue, for the Attorney to say that the committee had not met before so that it could wait to see what happened to the Human Rights Bill in the Federal Parliament. We knew on November 21 that the Federal Parliament would not by this time have had an opportunity to deal with that Bill, and there was no suggestion of that. The fact is that the Government, represented on the committee by the Attorney-General, is stalling until the end of this session so that it can avoid having the matter debated in the House, and I cannot see why the Attorney-General is not willing to admit that. Indeed, it would do him more credit if he would admit it than coming to the House with what is a completely false explanation. I am surprised at his remarks and I condemn him for them. It is the first time I have known him outright to mislead the House as he has done today.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): As a member of the same Select Committee of which the member for Mitcham is a member (I have no comment to make regarding his opinion of the Minister's conduct, an opinion to which he is entitled). I inform the House that my recollection of the same occasion coincides completely with that given to the House by the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: If the Attorney-General speaks, he closes the debate.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I want merely to say that what the member for Mitcham has said to the House today is a tissue of lies.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not. It is fact.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Let us be perfectly blunt about this: I described to this House exactly what took place in the committee—

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't.

The Hon. L. J. KING: —and the honourable member now, for his own purposes, sees fit to deny that that occurred. That is the simple truth of the matter, and I am astonished at what I have heard from him today. There was indeed discussion about the volume of evidence taken by the committee and the need to consider it. The plainest statement was made at the time by me that it would be fruitless for the committee to continue with its deliberations before it knew the fate of the Human Rights Bill in the Commonwealth Parliament. Every member was there, including the member for Mitcham, who sat as close to me then as the Minister of Transport is sitting to me now, and he heard every word I said. I do not recall whether he gave a verbal consent, but he certainly expressed not the slightest dissent and, after I had completed my remarks, he moved the motion that the date of the committee's next meeting be fixed by (he Chairman. What the honourable member has told the House today is false.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Relying on Standing Order 141, I desire to explain my remarks. It provides:

A member who has spoken to a question may again be heard, to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech, but shall not introduce any new matter, or interrupt any member in possession of the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General in replying to this debate has seen fit to call me a liar, and I very much resent that and deny absolutely the accuracy of what he said. What I said in my speech on this matter was the truth. It is interesting to note that the member for Mitchell did not see fit to say that what I had said was a tissue of lies, and the Attorney-General knows that what I said is right. There has been no suggestion whatever amongst members of the committee that we should wait to see the outcome of the Human Rights Bill: it was not mentioned. The only reason given by the Attorney-General for not calling another meeting before Christmas was that there was so much material for us to go through and digest that it would be better to wait until after the holidays.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I assumed that we were to meet again about—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham wants to be named, he is going the right way about it. The Minister for Transport was on his feet on a point of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Standing Order under which the honourable member is speaking enables him to give a personal explanation of a particular point but not to resume the debate that was closed by the Attorney-General, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order because the honourable member said, when quoting the Standing Order, that he would like to speak on this matter. He has the right to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech, but he cannot introduce new material. This is the Standing Order under which I allowed the honourable member to speak, and I uphold the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have little more to say in explaining the matter, except that there are five members on that

committee but only three have spoken in this debate. One member spoke before the Attorney-General closed the debate, but he did not see fit to support the Attorney's version or to deny mine. At some stage I should like to hear from the other two members of the committee.

Mr. Payne: They are not here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Gouger is here.

The SPEAKER: Order! I refer to Standing Order 141: the member for Mitcham must confine his remarks to the provisions of that Standing Order, otherwise I will rule that he cannot continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I end by saying that there is no doubt whatever about the reason why the committee did

not meet again and about the consensus of opinion in that committee as to the reason. It was understood. I believe, by all members that we would meet again and try to bring in a report during this session of Parliament and, so far as there was any discussion at all, by today. The Attorney-General has deliberately avoided calling together the committee.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 7, at 2 p.m.