

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 12, 1969.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. EVANS presented a petition from 29 electors stating that the signatories, being 20 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that from the time of its implantation into the woman's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception) the fertilized ovum was a potential human being, and, therefore, worthy of the greatest respect; and that the termination of pregnancy for reasons other than the preservation of the life or physical and/or mental welfare of the pregnant woman was morally unjustifiable; that, where social reasons appeared to exist for termination of pregnancy, then the social condition rather than the practice of abortion should be treated; and that experience in countries where abortions were permitted on social or economic grounds indicated that such practice created many new problems. The signatories also realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances which necessitated it on account of the life or physical and/or mental health of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that, if the House of Assembly amended the law, such amendment should definitely not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Petition received.

PETITION: EARLY CLOSING ACT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition from 5,694 electors requesting an amendment to the Early Closing Act to provide for trading hours between 8 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. Monday to Thursday and between 8 a.m. and 9 p.m. Friday.

Received and read.

PETITION: FLUORIDATION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS presented a petition from 5,000 electors who strongly objected to the infringement of their democratic rights by the compulsory addition of fluoride compound, the safety of which had not been proved, to the drinking water. The petitioners prayed that the Government would refrain from adding fluoride compound to the public water supply.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

TELEVISION COVERAGE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I direct my question to you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there has been discussion for some time about the use of television cameras and sound equipment in this Chamber. Previously, it has been laid down, as I understand it, that television cameras could not be used without reference to you and that sound equipment could not be used without your approval and notice to all members that it was being used; and secondly, that you required that, where television cameras were used in the Chamber, a fair coverage of both sides would be given. Sir, given these conditions I should think, with great respect, that the use of television cameras here on occasions of public importance could do nothing other than help to inform the public of the matters that transpired in this House. I understand that today ADS 7 applied for permission to use cameras in these circumstances but that the application was refused as far as the use of sound was concerned. I ask you, Sir, whether you will reconsider this ruling, because, if television cameras are used here for speeches or questions from either side, they can be very much more effective in informing the public of what is transpiring in this House by the use of sound than simply by the use of sight, and it is desirable that people in South Australia know what transpires here and that their knowledge be not confined to those who read *Hansard* and to those who sit in the public gallery. As I should think this was something that the House could find useful and helpful in its relations with its electors, rather than otherwise, will you, Sir, reconsider the application that channel 7 has, I understand, made to you?

The SPEAKER: Application was made by channel 7 and other stations to televise the proceedings of Parliament. As the honourable Leader has stated, I told those concerned that it was only fair that if they wished to feature one side they should also endeavour to feature the other. It was noticed the other day that sound was being recorded, and some members objected. Immediately that objection was raised, I informed the people responsible in the gallery that they were no longer to record sound. The honourable Leader will know that if members take objection the Speaker should take note of it. Concerning sound, this House is governed by the rule applying in the House of Commons where there is no broadcast at all. In the

Commonwealth Parliament, a radio broadcast is allowed under a special Act. I draw members' attention to the fact that, at a previous opening of Parliament, when television cameras were being used and sound was being recorded, at the conclusion of that recording some very uncomplimentary and profane remarks were made by some members, and these were transmitted to the public of South Australia. I received many complaints about that. The other point to be borne in mind by the House is that *Hansard* has the complete right, under privilege, of reporting every word spoken in the House. Although the television cameras would be filming proceedings of the House, those concerned might be selective in what they recorded on the sound equipment, and that is different from what happens in the case of *Hansard*. Those concerned might also say that the Premier, for instance, was making a statement on a certain subject and then make no reference at all to the Opposition. I would then receive telephone calls from people, saying, "Mr. Speaker, you are very partial," biased, or whatever it might be. Members can see the difficulty that might arise from a T.V. station's selecting what it wants to record. I have no control of that whatever. When a representative of the channel telephoned today, I spoke to the Leader about the matter, as he knows. The Leader told me that he did not object to television cameras or sound being used. Since this morning, having thought over the matter of sound, I am rather hesitant about giving stations the right to use sound. However, as the Leader has now raised this matter and does not object to sound (although I point out that other members have objected to it), I will take notice of this and consider the matter further.

TRACTOR SAFETY

Mr. GILES: I was pleased to see in this morning's *Advertiser* that, at the Waikerie field day, the Minister of Labour and Industry had spoken about tractor safety, about which many landowners in the Adelaide Hills have been worried for a long time. In the hills, tractors often have to go into difficult areas to do the job required, frequently getting into dangerous situations. The problem with tractors is that no protection is afforded the driver if the tractor rolls over, for the driver generally sits well above the main part of the tractor. Although I realize the Standards Association of Australia is looking at the matter, can the Minister say whether that association has considered making compulsory the building at the back of the driver's seat of a framework strong enough to take the full weight of the tractor if it rolls

over so that, if that happens, at least the driver is protected against the weight of the tractor crushing him?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I am aware of the latter part of the honourable member's contention regarding the safety precaution at the back of the driver's seat. The whole question of the safety of tractors was discussed last month at the conference of Ministers of Labour and Industry that I attended and, at present, the New South Wales Government is contemplating legislation which, in my view, is rather restrictive. Rather than introduce that type of legislation, I have obtained copies of the draft regulations in this matter and forwarded them to all types of rural organization in South Australia, including rural youth, inviting those organizations to comment on tractor safety. What the honourable member said about tractor accidents in hilly terrain was not quite correct. A total of 50 per cent of all tractor accidents reported has occurred on flat ground, which leads to the conclusion that often tractors are wrongly attached to the other equipment with which they are used. On receiving the information I have been seeking, I intend to encourage an educational programme amongst members of the rural community and, to this end, I have conferred with the Minister of Agriculture with a view to setting up within the Agriculture Department a safety officer. As soon as I have further information for the honourable member, I will inform him accordingly.

PORT MACDONNELL

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Marine may be aware that over the weekend at Port MacDonnell a fishing vessel was washed ashore and destroyed owing to its mooring breaking in the heavy seas. The Minister may recall that only recently I raised the matter of an additional dry parking area for boats being provided by the Marine and Harbors Department at Port MacDonnell so that, during the worst months of the year, boats could be parked on shore rather than their having to remain in the bay. The President of the Port MacDonnell Fishermen's Association has discussed with me the safety of the port. He has suggested, as has been suggested, incidentally, many times in the past, that this port, which is the largest in the South-East in terms of boat numbers, should have a breakwater. This matter has been raised previously, and it has been consistently stated that the cost would be prohibitive and far too much for the purposes that a breakwater would serve. On the

other hand, local people claim that this would not be the case, because of the shallow nature of the shelf that runs out from the shore, which would allow for the breakwater to be constructed progressively. Further, good quality stone is close handy and the cost, therefore, would not be nearly as great as the department has stated. In view of this, will the Minister be good enough to have his officers investigate the possible construction of a breakwater and determine whether or not its cost would be prohibitive?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will have the matter examined. The honourable member is correct in assuming that any breakwater would cost an enormous sum, probably several million dollars for an adequate-sized breakwater, depending on the prevailing winds and the coastline. I have already had discussions on the provision of additional areas for the dry parking of boats in the Port MacDonnell area but, as the investigations are not complete, I cannot advise the honourable member any further.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: Last week I asked the Premier several questions on the report of the committee that inquired into the numerous derailments on the South Australian Railways. I am sure the Premier will be alarmed, as every member of the public is, to learn that there have been two more derailments this morning. As the report of the committee blames the shortage of manpower for inadequate track maintenance, will the Premier, as a matter of urgency, obtain details of the reduction there has been in the number and size of gangs over, say, the past 15 years, and the resultant increase in lengths of line that the gangs are now required to maintain?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the available figures for the honourable member.

Mr. VIRGO: I draw the Premier's attention to the second paragraph on page 15 of the derailment committee's report, which states:

The efficacy of sleeper plates in minimizing maintenance of gauge problems, such as are currently being encountered in South Australia, has been proven beyond all doubt by the prolonged experience of the associated railway systems of Victoria and New South Wales. All the experimental work has long been done and the facts are plain to see. The question is not whether the South Australian Railways can afford to use sleeper plates but, rather, whether it can afford not to use them.

I am led to believe that over the years repeated requests have been made by those people directly engaged in the laying and maintenance of tracks concerning the necessity to use these

sleeper plates and, in fact, recommendations have been repeatedly made that they should be used. However, I am also led to believe that, on every occasion that such a request has been made, the administrative authorities of the South Australian Railways have always rejected the recommendations. In view of this situation, will the Premier investigate the matter to see whether the claims I am making are, in fact, correct? If they are correct, will he bring in a report indicating who rejected the recommendation and the reason for the rejection?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As usual, the honourable member lists a long line of hypothetical situations and uses "ifs" and "buts" to build a framework, which he then tries to present as fact. Without the honourable member's having to work so hard to build up a case such as that, I assure him that I will get a reply to his question. He does not have to try so hard to create fact out of rumour.

Mr. Virgo: It's not rumour.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In fact, the honourable member asked whether, if what he said was true, I would do a certain thing. I assure him that I will examine his remarks, simply taking them to be a report to me on which he desires information, and I will get that information for him.

SECONDHAND CARS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: About 12 months or more ago a constituent of mine went into a secondhand car sales yard and bought a car for \$2,100, on what he thought was a hire-purchase agreement. A few months later, because of metal fatigue in the brake master cylinder, he had an accident. The insurance company accepted the cause of the accident as metal fatigue and paid out but, because my constituent was under 25 years of age, there was a limit that he could be paid on his policy. This placed him in financial difficulties, and he rang the hire-purchase company. He claims that it entered into a verbal agreement to re-write his contract in order to get him out of his difficulties. However, the company did not honour that agreement and it repossessed the car. Later, my constituent saw the car in another secondhand car yard and, on asking the price, was told that it was \$1,300. Later, he received a statement and an account from the hire-purchase company stating that it had sold the car for \$508. I am not naming anyone today, because I want fair thought to be given to this matter, but will the Premier refer the matter to the appropriate authority for investigation if I give him the dockets and other details?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased if the honourable member hands me the dockets in confidence so that I can make the fullest inquiry on behalf of his constituent.

JERVOIS WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether there is any plan to improve the present poor domestic water supply at Jervois?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is recognized that a domestic water supply project is desirable, but as this is expensive it has not been possible to include it in this year's financial allocation. At present, the department intends that this project shall be commenced in 1970-71 and probably concluded in 1971-72. All being well, an allocation will be made for the next financial year.

ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to several questions I have asked concerning the renovations required at the Enfield Primary School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: In accordance with my statement in reply to the honourable member's question in February, work was executed to provide a general-purpose room, staff room, sick bay, and office and storeroom at the Enfield Primary School. Work also commenced on the provision of the library. However, representations have been received from the school committee for alterations to the library design. Departmental officers recently visited the school and examined the varied library design requirements, and, at the same time, the leaking roof was inspected. Measures will be taken to expedite the required work.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about the possibility of a high level in the Murray River this spring?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Hume dam is at 2,400,000 acre feet. Water is being released to keep it at this level until the end of September for possible flood mitigation. This level is 80,000 acre feet under capacity. The water released following the heavy rain in the Hume catchment late in July is expected to give a flow of 15,000 cusecs in South Australia towards the end of August. This is not sufficient to overtop the banks. If any further heavy rains occur in the middle Murray area or the Hume catchment, between now and, say, the end of September, then a high river can be expected in October or November.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. CASEY: About six months ago members of the South Australian Railways Institute, who were visiting Peterborough, spoke to me about the position regarding their headquarters in Adelaide as a result of the Government's decision to build a festival hall on the site of those headquarters. At that time, I told the people concerned that I thought the Government would do something that would benefit them in the event of their losing the premises used by them at present. However, I was rather surprised to read in yesterday's *Advertiser* a letter from the Secretary of the institute claiming that in only a few months the present buildings would be knocked down and that no argument on the matter had been entered into by the Government.

In fact, going into this matter I find that, overall, about 132,000 people who pass through the Railways Institute headquarters in Adelaide each year will be adversely affected if denied the present facilities. That was not the figure quoted in the paper yesterday; it is in excess of the figure quoted. The figure referred to in the letter relates only to two buildings used by the institute, but I point out that there are about 500 employees at the Adelaide railway station and that, during every lunch hour and on every working day of the week, about 120 people use the facilities provided at the institute.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is beginning to debate the question.

Mr. CASEY: I am giving the Premier facts and figures, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is still debating it.

Mr. CASEY: —so that he may know the score on future amenities for these people. I ask the Premier whether, as a matter of urgency, he will take up this matter with the officers of the institute so that he may give them some concrete alternatives and tell them exactly where they will have their headquarters in future. As the officers involved are deeply concerned about the present situation, will the Premier handle this matter as expeditiously as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I thank the honourable member for the great quantity of detail in his exposition and reasoning. I assure him that the matter is being looked at currently by the Government and that action will be taken as soon as possible regarding the alternative site of the premises for those who use the present building and the surrounding facilities. I assure the honourable member, too, that the Government is in no way unmindful

of the use that is made of the building and that it will do its best to settle the matter as soon as possible. When we do settle it, I will inform the honourable member.

LOCK ROAD

Mr. EDWARDS: At this time of the year Main Road No. 43, especially between Rudall and Lock, becomes wet, slippery and dangerous to drivers. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when the work being undertaken between Lock and Rudall on this important road will be completed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Mr. McKEE: I notice in this morning's *Advertiser* a statement headed "Critical of Minister" and stating, in part:

A resolution of no-confidence in the Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) has been adopted by teachers at "one of Adelaide's largest schools". The no-confidence motion, passed by teachers at a metropolitan high school, has been sent to the Premier (Mr. Hall), and the local member of State Parliament.

I am sure that the responsible people concerned would have fully considered the matter before adopting this resolution. In view of the seriousness of the matter, will the Premier say whether he has received a copy of the no-confidence motion and, if he has, what he intends to do about it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Answering the last part of the question first, what I intend to do about it is to express my complete confidence in the Minister's ability and integrity. Having said that, let me add that the Government does not mind criticism and, in fact, welcomes suggestions relating to anything in which it is involved and which concerns any part of the community. But to pass a motion of no-confidence in the Minister, who has at all times made herself available to those wishing to see her about education matters and who has faced publicly and fearlessly all the issues coming within the administration of her office, is pure nonsense.

This is especially so when one is aware of her ability in Cabinet and of the strong representations she has made, successfully, on behalf of South Australian education. I do not know whether the motion so described results from a lack of knowledge of the situation and of the work undertaken by the Minister or whether it is politically motivated but, in any case, I reject it entirely. I have not seen a copy of it but, if it is in my mail or is among the papers that arrived this morning, I will certainly deal with it soon.

PLANT CLOSING

Mr. RODDA: A couple of weeks ago a group of people consisting of about 100 employees of Perry Engineering Company Limited came to see the Premier at the House to express concern at a likely move to close down a part of the plant operated by Perry-Johns Limited. These people were worried about the likelihood of a retrenchment. Will the Premier outline the results, if any, of the representations made to him?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: When these gentlemen came with their union representative to see me one afternoon at Parliament House, they told me of their problem and were concerned that in about a month their jobs would disappear because of the re-organization taking place within the Johns-Perry group. They were concerned whether they would all be offered alternative employment. The next morning, on contacting the Manager of the Johns-Perry group, I was assured that the company would do all in its power to maintain the level of the employment and the job flow through the works to such an extent that most of these men would be employed at the other three city plants of the group. Since then, I have been informed that, the company having been able to arrange additional work from other States, all 116 employees at the Croydon Park plant have been offered jobs at the three other city plants situated at Mile End, Kilkenny and Port Adelaide. Of the 116, eight took other jobs in the meantime, but all of the rest are expected to transfer to the other plants. Although a few of the men may have to be involved in night-shift work as a result of the transfer, the company has told me that it expects a marked resurgence in business by September or October, when it will be able to offer these men normal employment. Therefore, I can say that the result of the approach by the men and of the endeavours of the company has been that there will be no loss, as I understand it, in the men's pay envelopes.

Mr. RYAN: About a fortnight ago I addressed a meeting of men who were vitally concerned about their employment at the Croydon Park factory of Perry Engineering Company Limited. These men having been informed that their services were to be terminated, this news causing them great alarm. As a result of their representations, I introduced to the Premier a deputation at which the men outlined their position and sought the Premier's assistance. The Premier said at the end of the deputation that, if he had any information at all on the future employment of these men with the

company, he would let me know so that I could convey the information to the men concerned. As a result of the Dorothy Dix question asked this afternoon by the member for Victoria, am I to take it that I have had the official reply as a result of reading in *Hansard* the answer to the question asked by the member for Victoria?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No. As a result of the honourable member's question he will now receive from me a full reply. I apologize for not giving him the reply last week. It was in my bag as a hand-written note from my department. I forgot that I said at the meeting that I would give the honourable member a reply. The reply was in my bag last week. It happened to be here again today and I wanted to get it out of my bag. It so happened that the member for Victoria asked a question, and I gave him a reply. If the member for Port Adelaide desires to have a reply, I will give him one in writing. The facts are as I have stated them, and I think they are well known to the men through their union representative. The company has been able to provide the employment that most of the men were seeking, but eight of them have obtained other employment which, I hope, is to their liking.

CITRUS

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture replies to the following questions I asked last Tuesday:

(1) Has the Minister of Agriculture been informed of any difficulties in the administration of the Citrus Organization Committee and South Australian Citrus Sales?

(2) If he has, are any investigations pending and, if they are, who are the persons involved?

(3) Has the Minister considered whether he has power under the Act to disband South Australian Citrus Sales and instruct the C.O.C. to undertake all sales and marketing of citrus?

(4) Has any discussion been held with Ministers of Agriculture in other States with a view to creating a Commonwealth citrus sales orderly marketing board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has furnished the following replies:

(1) Yes.

(2) The situation has been discussed personally by me with the C.O.C., which is currently making internal administrative re-organizations.

(3) Yes. I have considered my powers under the Citrus Industry Organization Act. I do not consider I have any statutory power to intervene in this matter in the way suggested by the honourable member.

(4) Yes. Informal discussions have taken place, and growers' organizations are working towards a Commonwealth control.

CATERING COURSE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On July 29, I asked the Minister of Education a question about the provision of catering courses by the Institute of Technology. I said I had addressed a very enthusiastic Liberal and Country League meeting at Edwardstown where a question was asked me in connection with the provision of catering services. Will the Minister now supply the reply that I understand she has?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: At present the institute offers only one course which could be said to be related to the field of catering. This is a three-year part-time certificate course in institutional management, which includes instruction in large-scale food preparation and in the organization and running of residential institutions. It is designed to prepare students for employment as home economists, domestic bursars, housekeeper-caterers and so on. Apart from this, the institute has no plans to introduce any courses in the catering field.

TENNYSON SEWERAGE

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 29 regarding sewerage at Tennyson?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As the area concerned adjoins the land to be developed under the West Lakes proposal, the Tennyson scheme is now being revised to ensure that it will fit in with the West Lakes requirements. The cost estimates for the initial Tennyson scheme showed that the works would be expensive and that the revenue return would be very poor. However, on completion of the revised scheme in about one month, the financial aspects will be re-appraised.

JAMESTOWN BUS SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN: Last year, figures for the Jamestown-Riverton co-ordinated service were supplied to me and published in the local press. Their publication was appreciated by the local people. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport how many passengers and parcels were carried on the co-ordinated bus service for the year ended June 30, 1969? What was the total revenue received and the total cost of providing this service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to get the information.

GRAIN FREIGHT

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of July 24 regarding charges for the removal of grain from railway sidings?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Wheat or other grain removed from stack or silo on railway land for carriage other than by rail is subject to the following charges:

(a) For local use or consumption, 15 cents a ton.

(b) To a destination not reasonably served by rail, 15 cents a ton.

(c) To a destination reasonably served by rail, the current "AP" rate a ton for one to 10 miles, nominal 83 cents a ton.

(d) To a destination reasonably served by rail for use on a farm that is 50 miles or less by road from the silo or stack, 15 cents a ton.

(e) As for (d), but where the road journey is in excess of 50 miles, 83 cents a ton.

There is a minimum charge of 50 cents a consignment in respect of items (a), (b) and (d).

NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of August 6 about national parks?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The possibility of purchase of some of this land is under consideration following a recent discussion with the owners. However, the possibility of purchase for national park purposes is rather remote because of the very large sum of money that is likely to be needed. At present, the State Planning Office is being asked to consider the purchase of the land for the various objects of the Planning and Development Act. It should not be understood from these comments that the owners are considered to be unreasonable in the price being asked.

SCHOOL TERM

Mr. BROOMHILL: I believe that the Minister of Education now has a reply to a question I asked last week, following some

doubt as to her intentions, concerning the request from teachers for a fortnight's break in May. Has the Minister reconsidered this matter?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not accept the statement that there has been any doubt about this matter. As I promised to do the other day, I have obtained a full report. In April this year the Director-General sent to the South Australian Institute of Teachers for its comments the term dates for 1970 with the normal 10-day vacation at the end of term 1, and an alternative proposal showing a fortnight's vacation at the end of the first term in 1970. In reply, the institute sent a modification of the term dates with the fortnight's vacation in May. Its proposal would have reduced substantially the number of days in the year on which children would have attended school. This modification needed much more consideration and consultation with other organizations, and the institute was informed that, because there was no time for this consultation, the term dates recommended for 1970 would not allow for a fortnight's vacation in May, but the normal 10 days as set out in the Director-General's letter of April 11. I am taking immediate steps to have a new pattern of term dates with a two weeks' vacation at the end of term 1 in 1971 promulgated for all to see in the November 1969 *Education Gazette*, and to be confirmed in the March 1970 *Gazette*. As there has been some doubt about the number of times in which there have been summer vacations of a shorter duration than seven weeks, I have had prepared a table showing the beginning and end of the school year and the length of the long vacation for each of the last 12 years, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

LONG VACATION

First Day	Last Day	Summer Vacation	Teachers
Tuesday, February 10, 1959.	Thursday, December 17, 1959.	1959-60	.. 7 weeks, 4 days.
Tuesday, February 9, 1960.	Thursday, December 15, 1960.	1960-61	.. 7 weeks, 4 days.
Tuesday, February 7, 1961.	Tuesday, December 19, 1961.	1961-62	.. 6 weeks, 6 days.
Tuesday, February 6, 1962.	Tuesday, December 18, 1962.	1962-63	.. 6 weeks, 6 days.
Tuesday, February 5, 1963.	Thursday, December 19, 1963.	1963-64	.. 6 weeks, 4 days.
Tuesday, February 4, 1964.	Thursday, December 17, 1964.	1964-65	.. 7 weeks, 3 days.
Monday, February 8, 1965.	Friday, December 17, 1965.	1965-66	.. 7 weeks, 2 days.
Monday, February 7, 1966.	Friday, December 16, 1966.	1966-67	.. 7 weeks, 2 days.
Monday, February 6, 1967.	Friday, December 15, 1967.	1967-68	.. 7 weeks, 2 days.
Monday, February 5, 1968.	Thursday, December 19, 1968.	1968-69	.. 7 weeks, 3 days.
Monday, February 10, 1969.	Friday, December 19, 1969.	1969-70	.. 6 weeks, 2 days.
Monday, February 2, 1970.	Friday, December 11, 1970.		

UNDERDALE HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about staff at the Underdale High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member's information that a mathematics teacher on the staff of the Underdale High School was resigning at the end of last week was not correct. In fact, the date of resignation is August 30, which is the end of this term. The Headmaster was informed on Wednesday last that a teacher for mathematics and science would be appointed from the beginning of the third term. The Secondary Staffing Officer of the Education Department keeps in touch with schools losing staff. During an earlier conversation the Head volunteered that he could cover the situation without a replacement by combining two small classes to form one large class in the low fifties. The staffing officer told him it would be best to avoid this, and said that endeavours would continue to be made to find a replacement. This replacement was found last week, as I have already said. At no time did the Headmaster receive instructions that under no conditions was he to have classes of between 60 and 70, as the honourable member has said. Furthermore, at no time were the figures 60 or 70 for a class at Underdale High School mentioned during these conversations.

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to the question I asked last week has the Attorney-General a reply from his colleague concerning the report of the committee inquiring into redevelopment proposals for the Hackney area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No: I would have told the Leader if I had.

HARD DRUGS

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked on July 31 concerning the availability of hard drugs?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The term "hard drugs" is often applied to the narcotic drugs, including heroin, morphine and pethidine. Heroin is now entirely prohibited in South Australia, but morphine and pethidine are very valuable, indeed essential drugs, in medical practice. They are controlled by the Dangerous Drugs Act, which requires strict accounting for their use, and provides severe penalties for illegal possession and unauthorized sale and distribution. All prescriptions for these drugs are examined in the Public Health Department,

and any irregular or unusual prescribing is investigated. Any addiction, or any extended treatment beyond two months, must be reported to the Public Health Department.

Purple hearts, which contain an amphetamine derivative, lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.) and similar drugs are generally referred to as "soft drugs"; the sale of these drugs is restricted to prescription, and the Police Offences Act Amendment Act, 1967, prescribes heavy penalties for the possession, distribution and use without lawful excuse of declared drugs. The amphetamines and the hallucinogenic drugs, including L.S.D., are declared drugs for the purposes of the Act. Discussions are currently taking place at the request of the Minister of Health, following the recent conferences of Ministers on drugs of dependence, between the Commissioner of Police and the Director-General of Public Health on the need for further legislation on drugs of dependence.

JERVOIS ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: I ask my question of the Minister in charge of electricity supplies. I notice in the Loan Estimates that money is to be made available for improvements in the hundred of Mobilong. As the voltage has dropped in the Jervois area, can the Minister say whether work is to be done in that area and, if it is, when?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will get the details for the honourable member.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about the report of the Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is understood that the Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution has completed its inquiries and that the report is being prepared.

WEEDS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the spreading of weeds along roadsides?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Wherever noxious weeds are identifiable, Highways Department personnel take care to avoid the cartage of soil containing such weeds. It is inevitable, however, that some unintentional cartage will take place. Councils are responsible to ensure the control of noxious weeds on roadsides, they are generally well aware of their responsibilities, and take all reasonable

precautionary measures to minimize the spreading of weeds.

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the possibility of controlling the spread of noxious weeds in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The following report by the Director of Agriculture outlines action being taken to control the spread of noxious weeds in the Adelaide Hills area:

1. Eleven district councils and two municipal councils are involved in noxious weed control in the immediate Adelaide Hills districts. All of these councils have noxious weed inspectors, and the Agriculture Department is actively assisting them in the field and training them through formal lecture courses. Eight of these councils receive Government grants to pay half the salaries of these officers.

2. During the past five years grants amounting to \$14,730 have been made to these councils for African daisy, St. John wort, cape tulip, wild artichoke, blackberry and other noxious weeds on unoccupied Crown lands. Besides this, Government departments such as the Highways, Forestry and Railways Departments have spent considerable sums attending to noxious weed control on occupied Crown lands. During the current financial year 10 per cent to 12 per cent of the total grants allocated for noxious weed control on unoccupied Crown lands and roadsides surrounding Crown lands will be received by these councils.

3. Besides the direct assistance outlined above, research facilities have been improved, and research work currently being carried out by the Agriculture Department will ultimately help landowners in these regions considerably.

BARLEY

Mr. VENNING: At present, as you know, Mr. Speaker, a certain quantity of clipper barley is being handled in this State and, because of its type, this barley is expected eventually to be the principal malting variety grown in South Australia. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture when clipper barley is expected to become the principal malting variety for South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer this question to the Minister of Agriculture and get a reply as soon as I can.

COOLTONG IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Irrigation ascertain when work will begin on installing the new pipe main in the Cooltong district? Will he also ascertain whether the main will be pressurized and when the project is expected to be completed? Further, will he find out when the pumping station's output will be increased from the present rate of 280,000 gallons an hour to the

proposed 400,000 gallons an hour which, I think, is suggested for that pumping station?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member and give it to him as soon as possible.

SOUTH-EAST HOUSES

Mr. CORCORAN: About three or four weeks ago the Minister of Housing promised me that a re-assessment would be made of the rent increase announced by the Government for Woods and Forests Department houses in the South-East. The Minister said that an officer of the Housing Trust would be dispatched to the area to conduct this re-assessment and that a further decision would subsequently be taken on the matter. Will he say what progress, if any, has been made in this regard and when we can expect a decision?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: So far as I know (and I must confess that I have not chased up the matter within the last 10 days), officers of the trust were going immediately to the area to commence their work. I have not yet had a report on the matter; nor, indeed, possibly would I expect to get one directly. It is a matter more between the lessee and the Woods and Forests Department, as the owner of the house, which is the relationship to be considered at this point. However, I will ask the Housing Trust just how much work it has done in this regard and let the honourable member know.

MORGAN DOCKYARD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 30 about the current state of plans for rebuilding the Morgan dockyard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Planning for improvements to be carried out at the dockyard at Morgan is still in progress, and no programme of works has yet been formulated. No firm decision has been taken on whether the dockyard will be protected against all floods up to the 1956 level. On present indications, it seems that it would not be economical to protect against floods of this level which will occur infrequently.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 29 about school subsidies?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: No change by the present Government has been made in the

policy regarding school subsidies. As the honourable member will know, this policy is that in April of each year schools submit form AD31 (an "application for allocation of subsidies") for the ensuing financial year. An allocation is then made to all schools having regard to funds available, school enrolments, previous allocation and special needs, for example, new schools. Schools may spend up to the limit of their allocations without submitting further applications for subsidy. At the end of February each year, schools are requested to inform the department of any allocated funds which they cannot use, and this money is distributed to schools requiring additional subsidy. In addition, Loan money is made available for the subsidizing of assembly halls, swimming pools, changerooms and canteens.

APAMURRA SIDING

Mr. WARDLE: At the Apamurra siding accommodation is available on the spur line to the silo for only about five trucks to be loaded with wheat. As there is only one train a week, obviously not much preparation can take place regarding the loading of trucks in this rather restricted area. Will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the department intends to extend the space available?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will get a report.

LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. BROOMHILL: In his report 2½ years ago the Licensing Royal Commissioner (Mr. Sangster) said that some dining-room prices for wines served by the bottle represented a surcharge of up to 200 per cent over wholesale cost. As a result, I have asked the Premier questions, the last of which was on July 24 when I pointed out that he had sent me a report by letter (and this was in reply to earlier questions) stating that the Liquor Industry Council of South Australia had pointed out that a subcommittee of that council had agreed to a new price list which showed that, where the bottle department price of wine was between \$1 and \$1.40, the dining-room price was increased by 60c and, where the bottle department price was \$3 and over, the price in the dining-room was marked up an additional \$1.50. The report continued:

These margins will be recommended to hotel-keepers as the maximum which may be charged, and we shall expect those giving less than first-class service to charge proportionately less. The Australian Hotels Association

has promised to police this to the best of its ability and we shall watch closely the effect and observance of the new margins during the ensuing months.

I received that reply by letter in April of this year. I then asked the Premier the following question:

As this report was sent to me in April, can the Premier say whether these new prices have been observed, what effect they have had, and whether or not hotel dining-rooms and restaurants have observed them?

Can the Premier now reply to that question? In the last week or two the Premier has replied to a question asked by the member for Angas on a similar matter, but that reply did not answer the important question I had raised. Therefore, can the Premier say specifically whether these new arrangements will be honoured because, if they are not to be honoured, we must look at what will be the next step?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out where the report is now. I sent a letter to the Liquor Industry Council about the matter, and I will find out how current that is. I think I might have told the honourable member previously that I have since had talks with the Chairman of the council. The same problems arise regarding questions about regulating prices as arose regarding previous questions about the type of service provided in the various establishments serving these beverages. I will get a reply for the honourable member.

GAS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the replacement of Malleys and Metters wall gas ovens and associated grillers?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I have a reply for the honourable member on a slightly different subject. From inquiries made, I am satisfied that all reasonable precautions are being taken by the South Australian Gas Company in connection with the conversion of gas appliances for the use of natural gas. The honourable member seeks assurances and, for his information, I point out that I had a discussion with the General Manager of the Gas Company last week. That company has effected very substantial public risk insurance as a matter of normal business prudence, not because it is thought that the introduction of natural gas will lead to extensive damage to property or injury to persons. In relation to the special ovens referred to by the honourable member, the General Manager told me that the

company was preparing to take special precautions. Although this is not thought necessary, at its own expense the company intends to provide additional materials for this purpose. As I said in reply to a question last week, the public has been unnecessarily alarmed in respect of this matter.

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Recently I received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport about the cost of lighting and the poles used for lighting on the Hills Freeway. I was told that one of the reasons the Highways Department used the particular type of pole it used was the capacity of the pole to collapse on impact. Within the last two days it has been brought to my notice that a motor car hit one of the poles, that this caused \$200 worth of damage to the car, but that the pole was still standing. Will the Attorney-General ascertain from his colleague whether the claim that these poles collapse on impact is actually true?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It sounds to me as though the car did not hit the pole hard enough, but I will get a report.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: In view of the unprecedented action taken by all staff members at the Brighton High School in supporting unanimously the disciplinary procedures taken within the school, I consider that it is necessary to clarify my own position. While I had received certain complaints in relation to disciplinary procedures at the school, I was not aware that the matter had become public until my notice was drawn to the statement of the Director-General of Education in last Tuesday's *News*. It would be my normal practice in these circumstances to request that the parents concerned see the Headmaster first. I did not take up these complaints with the department.

It was this statement that prompted my question in Parliament on the same afternoon. In the course of asking that question I said, "One is loath in regard to disciplinary matters to intervene in the way in which this school is run." Later in my explanation I made an adverse comment on the practice of excluding students from classes. I regret very much having made that comment in the course of

asking the question without first fully consulting the Headmaster and staff on the matter, and I apologize for that.

I take the view that any procedures adopted in relation to discipline should be subject to the fullest discussion by the department with the staff concerned and that any decisions taken should be very heavily influenced by the views of the staff, even though those views may conflict with departmental views. In the case of the Brighton High School the opinion of the staff must be given the fullest weight, and until members of the staff have agreed on possible alternative measures they must be fully supported not only in this Chamber but also by the officers of the department. It would not be honest of me if I allowed people to conclude from my remarks that I am now completely satisfied as to the general efficacy of exclusion of students from classes as a disciplinary measure. A distinction can be made between the exclusion of individual students who are malcontents within a particular class and the institution of a mass exclusion applied to the whole class. It seems to me that the latter could be justified only in the most extreme circumstances. It seems also that, if the exclusion of students becomes the general disciplinary method, it could well be treated by students as a formality and lose much of its effectiveness. I would also argue that care must be taken to ensure that any malcontents are psychologically isolated from the rest of the school and that the disciplinary action does not generate sympathy among other students or among parents, thus strengthening the standing of the malcontents among the students in general.

It is undoubtedly true that many additional problems of a disciplinary nature are created by large class sizes and unsatisfactory classroom accommodation. As a consequence, it may well be that certain disciplinary measures have to be adopted that could be avoided if the physical circumstances in which teachers carry out their tasks were improved. It is also true that the changing social environment in our community, which has resulted in a general permissive approach by many parents to their children, has made the disciplinary problems of schools in general more difficult. As a result of inquiries I have made, it is clear that the policy of excluding students from classes is not confined to the Brighton High School, and, should the department issue a direction in relation to that school only, unfair

discrimination would be involved. The members of the staff at the school, by their public pronouncement, have made it clear that a serious deterioration in morale is likely to be the consequence of the cessation of traditional methods of discipline without adequate substitutes being instituted and accepted by the staff. I believe that the department has a clear responsibility to discuss this matter fully with the staff before any change is instituted. I ask the Minister of Education to take all that I have said into account and to ensure that appropriate steps are taken to provide a backing for the staff of the Brighton High School that is now so patently required.

Later:

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister will be aware of my personal explanation and of the prior conversation I had with her. Is the Minister willing to ensure that full discussions take place between departmental officers and the Headmaster and staff at Brighton High School to ensure that there is a complete and full continuity in the disciplinary procedures adopted at that school, and that no changes take place in the disciplinary procedures which will leave a vacuum or which are not acceptable to the members of the staff of the school who, after all, have to operate the system?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The matter raised by the honourable member is one involving the internal and domestic administration of the department. I know the honourable member has had a conversation with the Director-General of Education and has been informed that the Director of Secondary Education is handling this matter. In fact, the Director of Secondary Education has been at the Brighton High School this afternoon. The honourable member seems to be pursuing a personal campaign that is completely out of step with the opinion of many people directly involved in this matter and, in addition, I believe he has blown it up out of all proportion to its importance, as it is seen by several other people. As the honourable member well knows, the Director-General of Education made a press statement on the same afternoon as the honourable member directed his question to me, and I told the honourable member then that the matter would be looked into. It is rather interesting to tell the House and the honourable member that I received a letter, which was signed by many parents and teachers at the Brighton High School, expressing their concern that this matter had been made the subject of public debate.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been approached by the Directors of Tubalco Proprietary Limited concerning the position that their company faces in this State. The company supplies copper tubing. At present the suppliers of copper strip and the other manufacturers of copper tubing are allied companies which have a monopoly in the supply of copper strip material in Australia. Previously it has been the habit in South Australia, in tenders to the Supply and Tender Board, to give preference to South Australian manufacturers—and this has happened in the case of Governments of both complexions.

In certain circumstances, however, additional preferences have been given. For instance, when it was obvious that interstate oil companies were prepared to dump fuel oil in South Australia at a price below the production cost of the South Australian refinery, we were not prepared to accept their tender, because it was obvious that the aim of the interstate concerns was to wage an economic war upon the South Australian concern. Therefore, to protect South Australian industry from dumping, special arrangements were made with the South Australian refinery to buy at a price considerably higher than that which had been quoted by the interstate suppliers.

In the case I am now drawing to the Premier's attention, the industry has important potential in respect of South Australian development and it has for some time been supplying a significant proportion of the copper tubing used by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The interstate companies involved in the supply of copper strip material have made no secret of their intention to drive this company out of business, and they have tendered to the South Australian Government at a price very much below the cost of production of the South Australian company. This may well mean that there could be proceedings before the Commonwealth tribunal relating to unfair trade practices, but at the same time there is a responsibility upon the South Australian Government to protect South Australian industry from what is a clear dumping practice.

It appears that this is what is happening in relation to this industry. It has lost because of the very low tender from the interstate concern and by the decision of the South Australian Government to contract for the supply of a large quantity of copper tubing to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Will the Premier say whether the Government will re-examine this matter, because it is vitally important that the South Australian Government should use its own buying practices to protect South Australian industry from the depredations of interstate industries that want to drive our local manufacturers and suppliers out of business?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I thank the Leader for his opinions and his question. The relevant documents have been on my desk on several occasions, as this matter has a reasonably long history because of the problems associated with the interstate prices of copper tubing. The State Government has a dual responsibility both to promote South Australian industry and to look after the welfare of the general community. The choice is not easy when the unwritten but nevertheless existing preference given to South Australian industry in the purchase of South Australian products may be exceeded.

The situation has received very careful scrutiny from both the Minister of Works and me, as Minister of Industrial Development. Difficulties have been raised in respect of this contract as a result of pricing policies by the various tenderers. The Government has been confronted by this type of situation on several occasions and it has reacted, I believe, to the benefit of South Australian industry in perhaps stretching a little further than normal the preference given to South Australian products. This cannot go on forever in all directions, and in this case the situation is difficult for the local firm. I will again examine the documents and bring down a reply when I have the full details of the case.

BUILDERS LICENSING

Mr. EVANS: Last week the Minister of Housing said that he might be able to make a statement this week on the suggested amendments to the Builders Licensing Act. Has he anything to report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday Cabinet authorized the drafting of amendments to the Act.

UNDERTAKERS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about the taking of films during funeral services at the Enfield General Cemetery?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did even better than the honourable member

asked: I made inquiries myself. This was easy because, as a result of the publicity that the honourable member's question received, Evergreen Memorial Park Limited and an undertaker got in touch with me to discuss this matter. The company does arrange for pictures to be taken during funerals. This is not for the purpose of publicity but, after the funeral, the undeveloped roll of film is sent to the relatives without any obligation for payment for it. Then, it is for the relatives to decide whether they want to have it developed and to keep the pictures as a reminder of the funeral.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is that part of the cost of the funeral?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is presumably included in the total cost, but I am told that no extra or special charge is made.

Mr. Corcoran: Sometimes they do charge for it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is one of the factors taken into account, but that is entirely separate from the practice of distributing what I think may be called memorial cards. This is the practice of at least two undertaking firms. I know this, because one well-known undertaker called to see me and showed me samples of the cards he uses, and the cemetery company mentioned another firm in its letter to me. I understand from the undertaker who called to see me that this is an idea that originated in Italy. He first used the cards at funerals of Italian persons but, since then, the practice has been extended and is now used generally. However, he has assured me that the cards are not pressed on to anyone: they are simply available for distribution, and they are distributed. Perhaps more important than that, he has assured me that he has not had any complaints about the practice; on the contrary, he has had expressions of appreciation from many people. I am merely passing on to the honourable member the information I have received on the pictures and on the distribution of cards. As far as I can discover, this does not involve any matter of law. What is done is perfectly lawful; it is rather a question of taste. I am told that these actions are appreciated by many people. This is a matter on which all of us must make up our own minds, I guess. It is not an unlawful action or one on which it would be appropriate for the Government to move.

NURIOOTPA ROAD

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Late last year and earlier this year I drew the attention of the Minister of Roads and Transport to the bad condition of the 18-mile length of road from Tanunda to Gawler, pointing out that this road was being used extensively by tourists attracted to the Barossa Valley by its delightful scenery and delectable products and that since last December the road was being used more than it had been previously by passenger road services. The Minister acceded to the request to have the road repaired. It was re-sheeted, the work being completed before this winter started. However, there remains a stretch of four miles from Nuriootpa to Tanunda, the condition of which was not as bad as the road to which I have referred, but this four-mile stretch is also deteriorating rapidly. At present, it is in glaring contrast with the repaired 18-mile stretch of road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister whether his department has any plans for putting into a good state of repair and condition the road from Nuriootpa to Tanunda? This would put into good order the entire road into the Barossa Valley.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to find out.

LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of August 6 about the allotment of Crown lands in the counties of Chandos and Buckingham?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The reply covers questions asked by the honourable member and also by the member for Albert, who asked me for information on the same area. I have examined the progress made in preparing land in county Chandos for allotment. Ten blocks have been surveyed in the hundreds of Fisk and Quirke. The nine blocks in the hundred of Fisk are undeveloped and will be made available for general application. The one block in the hundred of Quirke is partially developed and occupied. It is expected that allotment will be made to the occupier, subject to his making a satisfactory application. Soil conservation reservations have been determined by the soil conservator following detailed field inspection. All blocks have more than 4,000 acres of land capable of pasture development. Detail of the blocks is being prepared for publication in the *Government Gazette* in the usual way, for the purpose of inviting applications. The notices are expected to be published before

December. I am proposing to give further examination to the area of the blocks and the conditions of the lease.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the Minister did not say how many blocks were open for allocation in the hundred of Day and whether any applications had been received for these blocks, will he obtain that information?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will do that. I think the hundred of Day is not at the same stage as are the hundreds of Fisk and Quirke, to which I referred.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: On July 15 the Premier, when addressing a public meeting at Wallaroo, said that the seismic survey of the Wallaroo harbour had been completed the previous evening. Since then, the Minister of Marine said that good data had been procured and was being evaluated in Sydney. He said that it was thought that it would take one month to do the necessary processing. Will the Minister say whether a report has been received from the processing authority on this matter and, if it has not, when it is expected that it will be received?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have not yet received a report on the Wallaroo seismic survey, but I will make inquiries to see when it will be available. I believe I said that, after the data had been received from the computer, it would have to be assessed by departmental officers. This might take a little while but, as soon as I have enough information to advise the honourable member, I will do so.

STUDENT NURSES

Mr. McANANEY: Country hospitals are finding it difficult to obtain tutor sisters for the training of their staffs, so many make-shift methods have to be used, particularly in hospitals in the Murray Bridge, Strathalbyn and Victor Harbour areas. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether an investigation could be made into the possibility of providing some central training centre for student nurses or whether a pool of tutor sisters could be made available to country hospitals?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague.

MICE

Mr. EDWARDS: Last week the member for Semaphore commented on the standard of wheat being exported from this country and complained that export wheat contained a

high level of mouse manure. Farmers on Eyre Peninsula and in other parts of the State are worried about the mice problem and their numbers, especially as they seem to be breeding throughout the winter period. This matter is of real concern to all farmers and to all country people. Because of the increasing mouse population the Government should take steps to appoint a mousetologist to control this pest. I take exception to, and am disgusted with, members opposite who are casting reflections on our great wheat industry. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to ensure that action is taken to keep the grain free from all foreign matter and have it clean for export?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a most complicated question. It is complicated by the fact that, recently, the member for Semaphore gave me a letter on this subject which he did not read to the House but which referred to impurities in wheat. Now, the member for Eyre has asked me a further complex question incorporating a new word for me: I think he referred to a mousetologist. Members will notice that when I am in real difficulties on agricultural questions I refer them to the Minister of Agriculture, and this is about the only action I can take on this question. As I have not yet received a reply to the question asked by the member for Semaphore, I hope that I shall receive both replies together, and that the question of mousetology will be dealt with in detail by the Minister whose job I am happy to say it is.

PARKSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about additional land for the Parkside Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Consideration is being given at present to the possibility of purchasing some properties adjoining the Parkside school. The Education Department is at present awaiting a valuation by the Land Board.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD

Mr. EVANS: My question concerns the corner on Mount Barker Road, which is an extension of the freeway, adjacent to the concrete mix plant about half a mile to three-quarters of a mile past the Toll Gate. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport how many accidents have occurred at this corner in the last two years, and the estimated amount of damage caused by such

accidents from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1968, and from July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1969?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although this corner is on the roadway where it is the boundary between the Districts of Mitcham and Burnside, the road is used by people travelling to and from the honourable member's district, and I shall be happy to find out the figures for the honourable member.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the shortage of science teachers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Following the honourable member's question, inquiries have been made that indicate that there are no full-time teachers with science degrees who are not teaching science and mathematics subjects. The honourable member gave me the name of Mr. Clive J. Nikkerud who, he said, was "teaching in a school at Mount Gambier, an area where science is not taught and not used". I have ascertained that Mr. Nikkerud is teaching the normal load, and all of his teaching subjects are mathematics and science.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked on August 5 about the South Australian Egg Board's grading charges?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that an independent investigation into costs incurred by the board's grading agents in the candling, handling, and grading of eggs has been concluded. As a result of information revealed in that investigation the board has informed its agents that as from August 31, 1969, reduced handling and grading charges will apply. An announcement to this effect will be published in the August issue of the board's journal.

FINDON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BROOMHILL: As a result of my interest in the problems that have been confronting the Findon High School recently, I have been provided with further information that I believe the Minister of Education should consider. It has been pointed out to me that the Matriculation classes at this school number 139 pupils, most of them studying five subjects, giving a total of about 730 "subject-students". There are 24 subject-classes altogether, six of them with more than 40 students, and 11 with more than 35 students. Thus, one quarter of fifth-year classes have more than 40 students.

A more meaningful, and alarming, statistic is that no less than 34 per cent of subject-students are in these classes, and over 80 per cent of students attend at least one such class. It is no consolation to these students to hear that the average size of the State's Matriculation classes is 25, nor that 6 per cent of these classes are in excess of 40 students. Anyway, it would be more significant to know what percentage of students are in these classes. Although 20 is considered to be a desirable limit to the size of classes in most Matriculation subjects, 75 per cent of the classes at Findon are larger than this, involving 86 per cent of subject-students. No student can attend five classes of desirable size. In view of these facts, can the Minister say what special measures are being considered by her department to ensure a progressive fall in the number of Matriculation students in each class in the next few years?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report for the honourable member.

MENINDEE LAKES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the agreement concerning Menindee Lakes water?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The meeting of State and Commonwealth Ministers held on March 7, 1969, agreed to the inclusion of the terms of the 1963 Menindee Lakes Agreement in the permanent operations of the river system, and this is an essential item in the formula developed for the acceptance of the Dartmouth proposal. The operation of the Menindee Lakes as a River Murray Commission storage was considered both for the Chowilla and Dartmouth proposals. The meeting also agreed to only modify the terms of the agreement, in respect to the water available to New South Wales, by increasing the quantity from 90,000 acre feet to 100,000 acre feet a year. The original conditions as to storage levels are not to be changed. This means that the River Murray Commission may call on waters in storage in excess of 390,000 acre feet, provided that, when the storage falls below 390,000 acre feet, the commission shall not have any claim on waters out of Menindee Lakes until the storage has risen to 520,000 acre feet. Legislation in relation to the extension of the Menindee Lakes Agreement will be embodied in the wider proposals for amendment to the River Murray Waters Act.

WHEATGROWERS

Mr. CASEY (on notice):

What is the percentage of wheatgrowers in South Australia, for each of the last five years, who have produced:

- (a) less than 3,000 bushels;
- (b) between 3,000 and 4,000 bushels;
- (c) between 4,000 and 5,000 bushels; and
- (d) over 5,000 bushels?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Australian Wheat Board states that the statistics requested have never been kept. Furthermore, because of variations in expression of the grower's name (*e.g.*; initials only or full name supplied) and because of the complications involved in partnerships, reliable figures of the kind asked for could not be obtained from the board's head office. The only way in which the information sought could be obtained would be from the statutory declarations sent in in regard to wheat delivery quotas, but this would involve several man days of effort. The staff of Co-operative Bulk Handling of South Australia Limited is already working overtime in processing these forms.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What progress has been made with the extension of electricity supplies to the Naracoorte District Council area?

2. When will the Frances area of stage 4 of the scheme be connected?

3. What is the present progress and expected completion date of extensions in the District Council of Penola area?

4. When is it expected that electricity extension work will be commenced in the hundred of Lochaber?

5. What stage of planning has been reached with extensions in the Lucindale District Council area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The replies are as follows:

1. The Electricity Trust of South Australia took over the electricity supply in Naracoorte from the Naracoorte Corporation in September, 1966. A high voltage transmission line was then built to Frances and the electricity undertaking there taken over by the trust in June, 1967. After this the trust embarked on a programme to extend electricity supply into the greater part of the District Council of Naracoorte area comprising the hundreds of Hynam, Binnun, Naracoorte, Jessie, Robertson and Joanna, in four stages. The first stage, covering the eastern section of the hundred of

Hynam and most of the hundred of Binnun, was completed in June, 1969. Construction of the second stage, covering most of the hundred of Jessie and the eastern part of the hundred of Naracoorte, is in progress and the contractor is expected to complete work by March, 1970. Design work is in progress on the third stage, which will cover the hundred of Joanna and the southern portion of the hundred of Naracoorte. Tenders will be called for this stage later this year. It is expected that construction will begin in about December, 1969, and be completed by about March, 1971. No work has yet been done on the fourth stage, covering the remaining part of the hundred of Naracoorte, the hundred of Robertson and the remaining parts of the hundreds of Hynam and Binnun. This stage is scheduled for completion in about March, 1972.

2. This area will be the first to be dealt with in stage 4 and, if the present schedule can be maintained, extensions in this particular area should be completed in about June, 1971.

3. The hundreds of Gray and Nangwarry, with the exception of a small area in the north-east of the hundred of Nangwarry, have been supplied by the trust for several years. After taking over the responsibility for electricity supply to Penola in July, 1967, the trust began planning extensions to extend supply throughout the remainder of the district council area, comprising the hundreds of Killanoola, Comaum, Monbulla and Penola, previously covered by the franchise held by the Penola Electric Supply Company Limited. A 33,000-volt transmission line was extended north from Penola to Coonawarra and a substation constructed at Coonawarra. Extensions from this substation to provide supply to the wineries and vineyards at Coonawarra were completed in March, 1969. Further extensions in the area between Coonawarra and Penola and south-east of Penola are under construction and should be completed by October, 1969. Design work is now in progress on the next stage of the extensions, which will supply the areas east of Coonawarra and Penola and the hundred of Monbulla, west of Penola. Tenders for the construction of this stage will be called later this year. It is expected that work will begin in about September, 1969, and be completed by about June, 1970. The final stage, covering the hundred of Killanoola and the northern part of the hundred of Comaum, is expected to be completed by June, 1971.

4. It is expected that construction of extensions in the hundred of Lochaber will begin in about March, 1972, following completion of

the fourth stage of the Naracoorte extension mentioned in the answer to Question No. 1.

5. The trust plans to erect a transmission line from Naracoorte to Lucindale and build a substation near Lucindale by the end of 1972 or early in 1973. The site for this substation has already been purchased just north of Lucindale. Detailed plans have not yet been made for supply to the rural areas surrounding Lucindale. Work on these extensions would begin after the substation has been established at Lucindale and a supply provided to the township from the trust's system.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COLEBROOK HOME

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I refer to the questions asked me in the last few weeks by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Onkaparinga concerning the decision of the Government not to renew the lease of Colebrook Home. I had previously declined to say why the Government had made this decision and I did not do so in answer to questions. I had two reasons. First, although the lease is due to expire on October 31, 1969, and is not to be renewed I have made an offer to the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated to allow it to continue to occupy the premises after that date and until they are required for other uses. I did not want to prejudice consideration of the offer. Secondly, I was anxious to avoid public criticism of persons who have worked long and hard in the interests of Aborigines even though in my view their efforts have not been effectively directed. However, I acknowledge the public criticism which this course of action has brought and now feel obliged to make this statement to the House setting out the reasons for the decision.

I understand that Colebrook Home was first commenced in 1924 at Oodnadatta. Later, premises were obtained at Quorn, and Colebrook Home was in operation there until 1944. Whilst at Quorn it was under the control of Sisters Hyde and Rutter, who gave motherly care and guidance for the children, many of whom have distinguished themselves in the general community. In 1944 Colebrook Home took over its present location at Eden Hills.

Over the years the standard of care has deteriorated and conditions that passed prior to the war as satisfactory are no longer up to the required standard.

With few exceptions the superintendents of the home, whilst highly motivated and possessed of evangelical fervour, have had no training for the position of a superintendent of a children's home. Since 1944 there have been many changes of superintendent and since 1960 no superintendent has stayed longer than two years. This necessarily has a disturbing effect upon the children who already have experienced considerable disturbance in their lives. In 1962 the home had 20 children, all maintained by the Aboriginal Affairs Department. At present there are 11, with five being maintained by the department. For a number of years it has worked towards reducing the inmate population and the children have been placed with foster parents or in other institutions. It is felt that the remaining boys could, with a little effort, also be placed out in a short time. However, the Secretary of the mission, in his possessiveness and unco-operative attitude, has thwarted the welfare officers in their efforts to achieve this.

The Secretary is Pastor Samuels of the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated, by whom the home is conducted. It is an organization entirely separate from the Federal United Aborigines Mission. I shall refer to this later. Much of the present ineffectiveness of the home as such is due to the attitude of Pastor Samuels for the following reasons:

- (1) He controls the superintendent too rigidly and is not able to keep staff, and actively discourages their discussing problem inmates with welfare officers.
- (2) He is loath to permit visits between children and their natural parents.
- (3) He is unable to institute a healthy programme of child care with suitable recreation, etc. There is strong emphasis on religious exercises, to the exclusion of the broader cultural, vocational and personality needs of the child. I emphasize, however, that the religious convictions themselves of those responsible for the home is not a factor relevant to the decision.

The home is not licensed under section 162a of the Social Welfare Act, subsection (1) of which reads as follows:

No person shall keep or conduct a place as a children's home in which more than five children under the age of twelve years are at

any time received, cared for, maintained or trained apart from their parents or guardians unless he is the holder of a valid licence in respect of such place granted to him under this section and he complies with such terms and conditions (if any) as are specified in the licence or are prescribed.

At present, there are five children under 12 years of age at the home, so the mission can operate as an institution without the need to be licensed. On June 15, 1966, the General Secretary of the United Aborigines Mission Inc. applied for Colebrook Home to be licensed as a children's home pursuant to section 162a. Before amending legislation came into effect on January 27, 1966, there was no requirement that children's homes in South Australia should be licensed.

The home was inspected by an officer of the Social Welfare Department in June, 1966, and again in April, 1967. Following the second inspection the General Secretary was informed by letter that the Director of Social Welfare was not prepared to issue a licence under section 162a of the Social Welfare Act. He was further informed that pursuant to subsection (1) of section 162a the home should not be used as a place in which more than five children under 12 years of age may be received, cared for or maintained. I point out that this was well before I became Minister, and during the period of office of the last Government.

On March 4, 1969, a fresh request was received from the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated for Colebrook Home to be licensed. No action was taken by the Social Welfare Department on that request pending notification to the authorities of the home that its lease was not to be renewed. At no time has Colebrook Home been licensed as a children's home. Apart from the dissatisfaction with the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated in its management of the home, the premises at Eden Hills are unsuitable for the purpose. They were built in about 1915 or earlier as a retreat for inebriates and consist of some 26 rooms, with four suitable as dormitories, and other rooms suitable for staff and offices. Because of the layout of the buildings effective staff supervision of more than a small number of children would be difficult and costly.

The buildings are in very poor condition. The toilet and ablution block has been so badly damaged by white ants that replacement at an estimated cost of \$10,000 is needed. It is estimated that other renovations and

repairs necessary to restore the buildings to reasonable condition would cost about \$13,000. I mention that a term of the lease is that the lessee keep the premises in good repair. Expenditure of about \$23,000 to place these old buildings in order is considered to be unjustified, especially as the design makes them inconvenient and unsuitable for use as a children's home.

Even if the necessary repairs were done the premises could only be used as an institution accommodating a maximum of 28 children. This by present-day accepted standards of child care is far too many. It is generally agreed that children should live in cottage homes in groups of not more than about 10 or a dozen. The Colebrook property is just over 16 acres. Obviously the property, and the buildings on it, is far too large indefinitely to be used for this purpose.

At its meeting on Monday, July 1, 1968, the Aboriginal Affairs Board discussed Colebrook Home. The minute is as follows:

The board received an application for the following financial assistance for the Colebrook Children's Home:

	\$
20 cub. ft. refrigerator	531.71
No. 6 Metters stove (48in. x 24in.)	314.00
	<u>\$845.71</u>

The board was advised by the Director that United Aborigines Mission Inc. lease expires on November 1, 1969, and the Public Buildings Department has referred to the Honourable the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs the question of the future of Colebrook, as the United Aborigines Mission Inc. has also requested from the Public Buildings Department that the toilet block be completely renovated at a total cost of \$10,000. The board decided to recommend to the Minister that the lease of Colebrook Home to the United Aborigines Mission Inc. should not be renewed and that the requests for renovation of the ablution and toilet block, as well as for a new refrigerator and stove, be declined.

The recommendation was subsequently conveyed to me. Many years ago, I believe in 1947, there was a division in the United Aborigines Mission. The Federal United Aborigines Mission operates in several of the other States. In South Australia, it is completely separate from the United Aborigines Mission Inc. which now runs Colebrook. The Federal United Aborigines Mission runs Tanderra Hostel for girls, at Torrensville, and Kali Hostel for boys, at Westbourne Park. Sisters Hyde and Rutter, whom I mentioned earlier, left Colebrook at the time of the split to establish Tanderra.

They have now retired. At present, 12 girls are living at Tanderra. It is full, with a waiting list. Kali is a hostel for secondary school boys at Westbourne Park, started this year. Because alterations to the building are not yet completed there are only three boys there, but its capacity will be 11. Besides these the Aborigines Advancement League runs the Wiltja Hostel for 15 girls at Millwood.

It will be seen therefore that there are other hostels for Aboriginal boys and girls in and about Adelaide well run by other organizations. Eventually the decision which has been taken is a matter of judgment based on the knowledge and observation of officers of the Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Social Welfare Department over a long period. It is profitless to canvass separate incidents. I should add that the home is situated in my own electoral district. I live at Eden Hills within about half a mile of Colebrook. I have visited there on occasions ever since becoming the member for the district in 1955. I therefore have personal knowledge of the home. This confirms the advice given to me by the two departments and the Aboriginal Affairs Board. I am also fortified by knowing that my predecessors as Ministers of Social Welfare were the first to refuse the licence. I believe that their opinion of the home was broadly the same as mine.

I know that the Legislative Council Select Committee has reported favourably on Colebrook and its work. With respect, I cannot accept its recommendations on this point. Necessarily its time was limited and it had a tremendous amount of work to do to cover its terms of reference. I understand that members made one visit to the home and subsequently had a discussion with Pastor Samuels in his office. I cannot prefer its views to those to the contrary expressed after consideration over a much longer period. Personally I still hope that the United Aborigines Mission Inc. will remain at Colebrook until we require the property. It is better for it to be used for some purpose rather than to be empty. I do not know how soon it will be required, nor the use to which it will be put. It is likely to be for the Social Welfare Department or the Aboriginal Affairs Department or both.

CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all consolidation bills shall

stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report. That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions. That the Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse), the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Mr. Nankivell be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That Mr. G. R. Broomhill be appointed to the Standing Orders Committee in place of Mr. L. G. Riches.

Motion carried.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon.

R. S. Hall:

That this House:

(a) acknowledges:

(i) that the general principles underlying the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study were laid down in the Metropolitan Development Plan which was endorsed by Parliament by legislation enacted in the years 1963 and 1967 and are designed to meet the transport needs of all people of the State whenever they move within the metropolitan area; and

(ii) that adequate safeguards in the implementation of that part of the proposals accepted by the Government will be assured to the community because the transportation proposals are required (under the terms of the Planning and Development Act) to be consistent with the general provisions of the development plan as it may be varied from time to time;

and

(b) endorses:

(i) the general principles underlying the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals for the co-ordinated development of both public and private transportation and ancillary facilities; and

(ii) the action taken by the Government in approving in principle a major proportion of the proposals as set out hereunder:

Retention of suburban rail passenger service on the four existing main lines to Outer Harbour, Gawler, Blackwood, and Hallett Cove, and extension of the Hallett Cove line to Christie Downs.

Construction of the King William Street subway to connect the two main lines on the north with the two main lines on the south and necessary modifications to rolling stock.

Express bus services on the Modbury Freeway.

Express feeder bus service on the Reynella Expressway to a transfer terminal at the Oaklands railway station.

An extensive programme of station modernization and reconstruction to encourage transfer from automobiles and feeder buses to the rail system.

Twenty suburban rail road-grade separations.

Arterial road system: 220 miles of arterial road improvements including 20 miles of new arterial roads, and 200 miles of arterial road widening.

Expressways—

Dry Creek Expressway

Glenelg Expressway

Gawler By-pass

Reynella Expressway

Port Wakefield Expressway

Freeways—

Noarlunga Freeway

Hindmarsh Interchange

Salisbury Freeway

Port Freeway

North Adelaide Connector

Modbury Freeway

and contained in the report and excepting certain proposals which include those relating to the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway (affecting the eastern and southern suburbs) and the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail diversion (in the western suburbs);

and

(c) is of the opinion:

(i) that the Metropolitan Transportation Committee should annually make a written report to each House of Parliament on the programme of work in implementing the proposals contained in the report which are accepted from time to time by the Government; and

(ii) that the Government should continue its examination of existing legislation relating to the compulsory acquisition of land and introduce amendments thereto so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the acquisition of land necessitated by those proposals.

(Continued from August 7. Page 798.)

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): Before I resume speaking to this motion, let me say that I was somewhat amused by the Leader of the Opposition championing the televising

of the proceedings of this House from the gallery. Perhaps he is not aware that, in his absence from this State, there was some opposition to this procedure from his own members, who made a noise from the benches opposite when I was being televised in the course of my statement. The noise was quite evident from members opposite.

Mr. Lawn: We asked whether the same facilities would be available to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I understand it, the Leader of the Opposition objected to the *Four Corners* team being present in this House last Thursday when I was speaking.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense! There was no objection from this side.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I accept what the Leader says, but it was reported to me that members opposite were objecting. If that is not so, I believe they would in future always champion the presence of television in the House.

Mr. Corcoran: Objection was taken last week to the fact that you were being televised and the Leader was not.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Then objection was taken. When I was granted leave to continue last Thursday, I was outlining the planning goals of the transportation study. So that they may be on record in full, I will outline in full the general planning goals. The plan should guide and where necessary direct the development of transportation facilities and services in the Adelaide metropolitan area in such a way as to preserve and enhance the social and economic welfare of the community as a whole. The plan should be within the financial capabilities of the community. Compromises may have to be made, therefore, between the ideal and the obtainable.

Within the broad principles expressed in the above planning goals, guide lines were established to guide the study. These were as follows:

Maximum use should be made of existing facilities.

The transportation plan should support a pattern of land use which will minimize travel needs in the future.

The plan should be aimed at maintaining and enhancing urban property values.

All major traffic generators should be well served.

The plan should be aimed at maintaining and enhancing the vitality of the entire metropolitan area with particular emphasis on the central business district.

Implementation of the plan should promote orderly development and growth of the metropolitan area with minimum disruption of the urban structure consistent with the objective of achieving efficient movement.

Total cost to the community, both in first cost and in continuing maintenance and operating expenses, should be justified by sound economic analyses and the plan should be realizable within financial resources likely to be available.

A number of alternative transportation systems were developed, with varying degrees of emphasis on public and private modes of travel. Within these systems, numerous alternatives for specific elements of the proposals were considered. To assist in the assessment of the various alternative elements of the proposals, more detailed community value criteria were established, and each alternative was rated as to the degree to which these criteria were complied with. I will now comment briefly on the M.A.T.S. proposals.

Public Transport: The plan envisages the development of public transport to the maximum extent that is economically feasible. In the course of the study an extensive investigation was undertaken on the factors which influence the choice between the use of the private car and public transport. Based on the findings of this investigation, an assessment was made of the public transport patronage that can be expected with various levels of improvement. It was found that beyond a certain level additional expenditure (even every considerable expenditure) could be expected to attract only very few additional patrons.

In the particular circumstances that will apply in metropolitan Adelaide within the next 20 years, further expenditure on the improvement of public transport services beyond that recommended (\$107,000,000) would be grossly ineffective and cannot be justified by sound economic analysis. It is also considered that the level of expenditure recommended for the improvement of public transport services is the maximum that is realizable within the financial resources likely to be available for the development of this element of the transportation system.

Without question, public transport has an essential and vital role to play. The travel for which public transport is most suited is the travel between home and the place of work. The vast majority of the daily travel is other than this. Therefore, the Government believes that it must be realistic about the level of public acceptance of public transport as a means of travel and of the economic consequences of failure to recognize the proper balance between the public and private modes of travel.

The public transport plan is co-ordinated with the highway plan to form a balanced transportation system. Comprising an integrated rail and bus network, the plan allows for travel between most residential areas and centres of employment, education, commerce and recreation.

Some important aspects of the plan are: rail rapid transit serving north-west, north, south-east and south corridors; an underground rail link through the central city; extension of the Hallett Cove rail service to Christie Downs; and express buses operating on the proposed Modbury Freeway serving commuters from the Tea Tree Gully area.

Primarily, the rail system is seen as most suited to serve commuters from outer suburbs. Adelaide's existing rail network is readily adaptable to rapid transit type operation offering fast, comfortable, convenient and economical service. The plan recognizes rail's high passenger-carrying capacity and fast average speed capability. Strategically placed stations will draw passengers from large areas by means of properly co-ordinated feeder buses and the provision of parking facilities at selected rail stations. Convenient distribution in the central city area, a key requirement for successful operation of the system, is achieved by routing all lines through a railway under King William Street bringing patrons within a few minutes' walk of their city destinations.

The proposed rail rapid transit route mileage is 64. It is estimated that approximately 112,500 people will use the metropolitan rail system on an average week day in 1986.

The proposals for bus services visualize several types of operation, namely: express bus between the central city area and outer areas not served by rail; express bus from outer areas with passenger transfer to rail at an intermediate station; local bus with frequent stops and routes radiating from the central city area district or from regional centres; feeder bus

services to outer rail stations; and crosstown bus services operating between inner suburbs but not passing through the central city area.

In the proposals the existing Glenelg tram service is to be discontinued and replaced by local bus operation in about 10 years' time. However, in the light of the decision now taken by the Government in connection with the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail diversion, it may now be possible to retain a service on the Glenelg tram route, connecting with the King William Street subway. This matter will now be investigated fully. About 272,000 person-trips by bus are predicted for an average weekday in 1986.

The Highway Plan: Investigations have clearly shown that it is neither economical nor practical to rely on the arterial road system to provide for the whole of the road travel demand up to 1986. Development of the arterial road system beyond that recommended would not only be greatly more expensive in terms of money than the alternative of developing freeways, but would increase the social cost and general community disturbance to an extent that would be intolerable.

Of the 10,000,000 vehicle miles of travel expected daily by 1986, the plan provides for the accommodation of 6,000,000 vehicle miles of travel daily on the arterial road system (including expressways), and 4,000,000 vehicle miles of travel daily on the freeway system.

The arterial road plan envisages the widening and improvement of 240 miles of existing roads and the construction of 35 miles of additional new arterial roads to improve and extend the arterial network. Also proposed is the elimination of 20 road-rail level crossings, major intersection improvements at 29 locations, and the construction of a new bridge across the Port River at Port Adelaide.

The arterial road system in the inner area is based on a series of radial roads of which Torrens Road, Main North Road, Payneham Road and Anzac Highway are typical examples. Complementing the radial roads is a circumferential system which includes such roads as the terraces surrounding the central city area, Cross Road, Marion Road, Regency Road and Portrush Road.

In the outer areas, such as in the Salisbury and Noarlunga districts, the arterial road system is based on a predominantly rectangular grid pattern. A feature of the cross-section proposed for arterial roads is the provision of central medians which are regarded as essential for the efficient functioning of important traffic arteries.

The recommended freeway system in the study provides for freeway connections from the inner areas to Modbury (extending to Elizabeth), Crafers (Hills Freeway), Noarlunga, Port Adelaide and Salisbury (Port Wakefield Road). The Government has not accepted the recommendation for the Hills Freeway, as explained earlier.

The Salisbury Freeway connects with the Noarlunga Freeway to provide a by-pass on the western side of the city of Adelaide. The Modbury Freeway connects with a freeway link between Walkerville and Hindmarsh (North Adelaide Connector).

Interchanges are provided where the freeways cross strategic arterial roads and, between interchanges, underpasses or overpasses will provide continuity of the arterial and sub-arterial road systems.

Disturbance of the Adelaide park lands by the freeways has been reduced to the minimum by locating the western by-pass route well clear of the park lands and by providing for a tunnel section in the North Adelaide Connector (the link between Walkerville and Hindmarsh).

The total length of freeways recommended in the plan is approximately 60 miles. With the exclusion of the Hills Freeway, the plan accepted by the Government includes 50 freeway miles.

The freeway system will be supplemented by three expressways: an expressway from Port Adelaide to Pooraka connecting with the Salisbury Freeway at Dry Creek and with the Main North Road and Montague Road at Pooraka; an expressway on the alignment of the old Glenelg rail line connecting from the Noarlunga Freeway at Marleston to the Anzac Highway at Morphettville; and the development of the Main South Road to expressway standard between Darlington and Reynella. The total length of expressway recommended in the plan is 15 miles. The M.A.T.S. investigations have shown that the section of freeway most urgently required is that providing a by-pass on the western side of the city of Adelaide.

Proposals for the central city area: To assist in the planning of the central city as the major business, entertainment, and cultural centre of the metropolitan area, the M.A.T.S. plan proposes: (a) improved access to the central area; (b) improved parking both long and short term; and (c) better public transport.

Principal access from the west and south-west will be via the proposed new Hilton Road connection. This high type controlled access

arterial road will connect Rowland Road and the proposed Noarlunga Freeway with West Terrace and allow for good distribution and dispersion of traffic on to the east-west city streets, south of the central area.

Anzac Highway will continue as the major traffic route to the inner south-west suburbs.

A proposal to realign Goodwood Road from Greenhill Road, into Morphett Street, at South Terrace, will reduce traffic on West Terrace. Through traffic will transfer on to Morphett Street which will become a main north-south traffic artery immediately west of the central city area. Traffic from the western suburbs will also be served by a new Henley Beach Road connection. Port Road, in the Adelaide City Council area, will be further improved. On the east of the city, a new connection will be provided from Magill Road via Rundle Street, Kent Town, to a new junction at the eastern end of Grenfell Street. Distribution of traffic from the eastern suburbs on to the east-west city streets will be further improved by the extension of Hutt Street, from Grenfell Street to a new junction with North Terrace near Botanic Park.

Other proposals include a new link between North Adelaide and Frome Street, City, and a new bridge over the Torrens River near the Zoological Gardens complementing the proposal of the Adelaide City Council to extend Frome Road southwards to join the Glen Osmond Road. The M.A.T.S. proposals do not cover specific parking policies or the location of parking facilities. Estimates of parking demand have been made in the study and as a result the general parking policies and programmes of the Adelaide City Council have been endorsed. It is estimated that by 1986 the city will require 2,500 short-term and 15,300 long-term parking spaces, in addition to those presently available.

Proposed improvements to public transport in the central city area include: a railway subway under King William Street with stations at Rundle Street, Victoria Square and Gilles Street; improved routing and frequency of local bus services; terminal facilities for express buses serving the Modbury and further north-eastern areas; and a major off-street terminal for country bus services near Victoria Square providing for transfer to rail and metropolitan services.

Cost of proposals: The estimated cost of implementing all the recommendations in the M.A.T.S. proposals is as follows:

Road		\$	\$
Freeways and Expressways	299,300,000		
Arterial roads, rail crossings and proposed Port River crossing	137,200,000		
Total Road			436,500,000
Rail			
Rolling stock	32,000,000		
King William Street subway (including Good- wood-Edwardstown rail diversion)	32,800,000		
Other line improvements	14,300,000		
Total Rail			79,100,000
Bus			
Rolling stock	26,900,000		
Depots, etc.	1,500,000		
Total Bus			28,400,000
Parking			
Parking	30,000,000		
Total			\$574,000,000

The proposals envisaged by the Government are estimated in cost as follows:

Road		\$	\$	\$
Freeways	224,700,000			
Expressways	11,900,000			
Arterial roads, rail crossings and proposed Port River crossing		236,600,000		
Total Road			135,300,000	
Total Road				371,900,000
Rail				
Rolling stock		32,000,000		
King William Street Subway		31,100,000		
Other line improvements		14,300,000		
Total Rail				77,400,000
Bus				
Rolling stock		26,900,000		
Depots, etc.		1,500,000		
Total Bus				28,400,000
Parking				
Parking				30,000,000
Total				\$507,700,000

Cost estimates have generally been based on current rates.

In so far as road projects are concerned, it is not acknowledged that unit costs will necessarily increase with the general inflationary increase in the cost structure. Larger scale road construction in the future will bring about the opportunity to organize the works on a much larger scale, the letting of larger contracts, and the more effective use of larger plant. Also, with increasing mechanization of large-scale roadworks, the labour content represents an ever-reducing proportion of the total cost.

These factors will tend to reduce unit rates whereas the inflationary factor in the general cost structure will tend to increase unit rates. It remains to be seen which is the more powerful influence in relation to future roadworks. It is of interest to note that unit construction costs of the Highways and Local Government Department have not increased in recent years in keeping with the increase in the general cost structure.

Funds available for road works: Principal sources of funds available to the Highways and Local Government Department are State

motor taxation, road maintenance contributions and Commonwealth grants to the State for road purposes. The total funds available to the department over the next 20 years are expected to exceed \$1,200,000,000. In mid-1968, when the study was completed, the estimate of the cost of road proposals exceeded the estimate of funds expected to be available for roadworks in the metropolitan area. The latter estimates were prepared prior to the announcement of the details of the new agreement between the Commonwealth and the States under which Commonwealth grants are available to the States for road works.

Under the new agreement with the Commonwealth, road grants to South Australia in the next five years will be substantially increased compared with the grants received during the past five years. Accordingly, it is now evident that the roadworks proposed in the study for the first five years, at least, can be financed without any increase in State motor taxation or any other form of taxation, and without detracting in any way from planned expenditure on rural roads. While the future of Commonwealth grants beyond the next five years is not known, estimates of revenue for roadworks based on present trends suggest that all the road proposals recommended in the study can be adequately financed without any increase in present rates of taxation.

Finance for public transport: The public transport proposals are estimated to cost \$107,500,000. Of this, \$58,900,000 will be required for rail and bus rolling stock and this figure includes the cost of replacing and expanding the privately operated bus fleet in addition to that of the Municipal Tramways Trust. It is generally recognized that failure to allow public transport to play its role in a correctly balanced transportation system would be extremely expensive in terms of the additional expenditure required on roads and in terms of the social costs involved.

Finance for parking: It has been estimated that an investment of approximately \$30,000,000 will be required to carry out the proposed parking programme of the city of Adelaide, which has been endorsed by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. This figure represents the total sum by both the city of Adelaide and private interests. The substantial progress already made by the city in its five-year parking programme has been largely financed by Loan funds.

Benefits of the plan recommended in the study report: Direct benefits to the users of roads and public transport services recom-

mended in the plan will result from savings of time due to higher operating speeds on freeways, and rail rapid transit services. It is estimated that by 1986 the savings on this account will benefit the community by \$28,000,000 annually. Owing to improved operating conditions on roads resulting from the proposals of the study, it is estimated that by 1986 road users will save a further \$43,900,000 annually because of lower vehicle operating costs. Savings in operating costs of road vehicles attributable to those passengers diverted to public transport who would otherwise use motor cars are estimated at a further \$5,500,000 annually by 1986. These estimates must be reduced proportionately to the proposals accepted by the Government.

The diversion of travellers to public transport will reduce the demand for car parking in the central city area by 3,000 spaces representing a saving of approximately \$6,000,000. In the Adelaide metropolitan area the current fatality rate in car accidents is equivalent to seven fatalities for each 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel. Studies in the U.S.A. indicate that the fatality rate on freeways averages less than two per 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel. But these are only the direct benefits. Apart from the saving in human life, direct benefits probably represent only a small proportion of the total benefit to the community of developing an efficient, convenient and low-cost transportation system. It is essential to look to transportation efficiency and convenience if we are to prosper as an industrial community and at the same time retain the high level of travel service to which we are accustomed. It must be evident to all that the cost of allowing traffic congestion to develop would be very high indeed. It is also evident that we are headed for chronic traffic congestion unless drastic action is taken, and taken soon.

I come now to road finance and expenditure on rural roads in relation to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. The implementation of the metropolitan transport study will not divert road funds from the country to the city.

The Highways Department is planning ahead for both city and country works. Planning in the city is necessarily on a longer-term basis. Because of the interrelationship between city transport proposals and other forms of urban development, it is necessary to develop plans up to 20 years ahead in order that other forms of development can be influenced and the necessary land can be reserved.

In the country it is not necessary to plan 20 years ahead; indeed, to do so would be disadvantageous, as it would limit flexibility. It is only where the land is likely to be developed for other purposes that we should plan beyond five or possibly 10 years. It must be acknowledged that there is a need for very large-scale roadworks in both city and country areas, and it is vital that all works undertaken be part of a comprehensive plan to ensure that there is no conflict between various aspects of our total development and that every works undertaken will be to the greatest advantage.

Before the M.A.T.S. plan was prepared, an assessment was made of the funds likely to be available for expenditure in the city. In making this assessment, allowance was made for road needs in the rural areas. The M.A.T.S. plan was prepared in the knowledge of the amount of funds likely to be available, and the principal object of the plan was to ensure that these funds would be used to the greatest advantage. It is quite incorrect to suggest that the existence of this plan will, in itself, draw funds from the country areas.

It is acknowledged that the cost of the M.A.T.S. road proposals exceeded the estimates of funds expected to be available when the M.A.T.S. Report was prepared. At that time details of the new agreement with the Commonwealth in connection with road grants to the State were not known. While this agreement covers only five years, it is pleasing to note the substantial increase in Commonwealth grants (a 50 per cent increase compared with the last five years). In the light of the new agreement, it now appears that adequate funds will be available for both M.A.T.S. and a considerably accelerated programme of road works in the country.

In the next five years, the State will receive \$129,000,000 in Commonwealth grants for road works. Almost half of this (\$59,000,000) must be spent on new construction of urban arterial roads (exclusive of maintenance). These funds are not available to the State for expenditure on rural roads. In the same period, we expect State motor taxation to yield \$91,000,000 and we plan to spend two-thirds of this (\$61,000,000) in the rural areas, and one-third (\$30,000,000) in the urban areas. The plan envisages a further 50 per cent increase in traffic on the normal arterial roads when the freeway system is complete and fully operative.

Professor Moyer, the eminent transportation authority for the University of California, when in Adelaide recently, examined the M.A.T.S. plan and commented that he thought it was a minimum proposal, but agreed that we had no option but to adopt a minimum proposal, having regard to our general economy and the funds available for road works.

In past years, it has been the aim, in so far as rural areas are concerned, to extend the system of black-top roads to every corner of the State. Excellent progress has been made, and it is planned now to push this work further ahead and at an increased pace. A few examples of works of this type, taken from the current year's programme, are:

	\$
Alawoona-Meribah Road	120,000
Nuriootpa-Loxton Road	100,000
Wilmington-Orroroo Road	100,000
Streaky Bay-Murat Bay Road	445,000
Cowell-Elliston Road Between Lock and Murlong	325,000
Freeling-Kapunda Road	100,000
Myponga Reservoir Road	100,000
Williamstown-Birdwood Road	100,000

We have also to look now to the remaining interstate routes that urgently need improvement—the Eyre Highway, the Stuart Highway, and the Birdsville Track—and to further upgrade our vital road links with Victoria and New South Wales.

In the current year, \$220,000 has been provided for the Eyre Highway, \$600,000 for the Port Augusta to Alice Springs Road (Stuart Highway) and \$600,000 also for the Birdsville Track. The need for further bridges across the Murray River is continually in mind. With the provision in this current year of \$1,500,000 towards construction of the new bridge at Kingston, planning is nearing completion for the proposed new bridge near Murray Bridge, and possible further sites are now being considered.

While recommendations concerning increased revenue for road works contained in the M.A.T.S. Report were possibly valid at the time the report was prepared, the Government has not accepted these. In the light of our new estimates of revenue for road works, taking into account the new agreement for the Commonwealth, the Government sees no need for, nor has any proposals for, any increase in motor taxation or any additional tax to provide revenue for road works in the immediate future.

The Government views the suggested King William Street subway as one of the major proposals recommended in the study. It would connect the two main railway lines to the north of the city of Adelaide with the two main lines to the south. The proposal is described in the study as "perhaps the most important factor of all in encouraging the use of public transport".

The Ministerial statement of February 19, 1969, states:

The King William Street underground railway approval is given, subject to further feasibility studies being completed for both financial and engineering aspects.

The South Australian Railways has started some preliminary planning on this project. The Government is considering seeking the services of an independent authority to carry out a feasibility study, and to make further and full recommendations on this proposal. The Government is anxious to expedite the construction of this public transport facility, provided full investigations, including those on financial aspects, can be approved by the Government.

I now refer to the motion. Parliament adopted the Metropolitan Development Plan, which was endorsed by Parliament in 1963, in the 1966-67 planning and development legislation. The general transportation principles in that plan were accepted by Parliament but were designed in broad form. Refinements were necessary and the study provides such refinements.

The detailed planning of the separate components of the total development is the responsibility of the appropriate Government departments and agencies, local government and other authorities. The Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, requires that the various authorities operating within their own fields of responsibility plan within the principles established by the Metropolitan Development Plan.

I wish to point out that the State Planning Authority has made a review of the proposals and has issued the following statement:

The State Planning Authority is of the opinion that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals are based on sound premises. The study adopted the land use proposals and forecasts of the Metropolitan Development Plan which had been recognized by Parliament in the Town Planning Act Amendment Act, 1963, and subsequently became the authorized development plan for the Metropolitan Planning Area by virtue of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967.

The State Planning Authority considers the recommended transportation plan to be consistent with the provisions and objects of the current Metropolitan Development Plan.

In regard to the safeguards mentioned in paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of the motion before this House, the Government's proposals so far in regard to the study are made in the knowledge that the proposals are consistent with the principles contained in the Metropolitan Development Plan applying to metropolitan Adelaide as it may be varied from time to time in accordance with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967.

Any approval will, therefore, be subject to any subsequent revision of the Metropolitan Development Plan varying the basic principles applicable to the transportation proposals. A supplementary plan cannot be approved by the Government in accordance with the Act unless public exhibition of plans and adequate opportunity given to the public to present objections to the State Planning Authority are undertaken in accordance with the Act.

The Government has included the main points that have been approved in principle within the motion so that the broad concept of approvals can be understood more quickly than having to refer in detail to the long and complex study report. The Metropolitan Transportation Committee will make annual reports of its work and progress and these will be tabled in the same manner as other departments and agencies table reports in Parliament. In this manner, Parliament can peruse and be informed of the co-ordinated planning of the various transportation agencies as they proceed and implement stage by stage the co-ordinated transportation plan for metropolitan Adelaide in the future. The Government is greatly concerned that fair and just treatment of individuals both from the financial and the social aspect should be given to people whose property is to be acquired.

A committee comprising Mr. K. C. Tacuber (Chairman), member of the Public Service Board, in his capacity as Federal President of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, Mr. W. A. N. Wells, Q.C., Solicitor-General, and Mr. C. E. Rix, Chairman of the Land Board, was appointed by Cabinet on March 7, 1969, and its terms of reference are:

To inquire into and report on the provisions of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act 1925-1966 and to recommend amendments, if any, to that Act to provide just compensation for persons affected by the compulsory acquisition of land.

The committee has met on several occasions and has sought submissions from the following parties: Real Estate Institute of South Australia, Law Society of South Australia, Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, Corporation of the City of Adelaide, Railways Commissioner, Commissioner of Highways, Director and Engineer-in-Chief, Director-General of Education, Director of Planning, Director, Public Buildings Department, Director of Marine and Harbors, and the Chief Government Valuer. Also, the committee has sought copies of legislation and comments from interstate authorities on the effectiveness of the practical operation of procedures and compensation assessments in other States.

His Honour Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell of the Supreme Court of New South Wales in its land and valuation jurisdiction, who is an authority on the subject of the committee's inquiry, has visited Adelaide for discussions with the committee. A member of the Land Board has made investigations interstate and is submitting reports to the committee on the terms of reference. The committee has already made certain recommendations to the Government. The committee considers that an essential requirement for the effective operation of compulsory acquisition procedures for both the Government and dispossessed landowners is that litigation over disputed claims for compensation be disposed of with the least possible delay by a tribunal which specializes in that jurisdiction. This opinion is confirmed by experience in New South Wales where there has been a Land and Valuation Court since 1921 constituted by a judge or judges of the New South Wales Supreme Court.

From information at present available to the committee it is evident that this court has provided the means for the effective and expeditious disposal of the whole range of land and valuation litigation in that State. Its decisions form an authoritative set of principles within which most matters in the field in New South Wales can be settled without recourse to litigation. Legislation to constitute such a court in South Australia would be complementary to legislation for the creation of intermediate courts, and it is desirable that if it is approved it be included in the current work being done on the proposal for intermediate courts.

The Government has agreed in principle with this recommendation of the committee and the Attorney-General is having the necessary legislation prepared. The committee has also

recommended to the Government to define phases for and to enact reservation regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967.

Since the publication of the M.A.T.S. Report, and its subsequent partial adoption by the Government, the consequential land purchases by the Commissioner of Highways have proceeded: (i) by a continuation of the purchases for metropolitan arterial road widening on the bases of negotiated purchase and compulsory acquisition that have existed for many years; and (ii) by negotiated purchase on the basis of administrative decision on "hardship" cases for new highway proposals in the report. (Compulsory acquisition procedures have been used only in a few exceptional cases.)

Owners of land in category (ii) are not only subject to a departmental assessment of "hardship" circumstances if they wish to dispose of their land and are unable to do so in the real estate market, but they also face difficulties if they seek approvals for building developments from local government authorities. At the request of the Commissioner of Highways, councils are discouraging private development proposals on land on proposed new highway routes.

In the committee's opinion, early action should be taken to safeguard land to be purchased for planned highway proposals and at the same time to protect the rights of landowners. The power in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, to make regulations reserving land required for future public uses, with consequential provisions for the protection of the use and compensation rights of affected landowners, provides an existing statutory code for this purpose. The State Planning Authority has prepared model regulations under this provision, and it is currently preparing specific regulations reserving land for future major recreational and educational uses.

The committee recommends that action should be taken: (i) to define the implementation phases of the M.A.T.S. proposals; and (ii) to prepare reservation regulations under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act for the land required for at least the first implementation phase, provided that the reservation is consistent with the current authorized Metropolitan Development Plan. The Government has agreed to the committee's recommendation.

I refer now to local government bodies. The Government stated in February, 1969, that it would investigate immediately the question

of council boundaries as they relate to three small councils whose areas are affected by the proposals. These councils were Hindmarsh, Thebarton and Walkerville. Discussions have been held between representatives of each of these councils and officers of the Local Government office. Each council expressed concern at the proposed loss of area, but each was definite that it should retain its identity as a local government body. The Hindmarsh council in particular was concerned that the possible reduction in area would prohibit it from obtaining sufficient finance to give effective operation. The council representatives decided to consider the question further and agreed to discuss problems informally with their larger neighbours. These investigations by the Local Government office will continue and the Government hopes that ultimately a satisfactory plan can be achieved to meet the wishes of each individual council.

Finance Committee: A special finance committee which the Government said in February would be set up has been appointed. Its members comprise: Messrs. C. Dracopolous (Treasury Office); L. A. C. Ellis (Municipal Tramways Trust); R. R. Gray (Adelaide City Council); E. A. H. C. Morgenstein (Highways Department); A. C. Morony (S.A. Railways); D. A. Speechley (State Planning Office); and M. E. S. Bray (Secretary for Local Government).

Community Values Advisory Committee: The Government is continuing to pursue the matter of establishing a Community Values Advisory Committee, and discussions are proceeding with persons who may be appointed to this committee, which the Government considers will play an important role in relation to the future development of metropolitan transportation. Finality in this matter has not yet been reached. It is the Government's intention also to appoint a group to make a close study of the social problems that will arise from acquisition.

Social workers will be given the responsibility of discussing social problems with people affected. Particularly is the Government concerned with any aged people who may encounter difficulties in resettlement, and such people dispossessed of accommodation will be advised on social questions so that resettlement can be achieved with the minimum worry and concern.

Of the 275 Government schools in the Adelaide metropolitan area, only one (Mitchell Park) is affected to the extent that replace-

ment will be necessary. A number of other schools will be affected to a minor extent by normal road-widening requirements.

The State Planning Office is investigating the question of loss of reserve space and will be submitting its report to the Government shortly in view of the recent changes the Government has introduced in its approvals to the plan.

The Government wishes to record its appreciation to all the institutions and to local government for the manner in which, during the six months' period of public scrutiny, such institutions and councils carried out close examination of the report. The Government was faced with several alternative methods of introducing recommendations within the report, but adopted a policy of encouraging maximum discussion and comment from individuals and from groups of people concerning the proposals. Those who raised objections and those who commented both publicly and directly to the Government can be assured that full consideration has been given to submissions that have been made.

In that regard, I can say that I received a telephone call at my office this morning or yesterday evening. The call was from a critic of the plan, one who has been most critical in the past and may still be in the future, but that person said he appreciated the Government's action in placing the Noarlunga Freeway under further review.

The balanced transportation plan for metropolitan Adelaide which the Government has approved is needed to plan efficiently and correctly for both the State's and Adelaide's inevitable growth and expansion. Undue emphasis has been placed by some people upon the highway aspect within the study.

The principal consultants engaged in connection with the transportation study are highly regarded for their work in highway engineering, but are better known for their vast experience and very high standing in the field of public transport. This firm, DeLew Cather and Co., has been engaged on many major projects around the world involving rail rapid transit, other forms of urban rail operation, and bus operations. This particular firm was engaged some years ago to advise on the operation of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the conversion, in Adelaide, from tram to bus services. All honourable members know how effective that transformation has been.

The firm of Alan M. Voorhees and Associates is also particularly highly regarded for its work in general urban planning and the inter-relationship between transportation and other forms of urban development.

The Australian firm of Rankine and Hill, Sydney, played a prominent role in the study and contributed very largely in the final stage of development of the recommended plan.

The public transport proposals within the plan will provide people with a public transport service which will be modern and efficient. The arterial road-widening traffic measures and the implementation of freeways will assure motorists that the inevitable congestion will be avoided as much as possible in the future. The parking plans for off-street facilities within the city provided for, and already being implemented by the Adelaide City Council, will ensure a proper and adequate service to those entering the central city area.

Rural people are reminded that the reduction in costs to commerce and industry and to private motorists, if the plans are implemented, are expected to be something in the vicinity of \$60,000,000 a year and the benefit of this saving in costs will be gained by nearly all sections of the community. Primary industries have goods, equipment and produce moving to and from metropolitan Adelaide, and in this area benefits will result.

Geographically, the city is situated between the sea and the hills, and an easy and convenient method for vehicular traffic to pass from north to south is needed now, and such a concept is surely acceptable to everyone.

The detail provided by the Government and its method of promulgation of information concerning the study have been aimed at achieving maximum discussion and in providing maximum information to both the public and to members.

I thank the House for its courtesy in listening to that rather long presentation of the detailed matter concerning the plan, which I believe is of real worth, framed under necessity and presented to the public by the most democratic means. However, I regret that debate has been brought to a rather low stage by an attempted smear of one of the Ministers of this Government, and I have watched with interest the mounting criticism that has finally descended in this personal way. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition in the first instance reduced the argument on this very real and great plan, which was

prepared under his Administration, to the "fun parlour" stage when he came back from overseas and suggested that, instead of this plan, we could have some form of automated capsule that would magically arrive at the door of anyone who required it at the proper times in the morning and evening all over the metropolitan area. I believe that his suggestion was greeted throughout the community with the rather amused tolerance for which South Australians are noted, and I believe that this is how it should have been received. This "fun parlour" attitude has no place in the argument on this very serious and important matter for the whole State; neither do the gutter tactics that the Leader used last week in this House in relation to the reputation of one of the Ministers of this Government have any place in the argument.

It would appear that the Opposition is willing to attempt to destroy any plan recklessly and regardless of the needs of the community as long as it sees some political advantage in its destruction. In the 16 months that my Party has been in Government we can look back at the things the Opposition has been against. As long as anything is constructive, looks to the future, and satisfies the needs of the public of South Australia, one can expect the Opposition to oppose it. These are the criteria Opposition members use. The Opposition descended to a very low level—in the gutter—in its attack on the Minister. This attempt at the character assassination of the Minister implicit in the question asked in the House the other week raises a few issues. Has the Minister done anything wrong?

Mr. Virgo: Let the public answer that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If he has done anything wrong, has he done anything different from what other Ministers have done? Has he done anything different from what the Leader himself did when he was a Minister? Is the Leader using a dual standard to form his judgments in this House and before the public? I have not charged the Leader with using a standard that he should not have used in public administration in regard to a number of things that I have noted as to his conduct. We could ask: has the Minister who has been questioned and whose character has been smeared in this House done anything different in essence in the administration of his portfolio from what the Leader did when he was in office?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You had better be explicit about this.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not charging the Leader with anything. It is all right for the Leader to make charges in this House, but he does not like to be examined alongside the charges he has made against people. I do not make charges—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you have charges to make, why don't you make them?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not make charges. I suggest to the Leader that he consider his own involvement before he charges the Minister.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Involvement in what?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No. 1 was the time when we saw in South Australia, after the passage of the Planning and Development Act, the then Attorney's own firm, Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor, advertising for land on behalf of clients for development. We saw that in South Australia. We know, and we perhaps raised the question: is it so that the Leader, when Premier, had a house built at Goolwa by the same firm with which he was dealing publicly? Did he or did he not? I did not charge him with it, although I was told that he did. I did not think he committed any impropriety, and I did not mention it publicly. However, I am led to understand (and he can deny it if this is not so) that he had a house built by that same firm when he was dealing with the West Lakes scheme.

They are the two items I mention to the Leader. Let me mention another: during his term of office, and when he was a member of the firm of Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor, did his firm ever submit properties to the Highways Department for purchase? I believe that, in its rather busy and (I believe) prosperous way, that firm probably did. Are those things any worse than what the Minister did and for which he was charged in the House the other day? I have been asked for his resignation. Has he done anything worse? What is the standard in relation to criticism of the Minister in this regard? If the Leader is to pursue that tack, he had better explain his own position.

I stated during my address that the Government had been applauded in a number of instances for its handling of this matter. It is a scheme that has been endorsed by people who have dealt with many problems in various cities. I think it was only recently that we were reminded that Auckland, which has 30 miles of freeway and 600,000 people, is enthusiastically looking for more freeways.

We are proposing to this House a comprehensive plan covering many years of development. Members opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, have said that we need some freeways. This plan has the endorsement of the body that the Leader confirmed in 1966-67 in the legislation that was passed in this House. Despite political intrusion and the attempt to destroy it by the Opposition, I believe that it has the overwhelming support of the population of South Australia. I ask this House to endorse the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

To amend the motion by leaving out all words after "That" first occurring and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

this House is of the opinion—

- (a) that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report does not make adequate provisions for the development of transport movement in Metropolitan Adelaide;
- (b) that the plan should be withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Authority for reassessment to ensure:
 - (i) a properly integrated plan for roads and public transport development;
 - (ii) that any plan is financially feasible;
 - (iii) that the destruction of homes and other properties is minimized;
- (c) that the Government should proceed forthwith to amend legislation on compulsory acquisition of land so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the proposals.

Before I turn to the gravamen of the matter before the House, I should like to deal with the personal attack that the Premier has just made on me as a diversionary tactic. He has, first of all, suggested that there was some dual standard involved in my questioning the fact that the Minister in charge of this particular matter had seen fit to invite transactions that he could directly affect, and in fact does directly affect and has directly affected, by Ministerial decisions. I have said that I do not think that course is proper: I do not think that course is proper.

Mr. Casey: Many people outside think likewise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier, in return, has said that I have something to account for in my own conduct in this regard through my membership of the firm of Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor, which is not a commercial firm of any kind and which is not itself directly involved in commercial

transactions, as the Premier and the Attorney-General well know: it is a firm of lawyers engaged in business on behalf of clients. While I was a Minister of the Government, I personally was not involved directly in any of the activities of that firm, as the Attorney-General well knows. (He has a very good personal reason to know that.)

Regarding the charges that the Premier has seen fit to make against me personally, I have no personal knowledge whatever (and I should be interested to find any evidence to the contrary that the Premier can produce) of any action by a firm of which I was a partner which involved a commercial transaction that I could in any way have affected by a decision as a Minister. As far as the other charge is concerned, relating to the building of a house for me at Goolwa, a house was built for me at Goolwa by a firm of builders that is not involved in any negotiations directly with the Government, and was not at the time. That particular company has never been involved directly. I purchased the land at a higher price than that at which anybody else in the area purchased land, and I paid more for my house than anybody else paid for his house. That was a personal debt that I undertook, on medical advice, in order to provide myself with some retreat from the burdens of office.

I have nothing to apologize for in that particular transaction, which was a perfectly open and proper one and which, again, involved no kind of Ministerial decision that could in any way have affected the transaction advantageously for me. The Premier knows perfectly well, and has known all along, that there was nothing whatever in that charge. I knew that the Liberal Party had proceeded to search the Lands Titles Office to get copies of the transfer and mortgage documents before the last State elections. Liberal members knew perfectly well that there was nothing in it, and that is why they have never said anything about it. The only reason the matter has been raised here today is that the Premier is trying to excuse a Minister for something that is quite contrary to British constitutional practice.

Mr. Ryan: And he knows it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the Premier's habit, whenever he wants to defend his Government from attack upon political issues, to embark upon a series of personal attacks; it is his normal practice. This happens constantly, and it has happened on occasions when he has been required by this House to apologize for what he has done.

Mr. Hurst: And today is another occasion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me turn to the motion before the House. Following the preparation and presentation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, it was obvious and inevitable that the course of development of metropolitan Adelaide would require some additional road facilities beyond the improvement of the existing arterial road system. Before the Labor Government took office, the Playford Government had appointed consultants to prepare proposals for an improved road and transport system. The reason for its doing so was clear: the freeway proposals contained in the original Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan had been prepared on an insufficient data bank; insufficient basic work had been done in collecting material that would give guide lines as to the necessity for development of a public transport system. So consultants had been appointed before our Government took office, on a contract that was already in operation when we took office, for the collection of the necessary material in a data bank and, finally, the formulation of specific proposals.

The specific proposals had not come to hand, of course, in detail at the time our Government left office. The specific proposals had been prepared over a not very lengthy period towards the end of the Labor Government's term of office. The major part of the time spent on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study had been in the collection of the data bank material. The result of the collection of that material made it perfectly clear that the freeway development in Adelaide providing a freeway over the 50-mile strip north to south would have to occur, as there would be no adequate means of providing for future motor car transport within the city of Adelaide if there were not a freeway along the length of the projected strip of development. I see no way of avoiding a freeway of this kind.

Concomitantly, in order to provide adequate transport movement there would have to be a freeway to Port Adelaide and also to the Tea Tree Gully area. All that was inevitable in some form: indeed, over a considerable period many properties had been acquired for projected freeway development in these areas. However, when the plan was presented we had not a freeway system of this kind, with a concomitant improvement in the arterial road system, but a much more massive series of freeways which would greatly cut up the metropolitan area of Adelaide and which would take new routes where houses and properties

had not already been acquired, where there would be a grave destruction of properties, and where, at the same time, there was no effective preparation for public transport development.

The Government originally put forward the plan in the glowing terms that the Premier used in his peroration today. It has strangely resiled from that position since it originally put forward the plan, because what we now have put forward to us is not the M.A.T.S. proposal as originally presented, or even that portion of the M.A.T.S. report which was contained in the original motion as put before the House and given notice of by the Premier; what we now have is very much less than this, and a whole series of projects has been deferred, not accepted or made subject to re-examination. We do not have the original study proposals: we have bits and pieces of them, and they are so cut up that in some cases we get gaps in the middle of a proposed freeway.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes we do. The honourable member should look at the report on the Modbury Freeway. At the moment we do not know what we are specifically required to approve. We are asked to approve in principle the Noarlunga Freeway when we have not the faintest idea where it is to go. Without the design of the Noarlunga Freeway, how do we know that the thing is to fit effectively into an overall north-south freeway or into other systems that must derive from it?

If we do not know the areas in which the Modbury Freeway is to work, how can we say that we approve it in principle? At the outset, in his speech the Premier presented to us page after page of deferment for redesign and re-examination, and these are major sections of the M.A.T.S. proposals.

What is said about the Hills Freeway strangely belies headlines in the newspapers about large numbers of homes being saved by the Government's not accepting the Hills Freeway, because the Government now says that the proposals for the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway are not accepted by it. The whole matter of a proposed freeway and expressway in this part of the metropolitan area is deferred and will be considered by the State Planning Authority in its review of the Metropolitan Development Plan now being undertaken. It is the Government's policy that land acquisition along the M.A.T.S. routes will

continue to be based on hardship considerations. So, obviously enough, the properties in that area are still under threat and will be subject to acquisition.

Let us see what the people in the eastern suburbs think of this. The Premier has tried to make out a case today that the opposition to the Government's proposals is at the lowest political level and is being introduced to the House and to the public by the Opposition simply to play politics. Let me turn to what has been put forward in my own district in relation to the Hills and Modbury Freeways—and this came not from an organization of the Australian Labor Party but from the corporate town of St. Peters, the majority of members of which are, as the Premier should know, members of his Party.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I think the mayor is not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The mayor is not; anyway, he is not the whole council. This is what the council had to say about the matter:

This council has given much consideration to the M.A.T.S. Report and Freeways since the official announcement in August, 1968. Its members and staff have made every endeavour to gain a comprehensive understanding of the implications of the report, and, as a result, the council has unanimously formulated the following official policy:—

This is the official policy, and it was endorsed at large public meetings in the district at which the Minister did not appear:—

1. That the freeway proposals contained in the M.A.T.S. Report should not be approved by the State Government at this stage in view of:

- (1) The grave doubts which have been expressed by the general public and professional organizations as to the needs for and effectiveness of a freeway system.
- (2) The magnitude and likely real costs of the proposals (as against the estimates).
- (3) The genuine fears and beliefs expressed that, because of this magnitude, the structures, once built, will have to be perpetuated and supplemented at the expense of all other forms of transport and other public facilities.
- (4) The large number of residential properties to be acquired resulting in disturbance of many residents in various suburbs.
- (5) The large number of commercial properties to be acquired resulting in considerable disruption of business and affecting employer and employee alike.
- (6) The aftermath effect on the many properties which will remain (without compensation) in close proximity to

a freeway and the owners and occupiers of which will face disruption during the construction process as well as a completely changed environment in subsequent years.

- (7) The anticipated detrimental effects on many suburban municipalities (where considerable acquisition is involved), and where great potential lies for future residential and commercial development.
- (8) The air of uncertainty felt by many property owners and occupiers and the likely continuance of such uncertainty for many years (this has already caused a depressing effect on property values and a reluctance to carry out improvements and extensions).
- (9) The absolute failure to seriously study alternative measures, coupled with the apparent absolute acceptance of the continued dominance of the private motor vehicle with its high community costs.

2. That a comprehensive study be immediately commenced by a fully representative study team under the direction of the State Planning Authority on a metropolitan and regional planning basis, to recommend a balanced, integrated transportation system to meet the anticipated over-all transport requirements with the least possible disruption to lives and property, after examining all factors and all alternative measures, including:

- (1) Provision of an improved and extended public transport system and a re-organization of present financing methods, to equate public and private transport facilities.
- (2) Other means of reducing the amount of unnecessary arterial road usage which occurs particularly during "peak hours".
- (3) The fuller and more economical use of existing road space to minimize "peak hour" traffic problems.
- (4) The advisability of continuing the present policy of undue encouragement of commercial expansion in the central area, which policy will generate more and more daily uneconomic traffic resulting in ever-increasing traffic and parking problems, in that area and the inner suburbs.
- (5) Provision of adequate off-street parking adjacent to arterial roads in the suburbs (perhaps with assistance by Government subsidy).

3. That the widening of and other improvements to arterial roads should be proceeded with as quickly as possible, and that where such widening involves acquisition of properties, the Highways Department work in close co-operation with the councils concerned, to ensure the best possible redevelopment of such properties, including provision of adequate off-street parking, and so that the widened highways will be utilized to their fullest extent, and for their true purpose.

4. That the stated acceptance of the freeway concept and of certain freeway proposals by the State Government (as announced by the honourable Premier in Parliament on February 19, 1969),—

I must admit the Government is not holding to that announcement at the moment, because day by day we get different decisions on this series of proposals—

—is viewed with the greatest concern, particularly as the M.A.T.S. Report is yet to be debated in Parliament and as this council has had no intimation as to the acceptance or otherwise of its submissions dated January 20, 1969, wherein strong objections, with supporting facts, were raised against the proposed Modbury Freeway location and the proposed Hills Freeway location, and wherein other general submissions were enunciated.

Mr. Ryan: That doesn't sound like Party politics to me!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier would have us believe that anything that is put up by anyone opposed to him is reducing the M.A.T.S. proposals to the gutter level of politics.

Mr. McAnaney: You knew what he was referring to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He went on to say "any opposition"; he did not confine himself to statements concerning the propriety of the Minister's activities which, as far as I am concerned, are entirely a side issue. Since the member for Stirling has interjected on that subject, I point out that I did not raise the subject first: it was the Minister's admissions that he was responsible for the action that caused the matter to be raised here.

Mr. Langley: That's right. Guilty conscience!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier, in making his introductory remarks, referred to this matter, and I gave the honourable Leader latitude to reply, as it is only fair for him to reply. I do not intend to allow any member to pursue this line of debate, because it is quite contrary to the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As much of the plan has been deferred or not accepted by the Government, we are left with parts of a plan. How can the Government contend that the parts of the plan that it has so far not deferred (and as to future deferment or alteration we have no guarantee, on past performance) do not require the same sort of scrutiny as is being given to the deferred sections of the plan? In my area the Modbury Freeway has been altered from its original course. This has required

the acquisition and destruction of properties where people previously thought they were perfectly safe—and for dubious reasons as far as traffic design is concerned.

Throughout the study the flimsiest of reasons seem to have been given for deciding the route of a freeway in one manner rather than in another. The most substantial reasons, as far as I can discover, are that it may be possible to get a slight margin in miles an hour along a freeway if a new route is used rather than one which will not involve the destruction or acquisition of properties. It is quite clear that the priorities sought to be used here need entire re-assessment. The reason given in the study for the choice of the route of the Hills Freeway is one of the most extraordinary I have ever come across. It was that the study members' original examination related to a route along the edge of the park lands but that, as that would interfere with the Victoria Park racecourse, they preferred to put it through the whole of the eastern suburbs, destroying a swathe of properties through Rose Park, Norwood and College Park.

What sort of assessment of priorities is that? It has given rise to the most bitter feelings, concerning the way in which the report has been prepared and presented, among residents in the eastern suburban areas. The re-assessment of the study could take place through the State Planning Authority by the setting up of one of the specialist committees that is authorized to be set up pursuant to the Act. There is not the slightest reason why we could not get an adequate re-assessment of the plan in the form suggested in the amendment to the motion.

There is every reason to re-assess the plan. First, the Government (in the speech of the Premier) and the plan (in its report) suggest that there should be a balanced development of private and public transport and that this is essential. Let me refer honourable members to the section in the plan which refers to this. The final statement in the report on transport refers to present problems, and the following appears:

The pattern of patronage in a modern city places heavy demands on public transport during short peak periods. This pattern requires a large number of buses and trains for peak hour services which are not needed in mid-day and evening hours. Any increase in patronage that might occur would likely be principally in peak periods. This might worsen rather than improve the financial results

of the operating authority. It is unlikely, however, that the pattern of public transport usage will change markedly in the foreseeable future. Most patronage will continue to occur in the short peak periods while mid-day evening and weekend trips will continue to be made primarily by private car.

Any increase in patronage would be accompanied, to some degree, by increased costs. The need to provide rolling stock with adequate capacity for peak periods, together with operating staff, would inevitably result in uneconomical operation. Public transport, nevertheless, must be viewed as an essential public service. Fares should be kept low enough to encourage usage, and ways and means should be sought to obtain financial support in addition to revenues from passenger fares.

However, as usual, nothing is spelt out on the score of financing public transport. In his speech, the Premier said:

It is important that we do not plan any one element of the transportation system in isolation. In too many cities, particularly in North America, the highway programme has been developed without proper regard for overall development objectives and without co-ordination with other forms of transport. Here in Adelaide we are in a position to benefit from the mistakes made elsewhere. The M.A.T.S. proposals do not contemplate unbalanced development of any one component of the transportation system; instead, it is proposed that all components be jointly developed in harmony and in the correct balance. Co-ordination of transportation with other forms of development is assured by the over-riding requirement that all development must proceed in accordance with the development plan as approved by Parliament in 1967.

The development plan as approved in 1967 had no adequate provisions for public transport; nor has this plan. In fact, there are no proper provisions in the M.A.T.S. Report for the development of public transport. What is specifically forecast in the report is the present form of rail and bus transport and a consistent decline in proportionate use. What is more, there is no proposal for the development of improved bus systems in Adelaide. The bus systems are still to use the present roadways, although this inevitably means that the bus systems will be slow.

Mr. Hudson: Slower than motor cars.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and the rail system is to have a decreased pick-up area, except for the extension to the south; it is to have a decreased number of pick-up stations. Consequently, there will not be an improved rail service in terms of the total area of service given; only a small proportion of people in the metropolitan area will be able to use what service is left to us. That is not

a balanced transport proposal. The M.A.T.S. Report provides for a very heavy concentration on private motor car transport.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What would you propose?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General ought to pay a little attention to what the Premier referred to as "fun parlour" works. Let me report to the House on what has been said from the "fun parlour" area, as he calls it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You did not go to Disneyland?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but I suppose the Attorney-General did. This report, entitled "Tomorrow's Transportation", is the official report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the Government of the United States of America; it was published in April of this year. Apparently this authority is the "fun parlour" of the United States of America. I will read the introduction by Dr. Robert Weaver, who was then the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the senior negro in President Johnson's Cabinet; Dr. Weaver is now President of Baruch College in New York. I spent a considerable period with him, and he became a good friend of mine. I hope the Premier will listen to the following "fun parlour" report:

The following report is a summary of the recommendations for a comprehensive programme for national leadership in research, development and demonstration in all aspects of urban transportation and of the basis upon which it was formulated. The study and its recommended action proposals were prepared in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, under the leadership of Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development of this department.

The insight and perception of the nature of urban problems shown by Assistant Secretary Haar and the staff which assisted him have resulted in the design of a programme of research and development which could beneficially affect every aspect of urban life for many years. The recommended programme involves not only new systems for meeting urban travel needs ranging from those of the pedestrian to those of the air traveller but also improvements in existing service and facilities, new and improved system components, and new and improved methods of planning and operating urban transportation systems.

Throughout, our concern has been to relate technology and scientific innovation as closely as possible to the present and desired shape of our cities and the improved quality of life of urban residents. The role of the recommended programme is stressed as only one of a number of tools needed to bring better cities into

existence in the future through an orderly process of ameliorating the urban difficulties of the present. While urban transportation research, development and demonstration alone cannot solve our current urban problems or bring about our desired future cities, it is an indispensable instrument for our efforts to reach these goals.

This report should be viewed as a first major effort to formulate a comprehensive urban transportation research, development and demonstration programme. The programme, its focus and objectives, will evolve as it is carried out. This evolution must be consonant with research, development, demonstration and implementation programmes in all aspects of urban service, facilities and development. It is our hope that we have been as successful in our effort as the Congress was farsighted in requesting that this effort be undertaken.

The effort had been directed by Congress, which was also interested in what the Premier calls "fun parlour" techniques. The summary at the beginning of the report pointed to new systems of urban transportation that ought to be examined in any forward planning for urban transportation in large city areas. The following are some of the things it mentioned:

Automatic controls for vehicles and entire movement systems; new kinds of propulsion, energy and power transmission; new guideway and suspension components; innovations in tunnelling; and the application of these potentials for movement of goods as well as people. The more promising of these new systems are:

Dial a bus: A bus type of system activated on demand of the potential passengers, perhaps by telephone, after which a computer logs the calls, origins, destinations, location of vehicles and number of passengers, and then selects the vehicle and dispatches it.

Personal rapid transit: Small vehicles, travelling over exclusive rights-of-way, automatically routed from origin to destination over a network guideway system, primarily to serve low- to medium-population density areas of a metropolis.

Dual mode vehicle systems: Small vehicles which can be individually driven and converted from street travel to travel on automatic guideway networks.

Automated dual mode bus: A large vehicle system which would combine the high-speed capacity of a rail system operating on its private right of way with the flexibility and adaptability of a city bus.

Pallet or ferry systems: An alternative to dual mode vehicle systems is the use of pallets to carry (or ferry) conventional automobiles, minibuses, or freight automatically on high-speed guideways.

Fast intra-urban transit links: Automatically controlled vehicles capable of operating either independently or coupling into trains, serving metropolitan area travel needs between major urban nodes.

New systems for major activity centres: Continuously moving belts; capsule transit systems, some on guideways, perhaps suspended above city streets.

These are the seven major things to which they look and which are spelt out in detail in this report.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: May I borrow that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, certainly. It was available when the Attorney-General was in Washington, I might say. The most important part of the report states:

Most large urban areas experience massive congestion during peak hours. Yet the number of automobile registrations continues to expand rapidly. By 1975, the United States will have well over 120,000,000 vehicles for a population of 220,000,000. Is the only answer to traffic congestion more and wider roads? Clearly, in many localities, it is not. The dislocation of people and businesses, the distortion of land use, the erosion of the real property tax base, and the dollars and cents cost, make this an increasingly unacceptable solution. If carried to its illogical conclusion, an ever-increasing population, building more and bigger highways, might produce a city of freeways with hardly any room for people or buildings.

Indeed, when I was at the Roads Research Laboratory in England and projected the development plan for Adelaide to people there, they estimated that, with the projected population increase forecast in the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, we would need 40 per cent of our total area as roads in order to get adequate mobility. The report continues:

This new systems study has provided two valuable insights affecting possible approaches to solving urban transportation problems. First, action is possible. Although the urban mass transportation industry has had difficulty in supporting extensive research and development, technology in related fields is available for direct transfer and application to the needs of urban transit. Other new technological advances have been devised in laboratories around the country. American industry and business are ready to respond to the great domestic challenge of the cities. The scientific and technical community, both as individuals and as companies, has expressed a readiness to attack the challenge of metropolitan transportation—given leadership, direction, and adequate funding.

Second, action at this time is likely to be fruitful. After decades of trying to solve their transport problems by building only highways, cities across the nation are beginning to realize that public transportation is an absolutely essential balancing component of sensible urban planning. The model cities programme, the production of 6,000,000 units of low and moderate cost housing called for in the President's state of the union message, the building

of new communities and an adequate infrastructure for rebuilding the second America and preserving the quality of urban life—all depend on adequate urban transportation systems. The cities, in short, now want to act.

The report also points to something that is apparently ignored in this plan: what is to happen to that section of the people who must always be served, for urban mobility, by public transport? If we are to have a constantly declining public transport system (and the forecast in this plan is for nothing more than that), a large section of the population will be inadequately served. Concerning this matter, the report states:

Nearly one-third of the urban population suffer serious disadvantages from being served inadequately or not at all by the vast auto-based systems on which the nation has come to depend.

Indeed, part of the reason for the riots in Detroit, a centre of major roads systems and inadequate public transport, was the lack of mobility. The reason most often given for the riots in Watts, Los Angeles, was the inability of people in Watts to move out to find employment.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Surely that's putting it narrowly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not; I do not know whether the Attorney-General went to Los Angeles and discussed the problem.

Mr. Hudson: He went to Disneyland.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He might have gone to Disneyland, but I do not know whether he went to Watts. I went there and discussed the question with members of the urban development league there.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They put down riots to a lack of major transport?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They put that down as a major factor.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I always thought it was a colour problem.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was partly a colour problem—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Predominantly a colour problem.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —but the reason for the outbreak in that area rather than in much more depressed areas was the frustration felt by the people in that area. One of the major causes of their frustration was their inability to get jobs because they could not move out to get them.

Mr. Hudson: I suppose the Attorney-General would have been very much impressed by the public transport system of Los Angeles.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps he went on the angels' flight, which is the only efficient public transport system in Los Angeles. The report continues:

These are the "captives" left to use the transit systems, or do without. If transit service continues to be reduced, many of these non-drivers will be destined to be isolated more and more in their narrow neighbourhood worlds while all around them the advantages of automobile mobility benefit the relatively affluent majority more each year. To serve the non-driver, it is not enough to provide more of the existing transportation facilities. Although new bus routes and more buses in poverty areas significantly increase the mobility of the residents, most trips are still unnecessarily long, tiresome, and expensive. Buses limited to fixed routes, and stalled by traffic congestion, and rapid transit systems crowded and noisy, will not meet the minimal transportation needs of urban areas.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Has any city shown any sign of action on this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, Atlanta has. The current proposal before Atlanta, which has rejected by a poll of the voters the kind of proposal that has been put forward for Adelaide, is for some improvement in the freeway system and for the development of dial-a-bus and guide-a-bus-way systems.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They do have a freeway system, don't they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, and I am not suggesting that we should not have such a system. What I am suggesting, however, is that this plan concentrates far too heavily on freeways and not nearly enough on public transport and on keeping the way open for the use of newer technologies. Here is the extraordinary feature of this plan. We are supposed to be planning for 20 years ahead. At a time when technological advances are being made at a greater rate than ever before in the history of man, the people who have made this report, the engineers who rely on it, and the Government all seem to think that there will be no technological advances for the next 20 years and that we will inevitably be confined to the present modes of transport.

Mr. McAnaney: That's why we are keeping it flexible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is keeping it thoroughly inflexible. At present the Government is not keeping it properly revised, so that we can have an overall balanced system. The Government has only a series of bits and pieces that do not even fit together as a jig-saw puzzle. These things are clear from an examination of these newer

developments reported in the "fun parlour" of the Housing and Urban Development Authority of the United States. This report is not put forward by some private consultants or by some private expert who comes out here and talks about Disneyland and his experiences there: it is put forward by the United States Government, which has shown itself not unable to make use of new technologies and not entirely lacking in understanding of them.

The official report of the United States Government agencies to Congress is for a series of systems of development in public transport, nearly every one of which will require the acquisition of a separate right of way; that is, a separate laneway on a roads system or, alternatively, an entirely separate right of way apart from the roads system. Yet, even though these are the advances in technology, this plan is chosen as the way ahead in getting flexible public transport!

Mr. Corcoran: We want the sort of transport the public might use.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, the kind of transport for which demand will be built up. City people do not want to use public transport, because it is inflexible in picking them up, because the journey is inflexible, for the most part over a fixed route, because it is inflexible in setting them down and, in many cases, because they have to transfer from one vehicle to another. Such transport is slow, generally; it is often uncomfortable; and it is inflexible. Naturally, people turn to the private motor car, which gives them flexibility in pick-up, in speed of journey, and in reaching their destination, even when they have parking problems. To get a public transport system that will attract a sufficient demand from the public, it needs to be more flexible than the one on which we have been relying and are retaining by this plan. I am not suggesting that at this stage South Australia could say that it wanted this particular technique or could use that one, because systems have to be developed. We should be experimenting in these areas, and we should be able to do so. The cost of experimenting, particularly with the dial-a-bus system, is small, as is pointed out by the report, which specifically deals with the cost of limited and full-scale experiments in these areas. We know that these technologies are developing in a country with cities that are most like and comparable to our own, and in a country that has a solution to the problem of which it now has been well aware for some time: that is, that money cannot be spent to provide facilities

for private motor cars without doing something about public transport, and that cities cannot be set up with expensive and extensive freeway developments for private motor car transport without accepting that a part of the public is uncatered for and that the rest is jammed up on the road system at peak hours, no matter how expensive a freeway system is provided.

Mr. Ryan: To say nothing of air pollution.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. There are many concomitant factors: air pollution, the erosion of property values, and the like, which are referred to in this report. I see where someone says that the position in Los Angeles is satisfactory. I do not know what the Attorney-General thought about it, but I remember going to the music centre from which we could see the baseball stadium about one and a half miles away. The local people told me that I was lucky to be there on the one clear day of the year, because normally they could not see the stadium. The smog in that area has to be seen to be believed, and the air pollution caused by the large-scale use of motor transport is real, indeed. We need to reassess this plan to see what should be done about providing right of way for new forms of public transport, and this is a simple means of keeping our options open in the future for developing public transport using the newer technologies. It is absurd for us to tie up the city with a system to enjoy which we would have to spend vast sums on providing such right of way. We need to keep the way open.

The plan assumes an increase in motor car population that will, in its view, multiply present road demands. To obtain the increase in motor car population for the future, the present road patterns were related to the present demands and a simple multiplication sum was done. However, no adequate account was taken of the development of regional shopping and work areas that will clearly be set up under the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan. With the development of more work areas in Elizabeth and in the Noarlunga area we can expect that we will not have a simple multiplication of the present pattern of road demands. It is clear that, by improving the major arterial road system, the traffic needs of the metropolitan area can be coped with for at least another decade and, because of that, there is clearly time for an adequate reassessment of these proposals. It is nonsense to suggest that by

reassessing the proposals we are wasting the money that has been spent. Most of the money was involved in the collection of the data bank material, which is valid for all reassessments of the proposals now before us.

I turn now to the proposals about compensation procedures. The Government has set up a committee to consider these and it has decided in favour of some land valuation court as a means of getting more prompt compensation procedures than the present procedures. The report recommends that we tie this in with the intermediate courts proposal. With great respect to the Government, however, I think that this is an extraordinary way of going about the matter. I make it clear that I oppose the intermediate courts proposal. I do not believe for one moment that the institution of intermediate courts or the institution of the three-tier system of courts instead of the two-tier system will provide swifter remedies to the average citizen.

Mr. Ryan: It will probably be a bit longer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The appeal procedure will be longer, because there will be another step in it. It will be more expensive for the citizen and for the administration, because if we provide a three-tier system we will have to provide additional accommodation and also for additional jury trials, and that will be more expensive than the present procedure. I have been unable to follow the reasoning put forward for the institution of intermediate courts. The major reason that has been given time and again by the Attorney-General for establishing intermediate courts is that this system will give greater status to the intermediate court's Judiciary and, therefore, attract more people to the bench. However, what will it do to the first and last stage of the Judiciary? It will be impossible to recruit anyone who is qualified.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must connect his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am. I do not think the intermediate courts system is a good idea. The Attorney-General will have to do much talking to convince members on this side that there is anything to be gained from this system. I believe that the present problem in the compensation procedures is not the nature of court proceedings: I believe they can be dealt with reasonably quickly, and there should be little difficulty about this. The trouble with compensation procedures is the nature of compensation. At present, we are not giving compensation in the form that it is

given in several other countries that are proceeding with extensive urban planning and renewal; we are not providing removal costs. We are not trying to compensate people for their real loss apart from the market value of their house 12 months before notice to treat. In these circumstances, hardships and injustices are occurring, and that is the real matter of the nature of compensation that needs to be revised, rather than fiddling around with setting up a jurisdiction with a new series of tribunals for hearing cases.

We need to examine immediately the problem of compensating people whose properties are not acquired but whose properties are affected by the proposals. At present, in the United States of America such people do not get compensation and in this country they do not get it, but in England they are given compensation under the new provisions relating to the collection of betterment. The authority seeks to collect on the swings what it pays out on the roundabouts. If there is an improvement in the property value from a community expenditure, the person should pay some contribution to those who have been harmed by it.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Prior to the adjournment I was speaking of the processes of compensation now being undertaken in Great Britain as a result of the system used of compensating those who are adversely affected. It will be difficult, of course, to provide adequate compensation here if some system of this kind is not used. I do not suggest for one moment that South Australia would not have problems in devising some system of compensation for those people adversely affected by planning measures but whose properties are not to be acquired; it would pose some problems. In fact, I spent the whole of the Australian Planning Institute's annual lecture last year expatiating on the problems that any Australian State would face in this matter. While that presents a real problem, nevertheless, as far as compensation for those people whose properties are to be acquired under this scheme is concerned, it is quite clear that the present compensation measures are inadequate. That is mentioned specifically in the M.A.T.S. Report, at page 197. Here again the report states:

Compensation for land acquisition is based on current market values. Where this falls short of replacement costs, as may occur in the case of older residential properties, hardship may result. Compensation in the form of a

replacement property may be warranted in such cases. Present legislation does not appear to recognize this problem.

It certainly does not recognize the problem; nor does it recognize the problem of removal from the property. Removal costs are paid in some other countries, but they are not paid here. Better provisions for compensation are necessary, and this is very much more important than the question of providing some additional tribunal for fixing compensation upon the present basis.

One of the grave problems with which we are faced in this report is its inadequate costing. Frankly, I think the projections of cost that appear in the report are inadequate. No adequate provision has been made for inflationary factors in the cost of construction of the major road systems. I, for one, am markedly unimpressed by the argument that appeared in the Premier's provided speech, in which it was suggested that economies of scale would counteract any inflationary factor in the unit cost of road construction. I do not believe that that is so; it has certainly not proved to be so in other areas of Australia where major freeway construction has been undertaken. Applying the sort of increase in unit costs that has occurred in other States of Australia, we observe that the cost of these proposals has been under-estimated by well over \$150,000,000.

For the Government then to say that the moneys available to it with the new road grants will be sufficient for it to discharge its responsibilities for the next five years is whistling in the dark. The extraordinary feature of the Premier's speech has been in relation to the costs of the public transport proposals. The original proposals of the report, of course, on this matter were sheerly ludicrous. Let me refer honourable members to pages 193-4 of the M.A.T.S. Report, where we find the following:

The total cost of recommended railway improvements is estimated at \$79,050,000. Of this total, \$32,800,000 is for construction of the proposed King William Street subway; \$32,000,000 is for conversion of rolling stock or for new rolling stock; and the remaining \$14,250,000 is for line, station and signal improvements, expanded depots and extension of the Hallett Cove line. It is apparent that the South Australian Railways will need substantial increases in funds for the subway and for additional rolling stock.

That is putting it mildly. The report continues:

Possible sources of additional funds: Many different methods have been used to finance rail rapid transit projects in North American cities. The 1964 Urban Mass Transportation

Act allows the United States Government to contribute up to two-thirds of the capital investment in transit facilities.

We have not only had no proposal from the Commonwealth Government to do anything of the kind but apparently there has been no proposition from the States (not from this State, anyway) in relation to getting more flexibility in budgetary procedures to allow us to invest more in public transport and to make a smaller commitment on the total roads programme in the inner-suburban area. The report continues:

Several States, including New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania, as well as the province of Ontario in Canada, have various programmes for subsidizing transit facilities in metropolitan areas. A more direct method of financing, which is in common use in cities in the U.S., is being utilized by Boston, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco. The administering public agency levies taxes against the properties within its area.

I have not heard any proposition from the Government about imposing an additional land tax in the metropolitan area. We do, in fact, need an additional land tax in the metropolitan area, but it is already part of the metropolitan Adelaide development plan proposals that that additional land tax be used for the acquisition of public open space, to which the Government has been providing no moneys for the development fund under the Act. The report continues:

In other centres, such as Cleveland and Chicago, revenue bonds have been used to finance the construction of rapid transit facilities.

Of course, in our circumstances, that would be illegal under the Financial Agreement, as the Attorney-General knows. The report then states:

The State of California has allocated funds from tolls collected on the San Francisco Bay bridge to finance the construction of a rapid transit tube under the bay, since it is expected that construction of the rapid transit system will postpone the need for an additional bridge.

I do not know where it is intended to put an additional bridge in South Australia on which we can impose a toll for the payment of the \$79,000,000-odd in connection with the rapid transit system. The report continues:

Other means of subsidizing transit facilities on a year-to-year basis have been used by various public agencies. In Boston, a 2c tax on each package of cigarettes has been imposed.

As the Attorney-General will know, and no doubt will advise his colleagues, that is illegal, under the Commonwealth Constitution. The report continues:

San Mateo County in California now taxes each vehicle at an average rate of \$8 per annum for this special purpose.

It was already proposed in this report that an extra registration fee be imposed on every vehicle in South Australia for road construction purposes. The report then states:

The cities of Seattle and Tacoma, in Washington, have the power to add a \$1 tax on each monthly utilities bill.

So far, we have not heard from the Government that it actually intends to impose what Sir Henry Bolte has applied in Victoria, that is, a charge on every gas and electricity bill in the State payable into the State Treasury. In this State, of course, it is intended for the purposes of paying for railway facilities, but I cannot conceive that even this Government will come forward with that particular proposition. All these proposals were deferred in February this year. We were told the Government was not going ahead with the financial proposals, and so I waited with bated breath to find how it was supposed to pay for the rapid public transit facilities which are now planned. We find some very strange things here. On page 747 of *Hansard* reference is made to funds available for roadworks, and the following reference is made to finance for public transport:

The public transport proposals are estimated to cost \$107,500,000. Of this, \$58,900,000 will be required for rail and bus rolling stock and this figure includes the cost of replacing and expanding the privately operated bus fleet in addition to that of the Municipal Tramways Trust. It is generally recognized that failure to allow public transport to play its role in a correctly balanced transportation system would be extremely expensive in terms of the additional expenditure required on roads and in terms of the social costs involved.

This tells us how we are going to get the money! What we have before us is an inadequate public transport proposal that would be undoubtedly costly, and we have no idea where we are going to get the cash. According to the report, we have \$11,000,000 available for the railway system over the 18-year period and the railway system is to cost a minimum of \$79,000,000, so where is the rest of the money coming from? All we are told is:

It is generally recognized that failure to allow public transport to play its role in a correctly balanced transportation system would be extremely expensive in terms of the additional expenditure required on roads and in terms of the social costs involved.

We do not even have a proposal from the Government that it will go to the Commonwealth Government and ask for greater flexibility in the provision of Commonwealth funds

in order that Commonwealth funds are not tied up as specifically as they are at present. We do not have any proposition at all, yet we are asked to come here to vote and commit ourselves to a system for which we have no cash! It is fairly obvious why this is so—members opposite know perfectly well that in 18 months' time they will not be sitting on the Government benches, so they could not care less what they commit a future Treasurer to. Any plan must be financially feasible: if we come up with proposals for public transport, we must be able to say to the people whom we represent, "Here is our proposition on our method of seeking finance." If we are not prepared to do this, how can we endorse the plan?

The Premier made some interesting statements about the proposals for public transport. Obviously, there have been some second thoughts about the form of the rapid transit proposals, as they are called. The Premier said, "We have proposed a feasibility study by railway engineers on the subway system." This report has, in fact, already been supplied but it has not been published or tabled, and I suggest that the Government knows perfectly well why it has not been published: the feasibility report is against the present proposal. I suggest that the Government knows full well that this is the case, yet it comes in here and asks us to vote in principle in favour of it.

I suggest to the Attorney-General that, when he makes his speech, he should table the feasibility report from the railway engineers upon this aspect of the proposal. The Government has a copy of it, so let us all see it because, after all, we are being asked to vote on it. Will the Government be honest with us and with the public about the proposals we are being asked to vote on? The whole of this measure has been handled with the most extraordinary administrative inadequacy. The Government has made it apparent that it has not known what it has been doing with this proposal from the moment it got it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Did you take any active interest in the preparation of the report during your time in office?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I met with the engineers from time to time. I met them in the office, informally and on social occasions when they discussed with me the sort of material they were compiling. In November, 1967, the Commissioner of Highways came to Cabinet and outlined some of the major features of the plan. However, when we

endeavoured to question him on details of the plan we were told it was not possible to provide us with a complete set of diagrams or the material that illustrated that set of diagrams until the whole thing had been prepared. Therefore, it was not possible for us to see the overall scheme in detail, and we never did.

Mr. Corcoran: That is right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then we had a series of statements from the Liberal and Country League. At the time of the election the Premier accused me of playing politics by not publishing the report, saying that it would be electorally disadvantageous for me to do so. He said I was playing politics by suppressing the M.A.T.S. Report! In July, 1968, I asked him whether he still adhered to this point of view, because he had then been in office for some time and had not published it. Of course, I knew very well why: he had not got it. Eventually it came to hand in August and, instead of the Government's reading the report, marking it, learning and inwardly digesting it, consulting with its senior public servants concerning it, and making up its mind whether it thought this proposal was viable, instead of discharging its responsibility as a Government, what did it do? No sooner did it get the report than it published it. Indeed, the Minister of Roads and Transport started making public statements about sections of it before Cabinet got it. He was so keen to get into headlines in the press that he talked about the subway before the other characters in the Government had seen it.

Mr. Corcoran: Not only that but, when the Government did get it, it didn't look at it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government put to the public a series of proposals that immediately brought protests because there were obviously unsatisfactory things in the report. If the Treasurer had exercised his mind about the report and consulted for a moment with the Under Treasurer, he would have demanded that the report go back to the steering committee. There is no doubt what would have happened to the report had the Labor Government got it in this form: we would have thrown it back to them telling them to have another look at it. I am chided by the Premier that we do not accept the advice of experts. The Premier has not accepted a good deal of advice of the experts in this matter. True, he has been constrained to have second thoughts as a result of public protest. However, he has not accepted all

the advice but only bits of it, with gaps in the middle sometimes. He said that his Government was accepting the advice of experts and that when we criticized the advice our criticisms were all wrong.

Mr. Corcoran: He would not be criticizing experts when he has deferred so much!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, deferments are not criticisms: that course implies a reliance on serious and expert advice. When the Government published this wretched thing it proceeded to say to the people of South Australia, "Accept large portions of this in principle and we will go ahead with the acquisition." At that stage the Minister of Roads and Transport said that Parliament would not even get a chance to debate the matter but that the Government would go ahead administratively, doing things it has now deferred. It was necessary for Opposition members, and Government members in the Upper House, to object to this procedure in order to force the Government to agree to this debate.

Mr. Broomhill: What would have happened if this had not been done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: According to Government members this is playing politics. Towards the end of the Address in Reply debate the Government introduced a motion asking us to agree to things that within a week it had changed its mind about. This is not adequate administration: this is not the way in which this plan should have been proceeded with, and the Government knows that it should not have done it this way.

Mr. McAnaney: We are waiting for you to come up with something constructive.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is constructive is in the amendment, but the honourable member was not listening when I pointed out things that should be in the plan and to which the plan did not refer. The honourable member is not capable of listening, except to his own voice. It is extremely important that this plan be withdrawn and radically revised. As it stands it is basically unsatisfactory, and we have the time for revision. It is important for us to revise the plan in order to see that we have a properly integrated system of roads and public transport, and that we keep our options open for the future to be able to develop satisfactorily in Adelaide, rather than to tie us to a massive freeway system that will be obsolete before it is completed.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I have much pleasure in seconding the amendment. I was amazed to hear the member for Stirling, by interjection, asking for information. If the honourable member had a contribution to make I should have thought that, instead of either being out of the House or reading a book, he would have listened to the debate and contributed to what is a most important matter. I should have thought that any Government member, and particularly one representing a country district, would have supported the Premier or the Minister of Roads and Transport on such a matter. If any Government member does that I should not like to be in his position when he returns to his electors to answer to them about how most of the finance raised by motor taxation is to be spent in the metropolitan area to the detriment of country areas.

Mr. McAnaney: That is not correct.

Mr. Broomhill: Get up and tell us where it is wrong.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope that the member for Stirling will show a bit more courage than his other colleagues, and will stand on his feet. To this stage there has been an indication that no Government member has the guts to stand up to defend the Government, because he knows the case is indefensible, and the member for Stirling knows it better than does anyone else.

Mr. Rodda: What are you talking about?

Mr. VIRGO: If the member for Victoria, the Under Secretary to the Premier, wants to support the Premier let him help by getting on his feet but, frankly, I do not think he has any more guts than has the member for Stirling. This is a most important matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Rodda: Would you like your nose pulled?

Mr. VIRGO: If the member for Victoria is game enough, he can come over here and try it. He does not have the courage to do that.

Mr. Rodda: Don't push me too far.

Mr. VIRGO: I will push the honourable member as far as I like. If he has sufficient courage, he can come over here and try to do it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. The member for Victoria is out of order. Also, the member for

Stirling is not maintaining a high standard of decorum. However, the member for Edwinstown must link up his remarks with the motion before the Chair.

Mr. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, my remarks are linked up completely both with the motion and with the amendment before the Chair, because I am talking about the motion that has been moved by the Premier and the amendment that has been moved by the Leader. I am suggesting that members opposite ought to be prepared to express a view on this subject, which I regard as of paramount importance not only to the people who (because they are in the path of the freeway or adjacent to it) are vitally concerned but also in fact to all the people of South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: They are all paying for it.

Mr. VIRGO: Exactly. If this plan is put into operation, considerably more than \$500,000,000 will be spent in the metropolitan area, to the detriment of country roads, and I would have thought that members of the Government who claim to represent country districts would be saying a few words in defence of the electors who put them here. However, apparently they have been struck dumb, apart from some stupid interjections and idle challenges which they are not prepared to carry out.

Mr. Rodda: Don't be too sure of that.

Mr. VIRGO: Well, in deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I will completely ignore the member for Victoria. Anyway, that is the treatment he justly deserves.

THE SPEAKER: I can promise you that if the member for Victoria keeps ignoring the Chair he will soon not be here to answer.

Mr. VIRGO: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker; he should not be here in the first place. It is a little ironical that it is 12 months to the day since the M.A.T.S. plan was thrust upon the people of this State. Monday, August 12, 1968, was a black day, for on that day the Government, in its fervour in trying to impress the electors of South Australia as a Party with forward planning ideas, received this report and said, "Let us throw this out to the public and show them what good fellows we are." The Government did not even worry about stopping to read the report, nor did it worry whether there were any problems associated with it or how it was going to be carried into effect.

Mr. Broomhill: It was pretty raw at the time.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, and it is not much better now, because, 12 months later, it still has not come up with the answers to the many questions that have been raised by the people of this State. Frankly, I think one can be pardoned for saying, "I don't believe it can ever come up with them; I don't believe it has the ability to come up with them." It certainly has not the common sense necessary to grapple with the plain logic of the problems associated with transportation.

It is perhaps worth recalling that on Tuesday, August 13, in the *Advertiser* the Premier described the M.A.T.S. plan as "exciting and somewhat controversial". He and his Cabinet (and presumably his Minister of Roads and Transport, who might have prompted him a little) certainly got excited; they were so excited they could not let the public look at it quickly enough. However, they forgot to look at it themselves; they forgot to consider the many controversial points in it. It was controversial all right. In the 12 months that has elapsed since the plan was presented to us, the Government has made no attempt to resolve any of its controversial aspects.

Mr. Broomhill: When they committed themselves to it, it was too late.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not believe it was too late.

Mr. Jennings: Too late for their pride.

Mr. VIRGO: That may be so but, for once in their lives, they could have been honest and said, "We acknowledge there are problems and immediately we will bring down some recommendations about them; we will immediately say how we shall implement the plan, how we shall raise the money for it, and how we shall treat the people involved in it." But we have not had one answer to this although many questions have been asked—and I have asked quite a few, as all members know. The only thing I have ever been able to get out of the Premier is, "You are not going to fence me in by asking those questions and making me commit myself; I am not going to be fenced in." That is all I could get out of him. However, the people who are being fenced in are those whose properties are in the path of these freeways or the rail rapid transit.

The Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport have been completely oblivious of the welfare of these people. They have never at any stage given these people the faintest idea that they care for them. How ironical it was to me when about three weeks ago, with the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), I led a

deputation to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who went to great lengths to assure the members of that deputation, representative of the people whose homes were to be demolished, that the Government was sincerely concerned about their welfare. What utter hypocrisy! It has never shown one iota of concern, and now it adds insult to injury by asking this Parliament to endorse a plan that is not a plan. What is there left in this plan to endorse? With the Noarlunga Freeway we have to endorse the principle of putting a freeway there but we do not know where it will go.

The same applies to the Hills Freeway. The first announcement was that it was abandoned, but then we looked at it again and found there was some subterfuge in connection with this abandonment: the Government had not abandoned it. It said it had abandoned it in deference to the Mitcham council because the council had put up a strong case. Indeed, a strong case was advanced, and I congratulate those responsible. I wonder whether the Mitcham council will feel so happy, and whether the people now in the path of that freeway will feel so happy, when the truth of the Government's action is known. The proposal has not been abandoned: it has only been deferred. This is the deceit in which the Government has engaged in relation to this plan from the day 12 months ago when it was released.

It has never been honest with the people, and it has never been honest in this House concerning questions that have been asked. When the report was released, the Premier said that it would remain for six months to enable the people to examine it and to express their views on it, and that the Government would then consider the views expressed and make a decision. However, 12 months has elapsed (double the time) and there is still no answer. Even if the Government's motion is carried, there will still be no answer. The people in the areas that are affected by the routes of the various freeways have been living under a cloud for the past 12 months, and many of them will continue to do so for an unknown period.

The Noarlunga Freeway has been deferred. Although we are to adopt it in principle, it has been deferred for a further six months, and the innuendo (it has not been clearly spelled out) is that the Government intends in the next six months to reconsider whether it ought to retain the route proposed in the M.A.T.S. Report, adopt the route proposed in 1962, or cut some

other path through the area of Edwardstown and Plympton and through areas beyond, such as Mitchell Park and Clovelly Park. So the Government has successfully not only left the people whose properties are in the path of the M.A.T.S. plan under a cloud for at least another six months: it has also included the people affected under the 1962 route and, in fact, everyone in the whole district, because judging from the Government's attitude to this who can say where it is going?

What do people do? Do we just suddenly freeze all our assets? Do we say, "It is not worth doing anything at all around the house, in case the freeway goes through. If we do anything, we will not get adequate compensation"? This is the impasse that has been reached as a result of the stupidity of this Government and as a result of the lack of leadership which has been clearly evident in the past and which is clearly evident concerning this motion.

I refer now to a letter I received only a few days ago. I did not catch the full details of what he said, but the Premier referred to a letter he had received from someone in the Edwardstown area, congratulating him or the Minister (I am not sure who it was) on the Government's action in relation to M.A.T.S.

Mr. Lawn: Did you see the letter?

Mr. VIRGO: No, but I am charitable enough to accept that there are possibly people who would write in this vein. In fact, I noticed in this morning's paper (and I am not going to transgress following your earlier statement when I say this, Mr. Speaker) a letter from a person, congratulating the Minister of Roads and Transport. I will say no more than that. An odd one of these things will come through from time to time. If the Premier or any Government member has any doubts on the feelings of the people in Edwardstown, Mitchell Park, Clovelly Park or Plympton, he should come down, and I will arrange a meeting. I can promise him that he will get a bumper meeting and an adequate expression of the true opinion of the people. I wish to read a letter that is dated August 3, 1969 (so it is not some relic that I have dug out); it is addressed to the Premier from the Secretary of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee and it shows the position fairly clearly:

Further to a telephone conversation on Friday, August 1, with your secretary by a member of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee (Marion Division), we wish to furnish you with the

following information: it has come to our notice that you are unaware of the strength and amount of protest against M.A.T.S. involving the people affected by the Noarlunga Freeway route. A petition with 6,000 signatures appended protesting against the path of the Noarlunga Freeway was presented in the House by the member for Edwardstown. Four hundred objection forms were lodged with the Minister of Roads and Transport in February, 1969, by the Marion council's deputation.

One thousand two hundred objection forms were further presented to the Minister on July 18 by a deputation from the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee (Marion Division). An earlier deputation was received by the Minister on April 9 to protest and to present its viewpoints on behalf of its members and of the people in Marion.

People affected by the M.A.T.S. plan objected through the channels available to them, but it would appear that some Government departments may not be fully aware of the strength and number of these objections and, in some instances, feasible alternatives were given for consideration.

Contact with the Minister of Roads and Transport, who is also the Legislative Council representative for Central No. 2, of which this area is part, has been non-existent, as he has never been in the area to discuss M.A.T.S. with the people affected.

No member of the Government has ever been in the area to discuss the M.A.T.S. Report with the people affected, and I include not only the Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. C. M. Hill) but the other three Legislative Council representatives for Central No. 2, who are supposed to represent the area.

Mr. Lawn: Mr. Hill is supposed to represent them.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, and they are complaining that they have never seen either him or any of his colleagues. I will say at least this for one of the Legislative Council representatives: had he not had the courage of his convictions and been prepared to raise this matter in the Legislative Council, I very much doubt whether that august House would be debating the matter at present.

Mr. Jennings: Nor would we.

Mr. VIRGO: I think we would. I like to think that the initiation of the debate, in this House at least, was engendered largely by the consistent claims made here. The letter I have read indicates the feeling of the people. It is from an organization which, last Monday evening, had 500 people in the Pioneer Hall. The organization has had other meetings and it organized the petitions that I have presented in the House. It has a proper appreciation of the views and feelings of the people con-

cerned, yet the Government has so ignored this organization that it will not even confer with it or try to get its advice. Is it any wonder that this organization is hostile not only to the so-called M.A.T.S. plan but also to the Government?

Mr. Langley: I think the Minister intends to stand as a candidate down there.

Mr. VIRGO: I only wish he would: that would be delightful. I can imagine the marvellous debates he and I could have on street corners.

Mr. Corcoran: Had he had his way, there wouldn't be any street corners on these freeways.

Mr. VIRGO: Then we could have the debates in the middle of the freeway, but I do not think he will have his way; I have enough confidence to believe he will not get his way. In view of the fact that the Government displays a complete lack of concern for the people concerned, is it any wonder that I have continually raised my voice in this House in their support? I assure members of the Government that I will continue to raise my voice in support of the rights of people, whom I regard as of far greater value than roads, sheep or anything else.

Mr. McAnaney: Your Government passed the land acquisition legislation.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member will have adequate opportunity to contribute to the debate, and I sincerely hope he does so. Up to this stage, however, not even one Government member has indicated that he will speak, and that includes the member for Stirling.

Mr. Ryan: Not even the member for Mitcham.

Mr. VIRGO: I heard that the member for Mitcham was having a look at this.

Mr. Ryan: Not now.

Mr. VIRGO: If he has given it away that is his fault.

Mr. Corcoran: They fixed Mitcham up.

Mr. VIRGO: The Government has not done so. It publicly announced that it had abandoned Mitcham but, if one reads Hill's and Hall's statement, one can see that it has been deferred and not abandoned. There is a vast difference. Some Government members, particularly the Premier, have often attempted to misconstrue my remarks, when I have spoken on the matter, by saying that I oppose the building of freeways and forward planning. Normally I would not pay much attention to such wild, stupid allegations, but I believe that, for the sake of the record, I should put the

position straight. Members will recall that last year I moved a motion arising from a petition which I presented, which contained 5,679 signatures, and part of which stated:

That the Government immediately cause investigations to be made to determine a more suitable and practicable plan for the development of metropolitan Adelaide.

That referred not to the scrapping of the plan, but to the determining of a more suitable and practicable plan. After presenting the petition, I moved a motion in the House. I remind members of the terms of that motion so that there will be no misunderstanding about where I stand in relation to this all-important matter. The motion, reported on page 1756 of *Hansard* on October 9, 1968, is as follows:

That this House is of the opinion that, whilst accepting the need for long-range planning for freeways and public transport for metropolitan Adelaide, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report should be immediately withdrawn in order to prevent continuation of the serious harm inflicted on the citizens, and also because . . .

That motion makes my attitude clear, and also the attitude of other members on this side. We must have freeways: there is no doubt in my mind about this, but to cut wildly a swath right through the metropolitan area in the false name of town planning is sacrilege, and there is no other name for it. Government members, including the Minister, know that there are other ways of achieving the objective sought, but they are too tired or too lazy to exercise themselves to consider them.

Mr. McAnaney: Ha, ha!

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member may laugh, but that reminds me of his interjection about half an hour ago, when the Leader was speaking, when he said, "Why don't you come up with some alternatives?" in that bushwhacker voice of his. Now he cackles like a broody hen looking after her chicks.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not speak up so that I can hear what you say?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know whether the honourable member is a bushwhacker or not, but he is a dill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Only one member is allowed to speak at a time.

Mr. VIRGO: I will try to continue. I am afraid that if Government members wish to disrupt me they will have to start early, and they will probably run into some difficulty with you, Mr. Speaker. If they do that it will be their problem with you, Sir, and not mine. I make my position clear. By announcements and by the Premier's speech

in this House, the Government stated that the Noarlunga Freeway was adopted in principle, but we do not know where it is going to be put: maybe the 1968 route, maybe the 1962 route, or maybe somewhere else.

This is not solving the problem at all, and I remind members that moving a freeway from where it affects one set of residents to where it affects another set resolves nothing. Transfer will not do any good. The position will never be resolved by that type of thinking, if there was any thinking in it at all. I strongly suggest that the Government embarked on this course in an endeavour to get itself out of a pretty nasty hole. It knows that it is completely offside with about 3,000 residents in the path of the freeway in the Edwardstown District. The Government did not get support from many of them before, but it will get support from a lot less of them in the future.

The Government knows that it is offside, so that it is now trying to solve the problem by setting the people on the 1968 route against the people on the 1962 route. In other words, Government members are saying, "Fight it out among yourselves. We are not responsible. Whoever wins, good luck to you." In that way the Government keeps its hands clean. What a coward's way of going about it.

The Government lives in a coward's castle. It does not have the courage of its convictions, and it is using up the people. It is thrusting upon the people unnecessary worry. I only wish some of these Government members, or more particularly the Premier or the Minister of Roads and Transport, would call on some of the elderly people who are virtually worrying themselves sick because of the announcement by the Government that their homes are going to be taken. Many of these are elderly people in Housing Trust pensioner cottages. Oh, what brave people members of the Government are to attack them! The position of the elderly citizens' clubrooms is in jeopardy. All the members opposite ought to be given the Victoria Cross for their bravery. They are not game to take on people who can fight with them: they have to pick on the elderly and the sick.

Mr. Venning interjecting:

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear murmuring from the cockie from Rocky, who is divinely guided. I hope he keeps on with his Divine guidance.

Mr. Rodda: It is time he started guiding you.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope the member for Rocky River keeps on with his Divine guidance and

starts to use a little of it for the welfare of the people of this State, because to me there is nothing more sacred than a human being.

Mr. McAnaney: What did you do in your three years of Government? Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for the member for Stirling. I suppose I am prompting him into things, and I will try not to do that any more because it must be hurting him a little. The motion moved by the Premier asks us to endorse the general principles underlying the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals for the co-ordinated development of public and private transportation and ancillary facilities.

Mr. Broomhill: If it weren't so serious it would be funny.

Mr. VIRGO: We are asked to endorse the principles of the proposals. Although I have searched to find a proposal, I cannot find one. We have a little bit of road here and a little bit of freeway there, but nothing joins it at either end. We have a Noarlunga Freeway that the Government says is going somewhere but it does not know where; I do not know whether it is going to put it on skyhooks. The Government abandoned the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway, but it then changed its mind and said, "We won't abandon it, we will defer it," so it still wants us to endorse it.

The Premier has at least been definite on the rail rapid transit services. However, I am not sure whether we can trust him. At least he said, "We are not going to alter the route from Goodwood to Edwardstown."

Mr. Broomhill: Not this week, anyway.

Mr. VIRGO: He did not add that. However, what he did say that worried me very much was, "We are not going to close the railway stations as suggested in the M.A.T.S. Report, but we are going to keep our eye on them and, if need be, we might have to change our mind later on." How can we seriously respect or trust the Premier or the Minister of Roads and Transport or any of the Government back-benchers (if any) who subscribe to this line of thinking?

Mr. Lawn: You can never trust a Liberal.

Mr. VIRGO: I think that is a very good axiom. I am convinced that the Government intends to try to obtain the endorsement, in principle, of this scheme. If it can fool enough of its own members to get support, it will then start on some of the backroom work of planning. Parliament will rise

probably in November or December, whenever the Government decides, and we shall be in recess, remember, for probably five or six months if the Premier follows the normal pattern, during which time the Minister of Roads and Transport will play havoc, without having to answer to Parliament, which will not be in session. He will have the green light of approval in principle, which will allow the Government to do virtually anything at all, and we shall have no redress. I suggest that the Government would be deceitful enough to do this when the House was not sitting.

Mr. Broomhill: I could believe it, anyway.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, and I think the public could believe it, too. If there is no other reason, this is a tremendously strong reason why the members of this House should seriously consider this point, that they are giving the Government a blank cheque to do what it likes about road transport, despite all the objections lodged with the Government; it would still be able to (and I suggest it would) go ahead and, as Sir Arthur Rymill said in the Legislative Council last session, it could create "a rape of the metropolitan area". Do not blame me for those words—they are his.

I am wondering how many members opposite have taken the trouble to read the report to prepare for this debate. I now refer to a couple of pages in the genesis of the report, and that is where we must start. Like my Leader, I do not subscribe to the view that by referring this report back we will have wasted \$700,000. On the contrary, it contains some valuable statistical information; in fact, it is with statistics that the report starts. It states, on page 4:

There were 746,400 people residing in the study area in 1965, comprising approximately 70 per cent of the total population of the State. The study area's population has almost doubled since 1945. The population of the study area is expected to reach 1,241,000 by 1986.

It is well, then, to look at the actual objectives that the study sought to achieve. The report states:

The broad objective of the study is to devise a workable, acceptable and adaptable plan to guide traffic and transport development of metropolitan Adelaide up to the year 1986. The study must be conducted and presented in such a form that continuing surveillance, refinement and amendment is practicable both during the period up to 1986 and beyond.

If we look at the plan presented to this House (either that part presented 12 months ago or the remainder of it presented by the Premier

last Thursday and again today), how many of these objects do we see are being achieved? Is the plan workable? I have not heard anyone yet say that it is. Is it acceptable? I have heard many people say it is not; indeed, thousands in my area are saying it is not acceptable. Is it an adaptable plan that is capable of amendment in the future? I think this is where the plan falls down completely.

The plan is not capable of amendment. If it is proceeded with, we shall have freeways in the form of monsters, rising 20ft. outside people's front doors, with vehicles crawling around on them like ants; and when there is an accident the whole system chokes up, because vehicles will be so tightly packed that a break-down waggon or an ambulance will have no access. Yet the object of the M.A.T.S. people was to produce a plan that was amenable to amendment. The plan falls down equally in regard to community goals. I remind honourable members of what the study was told, namely:

The well-being of the community as a whole should be considered above that of competing and somewhat conflicting interests.

What have we seen from the Government in relation to the well-being of the community? It has been a couldn't-care-less attitude. The study was also told:

The plan should guide and, where necessary, direct the growth of the Adelaide metropolitan area in such a way as to preserve and enhance the social and economic welfare of the community as a whole.

Yet the plan slices the social activity and social connection of our community more effectively than could a river.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't forget the business connections, too.

Mr. VIRGO: That is another point. The final community goal, as printed, is that the plan should be within the financial capabilities of the community. Members on this side of the House for 12 months have been asking the Government how the plan is to be financed.

Mr. McAnaney: You've been told.

Mr. VIRGO: Thank you. I am delighted to know that the shadow Treasurer (the member for Stirling) says that we have been told. I hope he will try to convince the Under Treasurer of the State in this regard, because I do not think that officer is convinced, and I do not think anyone has told him yet.

Mr. McAnaney: What has the Under Treasurer got to do with it, anyway?

Mr. VIRGO: For the benefit of the member for Stirling, the Under Treasurer happens to have a fair bit to do with the finances of this State, and if any member of the Government wants to bring forward a financial proposition—

Mr. McAnaney: He doesn't have anything—
The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: The Government first seeks the advice of the Under Treasurer on financial propositions. If a Minister does not seek that advice, he is an utter fool and should not be in the House. Indeed, he would not last too long in the House, because he would send this State bankrupt.

Mr. Casey: The member for Stirling knows that.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course he does.

Mr. Broomhill: He claims to be an economist.

Mr. VIRGO: That is so, but he is not displaying much nous in the economic field at present. The plain facts are that no explanation has been given in connection with the financing of this plan. I hope the member for Stirling will get on his feet and explain where the Government is going to raise the \$100,000,000-odd necessary for rail rapid transit.

Mr. Broomhill: I look forward to it.

Mr. VIRGO: So do I, because this is the weakness of the whole scheme: it is completely slanted towards motor car travel without any tangible consideration for rail rapid transit. The member for Stirling knows the difficulties associated with this question, and he knows full well that this Government, under the existing financial arrangement, cannot produce the necessary finance. If we are to provide a system of public transport that is in the best interests of this community, we must engage in the greatest transformation of our public transport system we have ever seen. The alternative is to have what the Leader has referred to—freeways occupying 40 per cent of the metropolitan area.

Mr. McAnaney: What is your alternative?

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member is still mumbering away.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope the member for Stirling has finished back-chatting to you, Mr. Speaker. I want to draw members' attention to a document produced by someone more qualified to speak on public transport—the

former Railways Commissioner (Mr. J. A. Fargher). This document, dated September 27, 1968, has been widely circulated amongst members, but I do not know whether many have taken the trouble to read it; any member who has not read it would be well advised to do so before he starts making stupid interjections.

Mr. McAnaney: I did not see you at any seminars on the M.A.T.S. Report.

Mr. VIRGO: Perhaps I will talk about the seminar conducted at the Adelaide University in a few minutes, if that will satisfy the honourable member. At this stage, however, I should like to refer to Mr. Fargher's report; it says:

It is clear that the plan is designed to cater for an increasing use of the car per person and a diminishing use of public transport per person. The justification of this is explained on page 177 of the report, where it is shown that there has been a downward trend in public transport since the war.

This, of course, is the premise upon which the M.A.T.S. Report was prepared: there has been a downward trend in the use of public transport since the Second World War. I refer members to the passage of the M.A.T.S. Report to which I referred a few moments ago showing that the population of the study area has doubled since 1945. There has been a doubling of population yet a decline in the use of public transport. I wonder whether members opposite have exercised their minds for long enough to wonder why this situation obtains. If they do this, they will find that the answer is clear.

There has been a doubling of population, but no expansion whatever has been made to the passenger rail service to meet the increasing demand made by the expanding population of the metropolitan area. Only on Friday I asked senior officials of the Railways Department whether they could tell me when the last railway line was laid in the metropolitan area. Of course, they all said, "That is easy: it is Tonsley Park." However, I told them that that line was laid for one reason only and that was because Chrysler Australia Limited wanted to get its vehicles out by rail ex factory. Co-incidentally, three or four passenger trains a day operate on this line, but it is not a normal passenger service. I asked them to start again and tell me when the last passenger service was initiated in Adelaide to serve the expanding population. No-one could remember, and I wonder whether any of the older members in

this Chamber can tell me. Perhaps the member for Stirling, who is in that category, can tell me.

Mr. McAnaney: You're talking like a mid-Victorian.

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member says it was laid in the mid-Victorian era I will accept that: he is probably right. In any case, that is about the date of his birth. There has been no move to provide public transport for the area that has expanded. Despite numerous requests to extend the railway line from Northfield at the Yatala Labour Prison through the gully to serve Highbury, Tea Tree Gully and other places in the Barossa District, nothing has been done. The expanding population of Reynella, Morphett Vale and Christies Beach has had no service whatever. In fact, this Government is so progressive that it has now removed the railway line that was laid to Willunga in 1916 to make sure that the people in this area do not have a rail service.

Mr. McAnaney: You had three years to build it.

Mr. Jennings: Don't be so ridiculous.

Mr. VIRGO: No attempt has been made over the years to provide for the transport of the public by rail by supplying a service to the people.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It took four years to consider the electrification of the Grange railway line.

Mr. McAnaney: Now that it is to be put down King William Street, you are complaining about it.

Mr. VIRGO: I only wish the member for Stirling would get his facts right or keep quiet, because every time he opens his mouth he puts his foot into it and his foot is so big that he must really hurt his mouth. I want to refer to one or two other aspects dealt with by the former Railways Commissioner. He said:

Indeed, the plan is so lavish that it is not only beyond the resources of the State but it also contemplates structures which sweep through built-up areas of the metropolis destroying those very things which was M.A.T.S. prime objective to conserve and use.

He also makes numerous other references. I can do no better than suggest that Government members read these references, because some of them are in relation to the festival hall and the quite absurd curve that is being put in the line in front of it. I hope that Government members may peruse this report,

because it contains valuable information and more importantly, it comes from a man who knows what he is talking about. He is not talking from political prejudices but from the point of view of a man who has spent a lifetime concerned with problems of transportation, and his view must have a considerable bearing on the situation. When the Premier released the M.A.T.S. Report 12 months ago he said it could be considered for six months so that comments and suggestions could be received from the public.

In his speech to the House the Premier said that objections had been lodged but, unfortunately, these were quoted in such a way as to give a false impression. The Premier said that 888 submissions had been received—28 from councils and 860 from private individuals, firms and organizations. That does not sound many when put in that way. He said there were six petitions involving 581 signatures and a further 17 petitions involving 6,961 signatures. Later, he referred to other forms of objection that were lodged. The plain facts of the matter are that those to which the Premier has referred total about 10,000 objectors, and since then more have been submitted.

Mr. Jennings: He got one letter in favour of it.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. Was he genuine and honest when he said, twelve months ago, that the Government was releasing the report in order to obtain public reaction and in the light of that comment and reaction would make up it's mind? Is he saying that the voices of 10,000 people should be ignored? That is the position we are in at present. One wonders whether the Premier has the same disease as the Chief Secretary suffers from—knowing the permanent will of the people without going out and finding out what it is. In fact, I believe that the tactic members of the Government have adopted, with the subterfuge of saying that certain things are not to be proceeded with when in fact they are being proceeded with, changing their minds more often than they change their singlets, is deliberately designed to lull the people into a sense of false security.

It is a case of applying the old tactic of divide and conquer: in other words, build one half of the circular freeway (that is what is envisaged) and then say, "Well, of course, the scheme won't work with one half going, so we now have to build the other half." I say that the people in the path of the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway are just as involved in this plan today as

they ever were, despite the hypocritical statements by the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport.

What did the Government do when it released this plan? On the day following its release, the Minister of Roads and Transport called representatives of local councils together and told them they had to go out and sell the plan, despite the fact that they had never been consulted in drawing it up. Only the Adelaide City Council had a finger in the pie: the other local government bodies in the metropolis had no say in it, and had been given no indication of what was happening, yet they were required to go out and carry this very smelly baby of the Government to the public.

Those representatives did not get on very well. In fact, if members opposite (particularly the member for Stirling, who seems keen on going to seminars and the like) had gone to any of those meetings they would know that the Government received, per medium of Highways Department officials, a very hostile reception. It is noteworthy that, although the Government required these meetings to be held, not one member of the Government attended a single meeting; yet the Government had said the meetings were to be held for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the public. How can the Minister know the views of the public if he is not at the meetings? Instead, he required Mr. Flint to act as his front man for him: he was the man who had to take all the abuse that the Minister should have been receiving.

Mrs. Byrne: And answer all the questions.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. However, neither the Minister nor any one of his Cabinet colleagues attended one of those meetings, yet they say they know what the people want. They put the plan out to get public reaction, and the public reaction was there but the Ministers or Government members were not. So the Government is going ahead with the plan. Members of the Government have closed their eyes and ears to public opinion; they are immune to it. All I can say is that in about 18 months' time they will not be immune to public reaction, for I think they will then be told very clearly what the public thinks of this and many other very important matters.

My Leader has spoken on compensation, and there are one or two aspects that I also would like to refer to in this all-important question. I am reminded of the statement made by the Premier on the day the M.A.T.S. plan was

released. The Adelaide *News* of August 12, 1968, reported:

The Premier (Mr. Hall) said that the Government was determined that no individual would suffer hardship under the M.A.T.S. plan without receiving adequate compensation.

The Premier has reason to remember that statement, because I have taken the opportunity of reminding him of it more than once. How hypocritical was this statement! Did he really believe it when he made it or was he just trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the people?

The Premier made this statement, which presumably the public accepted in reasonably good faith, but what has the Government done? Let me give two examples. In one case, a man came to see me because the land on which he wished to build was in the path of the Hills Freeway. I was able to get things moving for him, and the Highways Department finally purchased his block of land. It took only from October 15, 1968, to August 1, 1969, to get it arranged, so quickly did the department act! Flash Gordon has nothing on it!

This undue delay caused this person considerable hardship, but that was not the end of the hardship. He had purchased his block of land and had had his house plans drawn and prices calculated with the thought that he would not exceed the \$15,000 that is the upper limit to enable him to qualify for the home savings grant; but, because he was forced to sell this block to the Highways Department and purchase another, in the meantime the land sharks had gone in and jacked up the price of land, the net result being that this man, because of the Government's action, lost his chance to qualify for the \$500 home savings grant. The Minister and the department were not prepared to reimburse him for it. Yet the Premier has the gall to say that no-one will suffer under the M.A.T.S. plan!

In another instance, a gentleman who owned a house was transferred by his firm from Adelaide to Sydney. He owned a house in Glandore in the path of the railway recommended by M.A.T.S. Nobody was interested in him until a noise was made about it in this House. He had gone to the Railways Department and had been told, "Yes; you are in the path of the M.A.T.S. plan, but we have nothing to do with this. We could not care less about it; we are not interested." Finally, under pressure, the Minister succumbed and instructed the Highways department to negotiate for the land. That man lost \$2,000

on the value of the property because it had been deflated by the announcement of the M.A.T.S. plan. That railway line is now not being proceeded with, so the Government will "cop \$2,000 cool", because the price will now return to normal. Yet the Premier says no-one will be harmed, that no individual will suffer hardship. What hypocritical words!

There was an instance only today of a young couple, owning a block of land, who had been told by the Highways Department that they must either build 45ft. back from the front boundary or not at all. Yet they are not going to suffer hardship? That is the action of this Government, of the Minister and of the Premier, who hypocritically says the people will not suffer. Everyone who is involved with M.A.T.S. has suffered from the day it was prematurely released by the Premier and by his colleague in the Upper House. Since the plan has been released, many people have offered constructive criticisms.

Unfortunately, the Government has used the same tactics as those used today by the Premier: when in a hole, attack the other man! Those who have advanced sound criticisms of this scheme have been referred to as cranks. I suppose anyone is allowed to call someone else a name, and we cannot worry too much about that; but one of these cranks is Professor R. A. Jensen, who has so many qualifications that I am afraid it would take five minutes to read them out. I think it should suffice to say that he is more than adequately qualified and, I suggest, far more qualified than some of the people who label him as a crank. This is what he had to say at the seminar (I am sorry the member for Stirling has now departed, because I promised him I would refer to this seminar), which was held by the Adult Education Department at the University of Adelaide on November 1 and 2 last year:

After studying the M.A.T.S. Report carefully, it is difficult to believe that an important conference convened by the Duke of Edinburgh was held in Australia only a few months ago on the theme of urban environment. In spite of the verbal support which the Duke received on this occasion, there is little outlook and visible evidence of any real understanding for his basic philosophy that was achieved, and in spite of the pious praises and objectives referred to in the report the M.A.T.S. proposals are the very negation of everything that was implied in the urban environment theme.

I think people can put their own construction on what Professor Jensen had to say. Perhaps Mr. Platten's statement will be interesting to members.

Mr. Corcoran: Is he qualified?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, I think he is. He has more letters after his name than there are letters in the alphabet. He is Chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, South Australian Chapter, but he is apparently another one of these cranks to whom the Premier and Mr. Hill delight in referring. Mr. Platten said:

In contemplating the M.A.T.S. Report, I am reminded of a town I passed through in North America where a tornado had passed also the previous day. A great ugly gash ran through the town about a block wide. In its path nothing stood. On either side buildings remained but wearing, one felt, a rather shocked air of disbelief. The ruthlessness of the freeway is no less than that of the tornado, nor is the effect less dramatic. Long-established community relationships are swept away in its wake, leaving the remainder to rebuild as best they can.

I again commend to members opposite the correctness of this statement, because many people believe that they know better than does anyone else.

Mr. Edwards: You do.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not hold that view, but I do try to respect the views of people who are better qualified than I am to discuss, to analyse and to comment on this sort of thing.

Mr. Jennings: You try to absorb their views, too.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. The Minister of Roads and Transport, in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, August 24, 1968, tried to defend the M.A.T.S. plan, but what he really did was to show its inadequacies. He is reported as saying:

There would be 150 per cent more daily train services in Adelaide by 1986 if the M.A.T.S. Report were accepted in its present form.

There will not be even 1 per cent more train services in Adelaide by 1986 unless the Government comes forward with a practical proposition for implementing the sections dealing with rail rapid transit, and it has not done this. In fact, if one reads the report in the *Hansard* galley proofs of what the Minister of Roads and Transport said last Thursday (and I assume the Premier's statement today was the same) one finds that he refers to the finance needed, but there is not one word about where it is coming from. So, in fact, the Minister is condemning the scheme when he talks about 150 per cent more daily train services, because he is highlighting the fact that this ought to be the basis: public transport ought to be the basis of our transportation needs.

The whole of the M.A.T.S. Report, however, is slanted towards, and is entirely involved with, motor car transport. There is no suggestion on where the money is coming from. In fact, a report tabled last week shows that the Railways Department needs an enormous sum to rehabilitate its tracks and to restore them from their present run-down state. Where will it get the money to do this? Will it get it from funds that would otherwise go to the Education Department or to the Hospitals Department? The Government will not tell us—because it does not know. One could go further and say that the Government knows it is not going to get the money. We are in a terrible position.

Mr. McKee: The Government may tax the motorists off the roads, and then we will not need the freeways.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. The Government may increase registration fees by 10 per cent and driving licence fees by 100 per cent, and it will be hilarious when members opposite start advocating the M.A.T.S. proposals on the ton-mile tax. It will be even more hilarious when Government members start doing it in the Upper House. My word, what a back somersault will have to be taken. However, we know that this will not happen.

Frankly, the Premier has moved this motion, knowing full well that it should not be carried. He has moved it to try to save his face and that of the Minister in the Upper House. I hope members opposite are not fooled by his actions and that they will seriously consider the issues involved, realizing that if the M.A.T.S. proposals are put into effect less finance will be available for country roads. I hope they will look at this matter on the basis of human welfare, placing it above the dictates of the Party boss, and that they will properly consider the rights of citizens to own and retain their own property.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): Having the faith that I have in the M.A.T.S. plan generally, I find it a deplorable experience to have to sit here listening to criticism being hurled at it. While Opposition members have spoken I have wondered just what would have happened had their Party been in Government when the plan was printed. I believe that had the Opposition been faced with the situation with which this Government was faced it would have done much the same as the Government did, if it had had the courage to do so. I remind members that, up to the time of printing, the plan

had cost about \$700,000, the great bulk of which was approved by the Labor Government, which apparently did not know what was in the plan. The Leader of the Opposition said that the previous Government had only an outline of the plan given to it by the Highways Commissioner in Cabinet one morning; apparently that Government spent \$700,000 to get the plan made so that it could read it.

Mr. Hudson: Who signed the contract with the consultants?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Playford Government made the initial move to get this plan into operation. I am proud that it did so and I am proud of the plan. However, I am not pleased to hear the type of unconstructive criticism we have had to listen to most of the afternoon and this evening. When the plan had been printed, the Government examined it, discussed it and decided, in the interests of fairness, that it should be released. It is totally unfair to hold back a plan that cannot be, in its entirety, confidential. I emphasize that it cannot be confidential. During my experience as a member of the Public Works Committee before 1968, when school inquiries were instituted the committee often received evidence from officers of the Highways Department and, from time to time, it became evident to members of the committee that there was a general plan for freeways and other forms of roadmaking. Of course, these were part of, or could have been part of, the M.A.T.S. plan. In these circumstances, with all the pressure of buying and selling properties, it would be inconceivable that that plan would remain utterly confidential. Is it fair for the property owner to be completely unsuspecting and ignorant of details of a plan that could become known to people, by one means or another, who were working in the real estate business?

The Government decided (and whatever else might be said, the decision was utterly fair and honest) to release the plan when it did, and it was a decision that I endorse to this day. I call it a plan for South Australia and not just for the metropolitan area. We know that in the past there has been much talk about decentralization, and I think it would be correct to say that both Parties have honestly strived to assist in this. However, because of our geographical factors, whatever efforts have been made (and they have been considerable and extensive) it is obvious that the Adelaide metropolitan area will always remain the centre of the State in terms of every form of

industry, and that decentralization in terms of setting up other major cities is not practicable in our lifetime. If we accept that statement, it follows that from the point of view of everyone in the State it is well to have an efficient metropolitan area.

The plan, having set out to estimate what the population will be in 1986 and to make other statistical surveys of the State, shows that the population in the metropolitan area will probably increase by about 66 per cent. It also forecasts that the commercial traffic will increase by about 80 per cent, which is a larger increase than the increase in population. Everyone in the State would benefit if the metropolitan area was efficient: it would benefit farmers who bring produce here or who buy goods, and it would benefit farmers if industries in the State were efficient. If we want industries to establish in South Australia and to remain here, we must be efficient.

As everyone knows, the city of Melbourne has a traffic problem that is far worse than the problem in Adelaide. Melbourne is dealing with this problem as we are dealing with it in the M.A.T.S. plan. It has a plan that will cost four times as much as the plan we are talking about here, and that city will have a population three times as big as that of Adelaide. The cost of the proposals will be \$695 a head of the metropolitan population, compared with the estimated cost here of \$508 a head.

Therefore, why all the fuss about the M.A.T.S. plan? If South Australia can take up the challenge and go ahead with this plan, we shall be further ahead in regard to industrial competition, and everyone in this State knows that this is something we need. The principles behind this plan have been accepted in this House over and over again. The acceptance of the 1962 town plan naturally presaged the introduction of the M.A.T.S. scheme. A joint steering committee presided over the production of the M.A.T.S. plan.

Certain members like to quote qualified people who are opposed to the plan, such as former Railways Commissioners, professors in various walks of life, and so on. However, I point out that many members on both sides are usually ready to support our public servants and that, in fact, they have been well served by them, and on the joint steering committee there were some of the outstanding public servants in the State, the Highways Commissioner and the Railways Commissioner included.

Indeed, it was presided over by the Director of Planning, of whom I have heard nothing but praise from members on both sides. However, suddenly the joint steering committee is forgotten, and the plan is supposed to be bad, according to members of the Opposition. The Opposition will not look back to the authorship of the plan. Therefore, I say that this is a case of political expediency. I have seen this process at work.

When the M.A.T.S. plan was first published, the members of the Opposition did not say very much about it. The one person who did say something about it was the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), who started off in a truly destructive style from the beginning. The other members of the Opposition said little or nothing about it. Gradually, the member for Edwardstown, by his insistence and by his attendance at meetings in his own district and his questions in this House, dragged with him the other members of the Opposition. I think some of them are now uneasy about supporting the amendment, which seeks to withdraw the whole plan.

Mr. Broomhill: You wait and see.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am always ready to respect the genuine concern of the property owners and the public generally, and it was that motivation that made me enthusiastic about releasing the plan when we did and not holding it back under cover. I can just imagine the cries in this House if copies of the M.A.T.S. plan had been locked in a room and not circulated and this had become known. I can just imagine the cries of anguish and the protests from the Opposition if that had happened: "What has the Government to hide? Why does it not come out with this plan? Let the people see it; keep the people informed." I am using the sort of phrases that members opposite are so ready to use, but in this case there is a different story. The plan was not supposed to be let out. I do not know who was supposed to see it. To my mind, members of the Opposition are talking through political expediency and I think some of them are probably ashamed of what they are doing in regard to this plan. I think they are hoping there will be no further trouble over M.A.T.S. because they know that South Australia will be held back if we do not go on with it.

We have an opportunity to go ahead with it, and we ought to keep going. I have said that I respect the genuine concern of the public and the property owners, but this type of argument I do not respect nearly as much—

the type of argument that lives by slogans, such as "Don't let the motor car rule our lives." That is what is said by the people who criticize M.A.T.S. They have said that we should not let the motor car rule our lives, but do they not realize just how popular the motor car is with the Australian public? If they do not realize that, they are sadly out of touch. One reason for our low density living is that the people like to live on their own block of land, and have their own back yard and their own motor car, be it old or new; some like to pull them to pieces. Everybody likes to own and drive a motor car. That is a fact of life that the Opposition ought to accept. It is no good trying to force people into using public transport. That is the type of direction to which we should strongly object.

Again, it is often asked, "Why not use public transport? The M.A.T.S. plan does not take enough account of public transport." People who say that do not seem to realize that public transport forms a very large part of this plan—a much larger part, incidentally, than it does in most of the plans made for comparable cities in the United States that members opposite so often cite.

Mr. Hudson: That is not so.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As a matter of fact, some of those cities have no public transport. One of the things commented on by Mr. Dondanville, the representative of De Leuw, Cather and Company, when he was here, was that we were lucky in that we had this network of public transport to which we could devote such a large proportion of our plans for public transport purposes. If we had had to buy the land to run public transport on in the way that we shall have to buy land for freeways, then of course the expenditure would have been altogether different and it is doubtful whether we could have gone in for a public transport system. However, we have, to a large degree, a public transport system in this plan.

Honourable members will have read, and I think probably accepted, that, whilst the present usage of public transport is about 19 per cent, if the trend is not arrested it will drop by 1986 to about 9 per cent. The M.A.T.S. plan will arrest that drift and the figure will settle, according to the estimates, at about 14 per cent usage. To my mind, that is the answer to those people who are so obsessed with freeways that they talk of the M.A.T.S. plan as though it was a freeways plan and nothing else. It is not just a freeways plan: there are plenty

of other things in the plan, but of course the freeways plan is of overriding importance in the public mind because of the property that will have to be bought. Much land will have to be bought, and for that reason people are worried. Over and over again we hear complaints in this House about the methods of acquisition and questions concerning whether public rights will be looked after. The average member of Parliament does not complain about the normal acquisition process that has existed in our legislation for many years. Although suggestions are made from time to time concerning this process, it has stood the test of time. However, that is not the only consideration under this plan. It has already been said that the Government is drawing up legislation to establish a special tribunal in order to streamline the procedure and to cater for the sort of case that will arise under the M.A.T.S. plan, and the procedure will be streamlined largely in the interests of the property owners. People criticize freeways and say that we should not let the motor car rule us.

Mr. Casey: No-one suggested that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Did I hear someone say members opposite did not criticize freeways? The member for Edwardstown, speaking for about an hour, said at one stage that he knew that freeways would have to come, but the rest of his speech dealt with what he thought of these "monsters", as he called them, rising 20ft. or 50ft. in front of people's windows. He became quite eloquent in expressing his hatred of freeways. Perhaps he would be less critical if he had to face up to the problems that we as a responsible Government have had to face up to. One of these problems relates to the fact that, in 1965, 4,000,000 vehicle-miles were travelled on a week day in the metropolitan area, and in 1986 it is expected that that will increase to 10,000,000 vehicle-miles. Where will we put all these additional motor cars? Are we going to sit down and watch this city become glutted by motor cars? Are we going to let the present accident statistics build up, as they are so horribly building up?

Mr. McKee: You are not a very far-sighted Government to let—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Lands.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Alternatively, are we going to accept freeways, which we know are about four times safer than are ordinary roads, on which there are

intersections at the same level? That is the sort of decision we must make. We have made it for ourselves, and I think Opposition members must make it for themselves. There is just no other way of having intersection-free roads than by using the freeway system. We have a metropolitan area, say, 40 miles long, with busy areas in the south and the north. People engaged in industry and commerce, as well as private individuals, will want to travel through the metropolitan area and, after all, there is just no other way of getting from south to north at a steady pace and in relative safety than by way of a freeway system. I wish to turn now to the question of finance. This question has been explained, but the explanation has been ignored by people who do not want to hear it.

It has been explained that in the next five years the State will receive \$129,000,000 in Commonwealth grants; about half (\$59,000,000) must be spent on urban arterial roads, not rural roads. Of the motor taxation (which is estimated to raise \$91,000,000 over those five years), we are planning to spend two-thirds (\$61,000,000) on rural roads and one-third on urban roads. This, in the next five years will make a total of \$89,000,000 in the metropolitan area and \$131,000,000 in rural areas. In the next 20 years we expect that the metropolitan area will take \$400,000,000 and the rural areas \$800,000,000. This is a complete answer to people who talk about using money for country roads. How can the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) convince us that he cares? He cares about only one thing—the politics of this matter. If we fail to accept this plan we are turning our backs on an immense opportunity for progress. If we fail to accept it and if other cities accept plans of this nature, we will take a tremendous step backwards. I support the motion as it was first moved.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I find myself amazed at the Minister's speech. He extols the virtues of the M.A.T.S. plan, yet he supports a motion that carves up that plan in no uncertain manner and makes all sorts of modification to it. He tries to justify the Government's actions yet this Government, rather than attempting to minimize the extent to which people's lives are interfered with and rather than minimizing their uncertainty, has acted in such an incompetent fashion that the interference to people's lives has been maximized, not minimized. If the principle of the M.A.T.S. plan is so basic and important to the Minister of Lands, I am absolutely amazed

that he has not resigned from the Cabinet, because he has been a party to modification after modification and deferment after deferment.

The Minister's comment about the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), suggesting he was concerned only with the politics of the matter, is the kind of observation that, if someone else had made it, the Minister himself would be up on his high horse complaining about. The fact of the matter—and the Minister knows it full well—is that the member for Edwardstown has shown more concern for the position in which individuals have been placed and he has attempted to do more about it than has any other other member. The Minister so often treats us to little sermons on maintaining the dignity of the House, and so on. We have heard him so unctuous in his public statements on these matters. It ill behoves him to criticize the one member in this House who has attempted to do more than any other member to protect individual citizens. Goodness knows, the member for Edwardstown has enough people who will be displaced persons in his district as a result of this plan. The Minister talked about finance but did not bother to answer the question of the Leader and the member for Edwardstown about how public transport proposals would be financed. No Government member can tell us how they will be financed.

Mr. Virgo: They don't know.

Mr. HUDSON: True, they just stick their heads in the sand and their tails in the air and refuse to answer the question saying that we are condemning the plan and are against freeways. The members from this side of the House who have spoken so far have said that, in the development of metropolitan Adelaide, freeways are necessary, and I repeat that. I agree that in the metropolitan area, which will be about 55 miles long and seven to eight miles wide and where the nature of land use will generate a tremendous volume of traffic in the north-south direction, some freeway development is unavoidable. Yet we need to bear the fact in mind that there is no increase in productivity in the community as the result of money spent on arterial roads, the widening of existing roads, and the building of expressways or freeways. No positive economic contribution to the productivity of a society comes from that expenditure. The only contribution that that expenditure is designed to make is to prevent productivity from declining. This is not similar to expendi-

ture on education, health or water supply developments; it is a social cost of a large city, and that fact needs to be recognized.

I was amazed also to hear the comments of the Minister of Lands about public transport. Does he not know the percentage use of public transport in Sydney and Melbourne? Is he not aware that the percentage of people using public transport in Adelaide is much lower than the percentage using it in those cities? Are not people in those cities also Australians and do they not also have a penchant for the motor car? Is it not therefore conceivable that, if we really direct our attention to the development of public transport, we need not contemplate a reduction in the percentage of total trips by public transport declining from 19 per cent to 14 per cent, but could contemplate instead an increase? Is the Minister of Lands not aware that, even if public transport is run at a loss, if more people can be encouraged by that means, then against that loss has to be set the fact that not as much is required to be spent on roads.

Mr. Evans: How can you evaluate which is the greatest saving?

Mr. HUDSON: I think possibly that would be easy to evaluate, because one can assess from the plan itself (if one cares to accept those figures) how much road development is necessary in order to cater for any percentage increase in the number of trips. It is then possible to suggest that, if a certain percentage of those increases in trips can be switched to public transport, then so much capital development expenditure on freeway development is saved.

Mr. Evans: How can you guarantee that you will get such a percentage?

Mr. HUDSON: I believe that railways can be used to shift that percentage, because I believe that, whether we like it or not and even if this Government managed to come through its present incompetent state and build something, we would see a deterioration in traffic conditions on our roads and that the average length of time taken by a motor car would increase, as would the average length of time taken by a bus. This has happened where freeways have been built. The relative attractiveness of the railway system increases, because there is no reason why traffic congestion should cause trains to take longer. The proposal for rail rapid transit could mean a considerable reduction in the length of time taken for a rail trip at the same time as road trips are lengthening in time. The figure provided by the study

as to how many passengers should be taken by rail is purely a guess: they have no real idea of the extent to which people can be encouraged to use railways, particularly if account was taken (and could be taken) of the need not to raise fares and reduce the service offered every time a loss was incurred, but to do the reverse and extend services, reduce fares and increase the frequency of trains.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't you do something when you were in office?

Mr. HUDSON: That is irrelevant. I am sick of hearing stupid interjections from the member for Stirling. At least the member for Onkaparinga had the courtesy to ask an intelligent question.

Mr. Virgo: How could he?

Mr. HUDSON: His question showed some method of reasoning. If we were in a position where we could ensure that fares on public transport were reduced, that the time taken by trains to travel between two places could be reduced, and that train services could be extended farther into the outer suburbs, I believe that the relative advantages of train and road travel would be pushed much in favour of the train. One reason for travelling by motor car is that it gives one greater mobility at the other end and eliminates the need to travel to and from a railway station. If we reached the stage where travel by train was twice as quick as travel by motor car (and that is not beyond the realm of possibility), the relative attractiveness of rail travel would increase enormously. Does any Government member suggest that if he went to London he would travel around London by private motor car? He would use the excellent system of public transport.

Mr. Evans: You are talking about a city of 10,000,000 people.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but it had the foresight to lay down most of its underground transport system in the 1890's, and the member for Onkaparinga had better not forget that.

Mr. Broomhill: Apparently, he never knew it.

Mr. HUDSON: It is an excellent system that enables people, whenever they contemplate travelling around London, to leave the motor car behind and use public transport, and not suffer as a result.

Mr. Evans: How many motor cars were there in the world in 1890?

Mr. HUDSON: That is irrelevant. The fact is that no-one in our society had the same kind of foresight in the 1890's or at any other

time between then and the 1950's. We are dealing with a situation in London where there was some foresight used in developing a transport system for the future. That is a city that is able to use public transport in a way which caters for the greater part of the transport needs of its citizens and which has a population some 18 or more times greater than that of Adelaide. Therefore, let no member on the Government side say that public transport cannot do the job. If any Government member wants to say anything about this, he should say that we have a pathetic situation in this State, where there is money available in millions of dollars to spend on arterial roads, expressways and freeways but barely a penny available to be spent on public transport.

Mr. Virgo: It's ridiculous, isn't it?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. We have the one healthy fund available for expenditure in this State—the Highways Fund. This fund is outside the control of the Treasurer, and if the member for Onkaparinga really wants to know about this he should ask the Treasurer what he thinks and what the Under Treasurer thinks about such a fund which is outside of Treasury control, which has a regular growth element in it, and which enables a degree of expenditure to be carried on that leaves education, health, and all the other basic welfare services, along with public transport, for dead.

What sort of pathetic financial arrangements do we have when we have millions of dollars available to spend on roads which, as I have said, so far as freeways and that sort of thing are concerned, do not add to our productivity but merely prevent it from getting worse, when we do not have enough money to spend on schools, hospitals, water supplies, and on all sorts of other capital development and when any money we spend on capital developments in the field of public transport has to compete in the Loan Account with schools, hospitals, water supplies, and so on? What sort of a crazy, mixed-up financial situation is that? Has it arisen because the Highways Fund is some sort of sacred cow? I think it has, and I suspect that neither this Government nor the country majority in the Upper House would have anything to do with any proposal which said that some of that money allocated for metropolitan roads could be used for public transport instead. Would any member on the Government side support such a proposition? If so, let him get up and say it but, if not, let him hold his peace on the M.A.T.S. plan and on public transport.

Unfortunately, the position with our friends in Canberra is no better. They now give us grants for road purposes; they know the problems of urban development within our cities, and they know the needs of public transport. They must know what goes on in the United States of America, where since 1964 loans and grants have been made by the Federal Government to cities to enable public transport developments to take place. Government members have talked about the necessity for free-ways to follow the example of the U.S.A. Why has no Government member come up with a proposition that we should make a concerted approach to the Commonwealth Government to adopt the same sort of scheme in relation to public transport which applies in the U.S.A. and which applies here in relation to roads? How pathetic can we be in paying lip service to public transport if we are not prepared to go even as far as that?

Let me now deal a little further with the Minister and at the same time comment on the situation that exists with the M.A.T.S. plan. After 12 months of energetic planning and after spending, as we have been told, \$700,000 on producing a most magnificent report, what have we got? We have expressway after expressway, and parts of them deferred; we have arterial roads deferred, deferred, deferred; part of the Modbury Freeway deferred for further consideration; the Hills Freeway and the Foot-hills Expressway abandoned—but then, apparently, it is the case that they are really only deferred.

Mr. Virgo: The Government has changed its mind.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; it is gobbledegook. It is a Government of gobbledegook. Let members listen to this paragraph:

The proposals for the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway are not accepted by the Government. The whole matter of a proposed freeway and expressway in these regions of the metropolitan area is—

rejected, one would think, but that is not what is said; it is—

deferred and will be considered by the State Planning Office in its review of the Metropolitan Development Plan now being undertaken. It is the Government's policy that land acquisition along the M.A.T.S. routes will continue, based on hardship considerations.

Does not this Government know what it is going to do about anything? Does it make a statement one day and then think, "Oh, well, we can have another chop at that a few weeks later"? Cannot it get it into its head that on this matter it is necessary to take

decisions and make those decisions stick so that there is some certainty in the situation? Are not the people of this State entitled to some certainty about what will happen? Are we to be faced with the pathetic situation that arises with the Noarlunga Freeway, that everyone who lives between the 1962 route, the M.A.T.S. route and the route that was considered farther to the east must be wondering where it will go next? How could anyone legitimately contemplate purchasing a property in this overall area between now and the time when the Government says it will make up its mind where the route will be?

Do all members know that at a series of meetings held and addressed by officers of the Highways Department the people were informed that three possible routes had been under consideration for the Noarlunga Freeway: the 1962 route, the route adopted, and another route farther to the east? Do the Ministers know that Highways Department officers informed people at those meetings that roughly the same number of houses would have to be demolished whichever one of these three routes was followed? What is the point of the reconsideration unless the committee is instructed to try to devise a route that minimizes the extent to which people's houses have to be pulled down? What is the point of transferring the evil to someone else and leaving double or treble the number of people wondering whether their houses will be taken away and an even greater number of people still wondering whether or not they are going to wake up one morning with a freeway next-door, having received no compensation at all for any indirect hardship they suffer because of that freeway? We have the extraordinary situation, when the position concerning the Noarlunga Freeway was further considered, of the announcement made by Mr. Hill, as follows:

My statement concerns the Noarlunga Freeway in the city of Marion. The Noarlunga Freeway in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study will serve as the main route to the rapidly growing residential, industrial and recreational areas to the south of Adelaide . . . In February of this year the Government, after consultation with the Marion council—

which, of course, the Mayor denied next day—pronounced in favour of the study route. However, in view of the public concern at this decision and the strong representations that have been made to the Government by citizens of the city of Marion, the Government proposes to ask the Metropolitan Transportation Committee to further review the merits of the

two routes and to consider any alternative routes which may be submitted to the committee.

All the Government refers to the committee are the two routes (1962 and 1967). We know, because the Highways Department officers have told us, that the same number of houses is affected whichever route is adopted. What is the point of any further review unless the committee is instructed to consider possible routes that can minimize the extent to which people's houses are interfered with?

The matter of the Sturt River was raised by the member for Edwardstown. I am not sure whether this is practicable, but, if it were practicable as a route for the Noarlunga Freeway (that is, constructing the freeway over the re-aligned and widened Sturt River), then the Noarlunga Freeway could follow that route and, at the intersection of Morphett Road and Anzac Highway, it could connect up with what was proposed to be the Noarlunga Expressway, use the route of the Noarlunga Expressway, and connect up again with the existing route of the Noarlunga Freeway at Mile End.

I do not know whether that is practicable; it may not be. However, I suspect that it could well be practicable, if Highways Department engineers were prepared to tolerate a freeway where motorists could travel at only 55 or 60 miles an hour instead of at 70 or 75 m.p.h.; if they were prepared to tolerate a freeway that had some curves in it instead of being a straight line throughout; and if they were prepared to tolerate a freeway that extended a mile or two longer instead of over the most direct route. If the officers were so prepared, this suggested route might be practicable.

It would certainly reduce the number of houses to be knocked over not by the fictional thousand or so (about which we were told in the *News* after the phoney announcement made by the Government concerning the Foothills Expressway and the Hills Freeway) but by a fair dinkum thousand. Can any Minister tell members on this side why this suggestion of the member for Edwardstown, concerning the Noarlunga Freeway, was not put directly to the committee? Do members of the Government simply want to stir up trouble? It may well have been that the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport said, "Virgo is kicking up about this matter so much that we will have to put it on to Hudson, and let him bell the cat for a while."

Mr. Virgo: He would protest just as hard.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know whether I would be quite as vocal as the honourable member. Of course, I have to be polite to the honourable gentleman because, if I am not, I have to go home by public transport. The Government should show a little bit of common sense and decency. If it really cares about the people whose homes will be knocked over to make way for the Noarlunga Freeway, surely it must refer the suggestion of the member for Edwardstown to the committee, because that route does minimize the hardship and interference that would be suffered by the people—and is that not part of the Government's job? I am sure that even the Minister of Lands will agree that a freeway with a few curves that is a mile or two longer and on which one can travel at only 50 or 60 miles an hour instead of 70 miles an hour may be no less safe than the route he adopts.

One of the principles that ought to dominate all considerations is this: what public transport facilities do we need, and how can we limit the extent to which we need freeways by developing public transport? Further, we must ask: if we do not have the finance to enable public transport to carry out these functions, how can we get it? If we cannot get it from our own resources, how can we squeeze it out of the Commonwealth Government? Further, how can we get the Commonwealth Government to see what the Government of the United States of America has seen—the need to do something about urban development?

Having made these judgments and worked out the minimum amount of freeways necessary, surely it is incumbent upon the Government to try to devise freeway routes that minimize the extent to which people's lives are disturbed and which minimize the indirect consequences of freeways. If a freeway can go through an open paddock instead of through a built-up area, not only have we prevented houses from being knocked down but we have also avoided the situation of people living directly alongside a freeway. I have plenty of sympathy for people who lose their houses in this way, but in many respects I must confess that I have a deal more sympathy for those who are forced to live right next door to a freeway and who receive no compensation at all, even though the value of their properties has been diminished and even though the whole pattern of their lives has been adversely affected.

Mr. Broomhill: Would you buy such a house?

Mr. HUDSON: No, not unless I could get it at a substantially reduced price and I needed it. The question of interference with the rights of individuals must be considered. I suggest that the Government's actions and the complete muddle produced by the Premier and the Minister have adversely affected the position of many people. They may have paid lip service to it, but their muddling has maximized the adverse effect on individuals. Even when they do reconsider something they end up not by referring it to the committee in the way it should be referred but asking the committee to reconsider two routes both of which are equally bad in terms of the number of houses knocked over. Where are we going? Is it not possible to get even a subcommittee of the Cabinet together to make some sensible decisions and to tell the rest of Cabinet to stick to those decisions so that we can have some certainty in the matter.

The stupidity and incompetence of the Government in this matter has prompted the Opposition's amendment. The Government has demonstrated to everyone that it is incapable of reaching a decision and sticking to it on any one matter. If it cannot make a decision, it should withdraw the whole plan until it can come out with a set of decisions that are financially feasible, that minimize the interference with people's lives, that are open-ended regarding future development, and that leave open options for future development in the field of public transport. It is all very well for the Premier to sneer at the Leader when the Leader talks about future technology, to say that that has nothing to do with the Government, and to sneer at funland propositions. It is still up to this Government to ensure that none of its plan is of such a rigid nature that it restricts any future options open to future Governments. It is important in any of this planning that planning take place in such a way that future options and alternatives are kept as open and as wide as possible, and that is the point the Leader was trying to make. That particular point is not dealt with by the kind of cheap sneer and smear that the Premier likes to indulge in.

I want to refer to matters that have taken place in the United States where, in 1962, a report was presented to President Kennedy by the Housing and Home Finance Agency dealing with future public transport developments in the United States and stating amongst other things:

The major objectives of urban transportation policy are the achievement of sound land-use patterns, the assurance of transportation facilities for all segments of the population, the improvement in overall traffic flow, and the meeting of total urban transportation needs at minimum costs. Only a balanced transportation system can attain these goals and, in many urban areas, this means an extensive mass transportation network fully integrated with the highway and street system, but mass transportation has, in recent years, experienced capital consumption rather than expansion. A cycle of fare increases and service cuts to offset loss of ridership followed by further declines in use points clearly to the need for a substantial contribution of public funds to support needed mass transportation improvements. We therefore recommend a new programme of grants and loans for urban mass transportation.

The report recommended that the Bureau of Public Roads in the United States should, in future, permit the reservation of highway lanes for the exclusive use of specific types of motor vehicles when comprehensive transportation plans indicate this to be desirable. If we wish to develop a bus system in relation to freeway developments we have to contemplate the reservation of special lanes, and it may well be that appropriate rights of way can be obtained and associated with freeway developments to ensure that this will be permitted in future and that the options are well and truly open for future improvements in technology.

This report in 1962 led, in 1964 after the death of President Kennedy, to the passing of the Urban Mass Transportation Act in the United States, and it was this Act that provided for a system of loans to cities for mass transportation (or public transport as we call it) and for direct grants by the Federal Government of the United States for the payment of two-thirds of the cost of public transport programmes. Large sums have been made available under that original scheme and under the amendment that was passed in 1966. That is the sort of approach that we need to adopt in this country. I think that the specific railway projects that have been recommended by the M.A.T.S. Report have not gone far enough. Once again the Government manages to leave things up in the air: we do not know what railway projects the Government is to support. We know it does not have the money, yet the motion we are asked to support states that we should support a co-ordinated development by public and private transportation and ancillary facilities. Even with the dear old Glenelg tram, the Government has failed to come out with a clear-cut decision, although

it could do so if it cared to. The Premier said:

In the proposals the existing Glenelg tram service is to be discontinued and replaced by local bus operations in about 10 years' time. However, in the light of the decision now taken by the Government in connection with the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail diversion, it may now be possible to retain a service on the Glenelg tram route, connecting with the King William Street subway. This matter will now be investigated fully.

It must be possible: if it is necessary to keep the tramway going with modernized trams then this has to be possible. Some public transport facility has to be maintained along the route of the Glenelg tram. After all, for 95 per cent of its journey the tram has a separate right of way already existing and established.

Mr. Casey: Would you get from Glenelg to Adelaide in peak traffic hours more quickly by tram than by motor car?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, particularly if the trams could be modernized. If more people used the trams and fewer people used the roads that would limit the extent to which additional money had to be spent on roads. However, we cannot get a firm decision from the Government about the Glenelg tram. Dealing with the railway proposals, we have this masterpiece about the closure of railway stations:

There are no plans for the early closure of metropolitan railway stations as proposed in the study report (including the Womma railway station, closure of which was specifically deferred). The position with regard to the operation of all metropolitan stations will be kept under continuing review, and any decision on closure will be made having regard to the number of passengers using the various stations.

That is virtually the only comment in the Premier's statement that deals with the specific proposal in the report to cut out two of every three stations on each line and to introduce feeder bus services between these stations. Well, I think the proposal in the report is nonsense. If, as has been said, people will not use public transport, we are simply not going to get them to use a feeder bus service connecting up with the railways to bring them

into the city or to take them where they want to go.

If it is true, as the Minister of Lands claimed, that the average Australian will not use public transport, then people will not be encouraged by the kind of cut-throat system that is suggested in the report. The Minister must know this, and members of the Government must have had advice from the railways officers on this matter. Clearly, if we are to get rapid transit we have to keep all the existing stations and use a system of staggering the number of stations at which the trains stop; and there is no doubt that this can be done.

Why does the Government not reach a clear decision on this matter? We are told that we have to vote for co-ordinated rail and road transport, but we are not given any information on what is to be the form of the railway transport. Why can we not get from this Government some statement on the railways proposals? We have even had certain oblique references to the underground railway system and to feasibility studies that must be made. I have heard a rumour that certain railway engineers are suggesting that the plan set out in the M.A.T.S. Report for the underground railway is not a feasible one.

Mr. Casey: They said that long ago.

Mr. HUDSON: Is this in fact the case? Does the Government have reports from railway engineers that the subway proposals for King William Street as presently designed are not feasible? What is the position with respect to the subway? There are matters for disquiet in the Premier's statement. There is no real conclusion given to us as to what form the rail rapid transit system is going to take, yet the Minister of Lands has the hide to get up and praise the M.A.T.S. Report on these matters. The Government has left these matters also completely up in the air. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 13, at 2 p.m.